Every time I've seen data gathered via 10-point scale (especially when all point are not anchored), it has produced a multimodal distribution with peaks at 1, 5 and 10, with small "normal" curves in the valleys between these peaks. This has been the case regardless of the phenomenon being measured. The consistent production of such a highly abnormal distribution leads me to believe that these scales are measuring something more than the phenomenon (construct) of interest. I believe this distribution is more a function of cognitive complexity and motivation than it is of attitude or opinion (see Milt's post re: Miller's article).

With regards to "remapping" your data, you may want to take a look at "Test Equating: Methods and Practices" by Michael Kolen and Robert Brennan, and "Introduction to Classical and Modern Test Theory" by Linda Crocker and James Algina.

These references will not give you a simple answer, but may give you some background into the issues associated with trying to transform your data.

Off the top of my head, here are some of the problems I see:

1) Adding or subtracting will adjust the mean, multiplying and dividing will adjust the standard deviation. However, such transformations will still leave you with 10 values rather than 5 (e.g., 2.5x/5 produces the following values: .5, 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3, 3.5, 4, 4.5, 5).

2) Given the distributional abnormalities mentioned above, I'm not sure you would be able to justify collapsing the data without making a lot of cautionary footnotes regarding the nature of the data. My guess is that you have an apples to oranges comparison, even if the two scales were attempting to measure the same construct (i.e., the construct validity of the 10 point scale is poor).

3) Simply reassigning values (e.g., 0 or 1 =3D 1, 2 or 3 =3D 2, etc...) = will compound the measurement error problems you already have by adding
another "layer" of error to the data. I believe this type of approach would be even harder to justify.

Regards.
Ken Steve

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of LinChiat Chang
Sent: Wednesday, December 14, 2005 1:47 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: 10-point vs. 5-point scales

=20

Does anyone on AAPOR-Net know of research comparing 10-point vs. 5-point scales measuring quality (poor - excellent), and recommendations on how data collected using these 2 scales can be merged? Or perhaps any relevant work that speaks to this issue in general, e.g. how longer scales should be mapped onto shorter scales? Any suggestion from you would be much appreciated. Thank you.

LinChiat Chang
Opinion Research Corporation
(609) 452-5468

Be sure to visit our new website at www.opinionresearch.com

************************************************************************
* Notice: This communication, including attachments, may contain information that is confidential and/or copyrighted, and is the property of Opinion Research Corporation. It constitutes non-public information intended to be conveyed only to the designated recipient(s).
If the reader or recipient of this communication is not the intended recipient or an employee or agent of the intended recipient who is responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, or if you believe that you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and promptly delete this e-mail, including attachments without reading or saving them in any
Program Assistant - ODE (UCP III)
Office of Diversity and Equity

The University of Connecticut's Office of Diversity & Equity seeks applications for a Program Assistant position, which would support the University's commitment to diversity, social equity, and Affirmative Action through various services. Position responsibilities include assisting in the training of search committees and the production of written training materials as well as researching and reporting data and information (numerical/statistical/narrative) used to apprise others of the University's employment practices and workforce profiles.

Successful candidates will demonstrate strong written and verbal communication skills (public speaking/presentation skills), adaptability to changing priorities and challenging deadlines, proficiency in MS Word, Excel, and PowerPoint, as well as the ability to learn and use other software applications.

Salary range is low to mid thirties with a competitive benefits package.

Please read detailed job description, list of minimum qualifications, and application instructions posted under ODE Job Openings at http://www.ode.uconn.edu/openjobs.htm Committee review of completed application packages will begin immediately and continue until position is filled. (Search # 06A175)
Sanjeewa Karunaratne
860-208-6846 (cell)
860-487-4174 (home)
sanjeewa.karunaratne@uconn.edu
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Faux surveys seek voter data for Blackwell=
5119561.xml&coll=3D2

Julie Carr Smyth
Plain Dealer Bureau=
Columbus - Calls seemingly packed with poll questions about Secretary of State Ken Blackwell's run for governor and his tax-limit plan are being used to collect information on Ohio voters who might cast a ballot for Blackwell or give him money.=

The automated calls are amassing the voter information while sometimes spreading negative messages about Blackwell's leading Republican rival, Attorney General Jim Petro, in a practice called "push polling."=

A recent spate of calls made no mention of Blackwell, but did include questions peppered with references to Petro's "horrible track record," his alleged fund-raising ties to "favored GOP whipping-boy Bill Clinton" and his being "part of the problem in Columbus."=

What the calls are not doing, concedes Blackwell spokesman Gene Pierce, is measuring anything.=

"It's definitely an information-gathering tool. This is database management," he said. "These aren't polls in the strictly scientific sense."=

SNIP
All,

We have a client interested in the "industry standard" for offering monetary incentives to business executives.

After a bit of debate the client has decided to offer $50 to top level executives (VP and C-level) in both small (less than $5M in annual revenue) and medium/large ($5M+ in annual revenue) companies for participation in a 10 minute phone survey. However, they are now asking whether they should offer a non-monetary incentive (an informational incentive perhaps) or a more significant dollar amount ($100).

In addition to literature references, I would like to include others' experience with this issue.

As we are under-the-gun on getting the end-client's buy-in on this, sooner is better than later (as always). But I welcome your input whenever you can send it.

Best Wishes,

John

--

John C. Fries
Senior Project Director | Alan Newman Research
http://www.anr.com | Market Research Consultants
Phone: 804.272.6100 x228 | FAX: 804.272.7145
Email: mailto:jfries@anr.com

Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.org/
Archives: http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Hi John. Our experience with this type of audience is that for the smaller companies, as long as you are not dealing with a limited sample issue, the $50 should be fine (certainly no more than $75). It may be tougher to foster cooperation with the same amount among medium size businesses, but then again, this is without knowing the subject matter. I have seen combinations offered, such as $75 + top-line report of the survey results. Additionally, there are often times where the money to the individual is inconsequential. Subsequently, we have offered an incentive in the form of a donation to a charity on their behalf. This is usually well received as well, but only among top C-level executives, as people that are "lower on the totem-pole" generally want the money for themselves. However, if making a donation, you have the benefit of telling the respondent you are making the lump sum donation.

For instance, 100 respondents at $50 per = $5000. So, you can tell the respondent that for their participation you will be making a $5000 donation in their name to some charity. When you make the donation, you will donate the money in the names of all the respondents.

Hope this helps, and Happy New Year!

Lance Hoffman
Vice President of Sales
Opinion Access Corp
P: 718.729.2622 x.220
F: 718.729.2444
C: 646.522.2012
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To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Incentives for Business Executives

All,

We have a client interested in the "industry standard" for offering monetary incentives to business executives.

After a bit of debate the client has decided to offer $50 to top level executives (VP and C-level) in both small (less than $5M in annual =
and medium/large ($5M+ in annual revenue) companies for participation in a 10 minute phone survey. However, they are now asking whether they should offer a non-monetary incentive (an informational incentive perhaps) or a more significant dollar amount ($100).

In addition to literature references, I would like to include others' experience with this issue.

As we are under-the-gun on getting the end-client's buy-in on this, sooner is better than later (as always). But I welcome your input whenever you can send it.

Best Wishes,

John

---
John C. Fries
Senior Project Director | Alan Newman Research
http://www.anr.com | Market Research Consultants
Phone: 804.272.6100 x228 | FAX: 804.272.7145
Email: mailto:jfries@anr.com
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RnJvbSBteSBleHBlcmIlbmNlLCA1MCBkb2xsYXJzIHRoZSBvcHRpbXVtVGFtb3VudC4NCg0KV2UgaGF2ZSB0YWQgdVyeSBnb2Qgc3VjY2VzcyB3aXRoiG1ha2luZyBpdCBlaXRoZXRlYVWgQW1l
[A] poll conducted for Mr. Ponemon last month may show that people hold different views on commercial and government privacy issues. Conducted after The New York Times revealed the N.S.A. surveillance, it suggested great concern. Of those polled, 88 percent expressed concern, and 54 percent said they were "very concerned," he said.

"It was, 'Wow,' " Mr. Ponemon said. The 88 percent figure was more than twice the level of concern of past studies he had seen of public attitudes toward commercial privacy breaches.
The reaction to the president's program could be cumulative, said Bob Barr, a former Republican congressman from Georgia who speaks out on civil liberties issues in alliance with conservative libertarian groups and the American Civil Liberties Union. When the privacy violations on the business side and those on the government side are taken into account, he said, "you get a truly frightening picture."

The issue of government abuse of privacy in the name of security has been growing since the 9/11 attacks, said Alan F. Westin, a privacy expert and consultant who is a professor emeritus of public law and government at Columbia University. He has been tracking consumer attitudes about domestic security issues with telephone surveys since 2001, and has found a growing concern that the checks on government surveillance might be weakening.

Support for expanded government monitoring of cellphones and e-mail messages dropped from 54 percent in September 2001 to 37 percent in June 2005. Those who said they were "very confident" that expanded surveillance powers would be used in a "proper way" dropped from 34 percent in 2001 to 23 percent in 2004, the last year that that specific question was asked. Those who were "somewhat" confident in the government's conduct of surveillance stood at 53 percent in 2004, unchanged from 2001.

"The essence really is a majority of the public does not believe the administration should be given a blank check," Mr. Westin said.

Developing, this should get interesting.
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Please direct all inquiries about this position to=20
Kitty.Madden@capitalone.com.

You=92re a knowledge-is-a-competitive-advantage professional. At Capital=20
One, a financial services leader and FORTUNE 200 company, we value expertise in specialized disciplines. If you have deep knowledge in market research and brand management, you can join a fast-paced, collaborative environment that appreciates and rewards your experience.

The Brand Strategy Department develops value propositions, delivers market insights and analysis, and plans communication for individual business units throughout Capital One. Functioning as the key consumer advocate, the Brand Strategy group drives consumer insights into the decision making process.

Responsibilities:
- Effectively partners with peers, managers and leaders of the Brand Strategy group to collaborate on key initiatives and leverage best practices in marketing research and strategy development
- Develop impactful insights that drive strategy and decision making, including leveraging and integrating primary research, multiple studies, secondary sources, and competitive intelligence
- Diagnose and interpret business issues, identify knowledge gaps and obtain support from marketing and business partners for effective research and analytic plans
- Present market insights to business partners and stakeholders that drive business actions

Qualifications:
--Required:
- College degree, with preferred major in marketing, economics, statistics, business, computer science/engineering, sociology or psychology
- 5+ years experience in one or more of following areas: marketing research, marketing consulting, marketing strategy, active user of marketing research, or equivalent
- Strong analytic skills, including the ability to analyze and interpret large data sets, identify insights, and synthesize how these insights impact the business (so what? and now what?) and strategy
- Strong writing and presentation skills, including the ability to present and defend both research plans, recommendations and conclusions based on research findings, analysis, and insights
- Demonstrated ability to operate independently with multiple constituents with tight timelines and changing priorities
- Ability to lead internal and vendor teams in executing large scale research and analytic projects, as well as the ability to manage multiple in-process studies simultaneously
- Ability to travel between Richmond/Northern Virginia and within North America (10-20%)

--Preferred:
- Advanced degree, such as an MBA or an MS (statistics, economics, marketing research, consumer psychology, or related field)
- Experience on either the supplier side or the client side within the marketing research profession
- Experience at a Fortune 500 company or a company well-known for...
marketing discipline
=95 International work/study experience, particularly in Latin America=20
=95 Fluency in Spanish in addition to English
=95 Experience in planning, execution, and analysis of market research=20
across wide range of survey techniques with knowledge of sampling and=20
statistical survey analysis
=95 Specific experience in advanced research methods such as conjoint,=20
discrete choice, segmentation and statistical modeling
=95 Richmond or Northern Virginia location
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Dear all,

I am posting this for a colleague. Please respond to
ingmari.boynton@scb.se <mailto:ingmari.boynton@scb.se> .

=20

We have a client that wants to measure perceived discrimination in
Sweden due to ethnicity, disability and sexual orientation and its
effects on health. We are interested in the experience of others in
measuring the concept of perceived discrimination. Before developing the
instrument we plan to carry out a number of cognitive pretests. We would
appreciate the opportunity to hear from anyone who has experience in
this field. Thanks!

=20

Lilli Japec=20

Statistics Sweden
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I am right in the middle of a study on the effects of racism on different groups. I am using the Schedule of Racist Events scale which has a sub-scale that is on perceived racism. It is by Landrine and Klonoff, Journal of black Psychology (1996) 22(2):144-168

Bill

William Divale, Ph.D.
Professor
Survey Research Laboratory Director
York College, CUNY
94-20 Guy R. Brewer Blvd.
Jamaica, NY 11451
718-262-2982
www.york.cuny.edu

We are looking to revamp our interviewer evaluation procedure, and I was hoping to get feedback on the incorporation of refusals per hour in performance measures and the ways other organizations evaluate interviewer performance. =20

Currently, we use an evaluation system that incorporates both completes per hour and refusals per hour. Questions have been raised as to whether =20
the use of refusals per hour in performance evaluations increases the likelihood that interviewers will falsify response codes to avoid accruing refusals, and thus, improve their performance scores. Or, perhaps, interviewers who push respondents far enough to get more completes might, as a result, also get more refusals. Is there any research/feedback on these issues?

Also, our new evaluation procedure hopes to provide interviewers with an overall performance score (that combines the scores on supervisors' qualitative evaluations of interviewers and interviewers' quantitative survey performance). If refusals per hour are used in the quantitative performance evaluations, how much should they be valued in relation to completes per hour?

Your comments and suggestions are greatly appreciated and can be emailed off list to aknittle@fandm.edu.

Thanks

Angela N. Knittle
Project Coordinator of Community Research
Floyd Institute for Public Policy
Franklin & Marshall College
P.O. Box 3003
Lancaster, PA 17603
717.358.4667
angela.knittle@fandm.edu
Hi John,

We do a lot of research with B2B, especially with C-level executives. We have found that with the top level executives - VP and higher, they have been more interested in getting a report of the results or information regarding the study that will be beneficial to their management of their divisions or company. In some cases, we also sent the executives information about the client that was conducting the study. The donation to charity was successful until the hurricanes hit. We found that so many people had been inundated with all the news about charities, that they were tired of hearing about it. In the last few projects, in addition to the informational incentive offered, we also offered a monetary incentive of $100 (SR. Directors, VPs)- $200 (Chief Exec. Officers), and the option was given to the respondent to donate to a charity of their choice or have it mailed to them directly.

Hope this helps,

Ginger

Ginger Blazier
Vice President of Business Development

Directions In Research
8593 Aero Drive
San Diego, CA 92123

gblazier@diresearch.com
www.diresearch.com

tel: 619 299 5883
fax: 619 299 5888
toll free: 800 676 5883
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All,

We have a client interested in the "industry standard" for offering monetary incentives to business executives.

After a bit of debate the client has decided to offer $50 to top level executives (VP and C-level) in both small (less than $5M in annual revenue) and medium/large ($5M+ in annual revenue) companies for participation in a 10 minute phone survey. However, they are now asking whether they should offer a non-monetary incentive (an informational incentive perhaps) or a more significant dollar amount ($100).

In addition to literature references, I would like to include others' experience with this issue.

As we are under-the-gun on getting the end-client's buy-in on this, sooner is better than later (as always). But I welcome your input whenever you can send it.

Best Wishes,

John

--
John C. Fries
Senior Project Director | Alan Newman Research
http://www.anr.com | Market Research Consultants
Phone: 804.272.6100 x228 | FAX: 804.272.7145
Email: mailto:jfries@anr.com

Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.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
You're a knowledge-is-a-competitive-advantage professional. At Capital One, a financial services leader and FORTUNE 200 company, we value expertise in specialized disciplines. If you have deep knowledge in market research and brand management, you can join a fast-paced, collaborative environment that appreciates and rewards your experience.

Department Background:
The Brand Strategy Department develops value propositions, delivers market insights and analysis, and plans communication for individual business units throughout Capital One. Functioning as the key consumer advocate, the Brand Strategy group drives consumer insights into the decision making process.

Position Key Responsibilities:
- Effectively partners with peers, managers and leaders of the Brand Strategy group to collaborate on key initiatives and leverage best practices in marketing research and strategy development
- Develop impactful insights that drive strategy and decision making, including leveraging and integrating primary research, multiple studies, secondary sources, and competitive intelligence
- Diagnose and interpret business issues, identify knowledge gaps and obtain support from marketing and business partners for effective research and analytic plans
- Present market insights to business partners and stakeholders that drive business actions

Job Qualifications
Required:
- College degree, with preferred major in marketing, economics, statistics, business, computer science/engineering, sociology or psychology
- 5+ years experience in one or more of following areas: marketing research, marketing consulting, marketing strategy, active user of marketing research, or equivalent
- Strong analytic skills, including the ability to analyze and interpret large data sets, identify insights, and synthesize how these insights impact the business (so what? and now what?) and strategy
- Strong writing and presentation skills, including the ability to present and defend both research plans, recommendations and conclusions based on research findings, analysis, and insights
- Demonstrated ability to operate independently with multiple constituents with tight timelines and changing priorities
- Ability to lead internal and vendor teams in executing large scale research and analytic projects, as well as the ability to manage multiple in-process studies simultaneously
- Ability to travel between Richmond/Northern Virginia and within North America (10-20%)

Preferred:
- Advanced degree, such as an MBA or an MS (statistics, economics, marketing research, consumer psychology, or related field)
- Experience on either the supplier side or the client side within the marketing research profession
- Experience at a Fortune 500 company or a company well-known for marketing discipline
-International work/study experience, particularly in Latin America
-Fluency in Spanish in addition to English
-Experience in planning, execution, and analysis of market research across a wide range of survey techniques with knowledge of sampling and statistical survey analysis
-Specific experience in advanced research methods such as conjoint, discrete choice, segmentation and statistical modeling
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Director of Competitive Intelligence

The Director of Competitive Intelligence is responsible for developing Marketing's first comprehensive Competitive Intelligence team (4 FTEs). Responsible for the development, implementation, and management of this program. Consults with internal clients in marketing and across the company to define information needs and issues. Provides secondary / syndicated information and strategic insights to direct, inform, and evaluate marketing strategies and initiatives. Responsible for the development, definition and implementation of: competitive data source identification and validation, data analysis, development of reporting tools and distribution calendar, and developing strategic insights for dissemination across the organization. Manages corporate tracking studies to benchmark customer satisfaction and brand awareness within the competitive landscape.

Duties & Responsibilities:

- Develop Competitive Intelligence core competency within marketing and across the enterprise.

- Understand the drivers of competitive performance and identify
new marketing strategies that will optimize T-Mobile's industry performance.

* Work across ALL departments to develop competitive intelligence and disseminate insights that will drive improved business performance.

* Direct the procurement, purchase, licensing, and contract negotiations with information providers and manages 4.2M annual budget.

* Manage our corporate tracking surveys for customer satisfaction and brand awareness, which provide benchmarks for our performance within the competitive landscape. This includes vendor management; monthly and quarterly report creation; report distribution; and production/reporting of corporate and marketing quarterly and annual bonus metrics. Manage a team of two Sr. Managers and one Manager, plus cross-functional resources (CS&A) and third party vendors and consultants.

* Work Cross Functionally with Strategic Pricing, CS&A, Consumer Insights, Sales, Care and Finance

* Manage a team of 3 FTE's.

* Interact with CMO, COO, CEO, Sales and Marketing VPs, Senior Directors and Directors.

* Responsible for marketing's competitive intelligence competency and all deliverables.

Requirements:

* Advanced Knowledge of Strategic Frameworks (e.g., SWOT, Porter's Five Forces, 3C's) and experience applying them to industries (wireless
experience strongly preferred)

* Understanding of Industry competitive financial performance and implications to strategy

* Strong Analytical, Presentation, Communication and Leadership skills

* Ability to work with cross-functional units and Senior Executives.

* Successful track record of leading analytical teams and strategy development.

* 6+ years of experience

* People Management and Department Management Experience

* Needs to be flexible, adept at shifting direction and able to work in a very fast paced environment

Wireless Experience (strongly preferred); Financial Services Background (a plus)

Education:

* MBA or equivalent experience required.

Previous experience managing a competitive intelligence function required.
Interested candidates, please visit us at: www.t-mobile.com/jobs for more information or to apply online.

Michael P. Flanagan, CAE
Association Manager
Applied Measurement Professionals
8310 Nieman Road
Lenexa, KS 66214-1579
(913) 495-4470
FAX: (913) 599-5340
www.goAMP.com <http://www.goAMP.com>
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New Wal-Mart poll finds more favorable attitudes
Wed Jan 4, 2006 1:54 PM ET
06-01-04T185444Z_01_SIB467871_RTRIDST_0_BUSINESSPRO-RETAIL-WALMART-POLL-DC.XML
Or
http://tinyurl.com/9bmvq

By Emily Kaiser

CHICAGO (Reuters) - About 70 percent of Americans think Wal-Mart Stores Inc. (WMT.N: Quote, Profile, Research) is good for consumers, according to a poll released on Wednesday by a Wal-Mart-backed group of community leaders.

The poll, conducted by RT Strategies for the recently formed "Working
Families for Wal-Mart" group, comes one month after one of Wal-Mart's most vocal critics released a Zogby International survey that found a majority thought Wal-Mart was bad for America.

Wal-Mart, the world's biggest retailer, was among the financial backers of Working Families for Wal-Mart, a group of community leaders that aims to "show how Wal-Mart is good for America's working families," according to its Web site.

SNIP

The poll showed a majority believed a campaign against Wal-Mart was not a good use of union dues, although union households were roughly split on that question.

The question was prefaced by statements detailing job losses at union companies such as General Motors Corp. (GM:N: Quote, Profile, Research), contrasted with an estimated 100,000 new jobs that non-union Wal-Mart says it creates annually.

In a telephone interview, RT Strategies partner Thomas Riehle said the statements were intended to "inform everybody of the context" and did not skew the results of the poll.

"It's a mistake to dismiss the results of a poll where factual information has been provided to respondents just because they've been provided information," he said. "The judgment you have to make is, are the facts that are provided fair, provable, confirmable facts, and secondly, is it a reasonable amount of information."

Riehle said his firm conducts monthly polls and invites industry or interest groups to in Washington to add a question or two at a cost of $1,000 each. He said he had no Wal-Mart conflicts to disclose.

(c) Reuters 2006. All Rights Reserved.
A report I recently read claimed that focus group interactions "can provide deeper insights into a subject matter" than a set of individual interviews.

Does anyone know of any attempt to make a reasonably objective comparison of the results of a focus group approach and parallel results from a survey interview approach, taking into account both problems of sampling the same overall population and the problems of summarizing verbal evidence from both group discussions and survey data?  hs
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I am also interested in the issue Howard Schuman raised about the comparable value of focus groups vs. in-depth personal interviews. Any formal or anecdotal evidence will be appreciated. Phillip

Phillip E. Downs, PhD
Kerr & Downs Research
2992 Habersham Drive
Tallahassee, FL 32309
Phone: 850.906.3111
Fax: 850.906.3112
www.kerr-downs.com
In-Reply-To: <43BD5ED1.8050203@umich.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Howard-

The way I read this is that the writer is comparing focus groups with
(hypothetically) independent interviews with the same set of individuals
- not focus groups with sample surveys.

Nick

Howard Schuman wrote:

> A report I recently read claimed that focus group interactions "can
> provide deeper insights into a subject matter" than a set of
> individual interviews.
>
> Does anyone know of any attempt to make a reasonably objective
> comparison of the results of a focus group approach and parallel
> results from a survey interview approach, taking into account both
> problems of sampling the same overall population and the problems of
> summarizing verbal evidence from both group discussions and survey
> data?  hs
>
> ----------------------------------------------------
> Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.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
>
> ----------------------------------------------------

In my years in the "private sector" I supervised and/or moderated many focus
groups for the Ford Motor Company. I would state that it is certainly
possible to obtain greater insight with focus groups, if the members of the
group come from diverse backgrounds. A focus group consisting of dealers,
suppliers, and company executives can be worthwhile if the diverse elements
are encouraged to interact -- or challenge -- each other's established viewpoints.

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
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I am also interested in the issue Howard Schuman raised about the comparable value of focus groups vs. in-depth personal interviews. Any formal or anecdotal evidence will be appreciated. Phillip

Phillip E. Downs, PhD
Kerr & Downs Research
2992 Habersham Drive
Tallahassee, FL 32309
Phone: 850.906.3111
Fax: 850.906.3112
www.kerr-downs.com
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MDRC is seeking a survey management specialist to join our nationally recognized and highly respected public policy research organization. We are dedicated to learning what works to improve the well-being of low-income families and children, and increasing the effectiveness of public policies and programs. Established in 1974, MDRC has provided rigorous, nonpartisan, reliable evaluations of key interventions and policies. A clear leader in policy intervention design and methodological innovation, our interdisciplinary research staff are responsible for evaluating the effectiveness of social programs; disseminating research findings to policymakers, government officials, opinion leaders, and program operators; and actively publishing in leading peer-reviewed journals. MDRC’s projects focus on four areas: education, children and families, low-income workers and communities, and welfare and barriers to employment.

Surveys are an integral part of most MDRC studies, and we dedicate about $10 million annually to survey efforts. For most projects, MDRC hires an experienced organization to administer the survey, while in-house survey staff coordinate, support, and monitor the effort to ensure high quality data.

The new specialist will manage and support multiple survey efforts, working with project teams and survey subcontractors, and will report directly to the head of the Survey Unit. Responsibilities will include a range of management tasks and may include some technical and programming work.

Responsibilities:

* Coordinate the process to select survey firms: write requests for proposals (RFPs) from survey firms and be part of a team that negotiates the work plan and budget
* Monitor progress of survey efforts: ensure survey subcontractors achieve high response rates, produce high quality data files, and meet timelines
* Participate in and coordinate the development, format, pre-test, and administration of survey instruments
* Prepare written reports summarizing various survey efforts, OMB submissions, and IRB applications
* Participate and coordinate the development of cross-project survey tools and resources, including maintaining MDRC's survey intranet site
* Work with survey unit and senior project staff to coordinate efforts to create sample lists for survey firms and monitor quality of survey data files, typically using SAS.

Qualifications:
* BA/BS plus relevant work experience or MA/MS in survey methodology, non-profit management, or social science research.
* Demonstrated interest in social policy research.
* Strong management and organizational skills.
* Strong research and technical writing skills.
* Excellent attention to detail and ability to multitask.
* Comfortable working both independently and as part of a team in a fast-paced environment.
* Survey methodology and survey management experience preferred.
* Programming and spreadsheet proficiency preferred.

Some on-the-job training (including SAS, data management, etc.) is provided; salary contingent upon experience.

Please send resume and cover letter to:
Human Resources Department
Survey Management Specialist
MDRC
16 East 34th Street, 19th Floor
New York, New York 10016
Fax: 212-532-8453
Email: jobs@mdrc.org

Only candidates selected for further consideration will be contacted. As an Equal Opportunity Employer, MDRC strongly encourages minorities, women, persons with disabilities, and Vietnam-era veterans to apply. Legal work authorization required.
From the field of health communication, I have learned that focus group discussions are helpful for capturing the language both individually and collectively used in discussing the sensitive subject of sexual health. Qualitative research methods can be especially relevant to the study of an issue that has historically been shrouded in silence, in both interpersonal and mass media communication. Focus groups can then complement quantitative study.

Joan Cates

Quoting Howard Schuman <hschuman@umich.edu>:

> A report I recently read claimed that focus group interactions "can
> provide deeper insights into a subject matter" than a set of
> individual interviews.
> >
> > Does anyone know of any attempt to make a reasonably objective
> > comparison of the results of a focus group approach and parallel
> > results from a survey interview approach, taking into account both
> > problems of sampling the same overall population and the problems of
> > summarizing verbal evidence from both group discussions and survey
> > data? hs
> >
> > Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.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
What Joan said...but let me add that individual interviews -- especially when conducted over the phone -- are a very efficient and cost-effective way to get great information for b2b studies when the respondents are basically in the same position and the same industry. For consumer studies I think I would stick to focus groups for ideation.

I'm always a bit amazed when someone says that 'one method is always better than the other' when at least among researchers it's a given that a method needs to be matched to the purpose, and of course, the budget, time constraint, sample availability...

leora

Dr. Leora Lawton
TechSociety Research
"Custom Social Science and Consumer Behavior Research"
2342 Shattuck Avenue PMB 362, Berkeley, CA  94704
(510) 548-6174; fax (510) 548-6175; cell (510) 928-7572
www.techsociety.com

On Thu, 5 Jan 2006, Joan Cates wrote:

> From the field of health communication, I have learned that focus
group discussions are helpful for capturing the language — both individually and collectively — used in discussing the sensitive subject of sexual health. Qualitative research methods can be especially relevant to the study of an issue that has historically been shrouded in silence, in both interpersonal and mass media communication. Focus groups can then complement quantitative study.

Joan Cates

Quoting Howard Schuman <hschuman@umich.edu>:

A report I recently read claimed that focus group interactions "can provide deeper insights into a subject matter" than a set of individual interviews.

Does anyone know of any attempt to make a reasonably objective comparison of the results of a focus group approach and parallel results from a survey interview approach, taking into account both problems of sampling the same overall population and the problems of summarizing verbal evidence from both group discussions and survey data? hs
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Joan R. Cates, PhD, MPH
Principal Investigator
American Youth and STDs
School Of Journalism and Mass Communication
Campus Box 3365
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3365
(919) 843-5793 (voice)
(919) 962-0620 (fax)
JoanCates@unc.edu
Howard et al, unless one specifies what information is being sought, there is little basis to compare the two methods. Individual replies of focus group members can, of course, be solicited and even quantified, but even if they were "representative," which they aren't, their only value is to see whether the focus-gp mbr responses differ from interview-only responses i.e. does prior discussion make a difference (as in Fishkin).

The real value of focus group is in the interaction, where real-life norms and language emerge, and where opinion leadership is at work. Liebes and Katz' study of ethnic differences in "readings' and reactions to the TV program, "Dallas" is a good example of how ethnically homogeneous group in situ negotiate a shared understanding of the program and attitudes towards it. Somewhere we have a paper on methodology and the use of focus groups for this kind of research (but not now), much of it in our book, Export of Meaning (Polity).

Best regards, elihu
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A report I recently read claimed that focus group interactions "can=20 provide deeper insights into a subject matter" than a set of individual=20 interviews.

Does anyone know of any attempt to make a reasonably objective=20 comparison of the results of a focus group approach and parallel results = from a survey interview approach, taking into account both problems of=20
sampling the same overall population and the problems of summarizing verbal evidence from both group discussions and survey data? hs
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All,
We have a client interested in conducting a '360 degree review' to evaluate a project team/business process. He is thinking of conducting the study on team members who worked on the project or deal. Does anyone know of any study on it?
In addition to literature references, I would like to include others' experience with this issue.

As always, thank you for your input.

Best Wishes!
Amy
Amy Luo
Ernst & Young LLP =3F Quantitative Economics and Statistics
Phone: 202.327.6667 / Fax: 202.327.6740 / EFax: 1.866.760.6256
Email: Amy.Luo@ey.com

Any U.S. tax advice contained in the body of this e-mail was not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, by the recipient for the purpose of avoiding penalties that may be imposed under the Internal Revenue Code or applicable state or local tax law provisions.

The information contained in this message may be privileged and confidential=
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The Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research is looking for an Assistant Director, Client Services and Survey Operations. The assistant director works closely with the IU Center for Survey Research staff on survey design and implementation. The position is described below.

Please contact Dr. Jillian Kinzie regarding the specifics of the position. I can provide some information on the position and would be happy to talk about it informally.

John

John M. Kennedy
Center for Survey Research
Indiana University

POSITION ANNOUNCEMENT

Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research
Assistant Director, Client Services and Survey Operations
The Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research and National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) seeks an Assistant Director, Client Services and Survey Operations to join our team of productive higher education researchers and assessment professionals. NSSE obtains information about college student participation in programs and activities known to contribute to student learning and development. Since 2000, NSSE has collected data from randomly-selected first-year and senior students attending nearly 1,000 different four-year colleges and universities in the U.S. and Canada. The Center also houses four other national survey programs: Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement, Faculty Survey of Student Engagement, Law School Survey of Student Engagement, and College Student Experiences Questionnaire. The client services team works closely with institutional researchers, assessment professionals, academic leaders, and college and university presidents to aid their institutional improvement efforts. Grant support for additional research projects based at the Center is from Lumina Foundation for Education, the Center for Inquiry in the Liberal Arts at Wabash College, the U.S. Department of Education, the Teagle Foundation, and the National Center for Education Statistics.

Job Duties:

Principal responsibilities include coordinating client relations and survey operations for over 500 participating NSSE campuses annually and conceptualizing, implementing, and expanding upon a team concept for client services that spans three surveys (NSSE, FSSE, & BCSSE), acting as the point person for internal and external decisions related to client services and survey operations, responding to institutional user requests and enhancing user services, and working closely with our survey administrator, the IU Center for Survey Research (www.indiana.edu/~csr/), on survey creation, sampling procedures, administration and planning. Developing policies that facilitate effective NSSE administration and maintaining documents and institutional agreements for each NSSE administration, managing institutional review board processes, and preparing survey administration reports. Overseeing client services staff and identifying additional tasks and responsibilities for project associates. Contributing to efforts to assess the psychometric properties of survey instruments, performing literature searches and other required research to support ongoing projects, and reporting results from NSSE and other research in presentations and writing to institutional users and other groups.

Qualifications:

A master's degree in educational research, the social or behavioral sciences, or a related field, or advanced training in survey research is required. A minimum of 1-3 years experience in survey operations, institutional research, applied research, or database management in higher education or a related area is highly desirable. Preferred skills and abilities will include knowledge of survey methodology, psychometric theory, research design, and some data analysis skills; working knowledge of statistical, spreadsheet, database, and word processing.
software packages; and strong analytical, writing, and interpersonal skills. A demonstrated ability to work in a collaborative research environment is essential. Proficiency or ability to quickly become proficient in SPSS, HLM, Excel, Access, Visual Basic, and SQL is highly desirable.

Salary / Benefits:

Salary and benefits are competitive. The preferred start date for the appointment is March 1, 2006, but is negotiable.

To apply:

To apply, submit a letter of application, resume, and the contact information of at least three references to Dr. Jillian Kinzie, Center for Postsecondary Research, 1900 East 10th Street, Eigenmann Hall Suite 419, Bloomington, IN 47406-7512. Phone: 812-856-5824. Fax: 812-856-5150. E-mail: cprjobs@indiana.edu. Review of applications will begin immediately. For more information about the NSSE project visit our web site: www.nsse.iub.edu.

Indiana University is an equal opportunity / affirmative action employer. Minority group members, women, and individuals with disabilities are strongly encouraged to apply.
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Aren't we getting off the point here? I read Howard's human's original post as essentially asking the question: what is the likelihood of the different methods giving different, perhaps even contradictory, answers to the same question(s) about the same target group? That is, choice of method has rather more implications than assigned to it in conventional methods.
Apologies to Howard if that was not what he was asking. But, in any case, that seems to me to be a really interesting question.

Iain Noble = 20
Department = for = 20Education = 20and = 20Skills = 20
Strategic Analysis = 20RM = 201 = 20YCS = 20and = 20Next = 20Steps = 20Study), = 20
W606, = 20Moorfoot, = 20Sheffield, = 20S1 = 204PQ. = 20
0114 = 20259 = 201180 = 20
For information about Next Steps Study go to
www.dfes.gov.uk/research

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET = 20(mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu) On Behalf Of elihu katz
Sent: 05 January 2006 21:58
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: focus groups and individual interviews

Howard = et al, unless one specifies what information is being sought, there
is little to compare the two methods. Individual replies of focus
group members can, of course, be solicited and even identified, but
even if they were "representative," which they aren't, their only value is
to see whether the focus-gp mbr responses differ from interview-only
i.e. does priority discussion make a difference (as in Fishkin).

The real value of focus group is in the interaction, where real-life
norms and language emerge, where opinion leadership is at work. = 20

and Katz' study of ethnic differences in "readings" reactivity = 20TV
program, = 20"Dallas" = 20is = 20good = 20example = 20how = 20ethnically = 20homogeneous
group = 20in situ = negotiate = shared = understanding = example = 20methodology = 20and = towards
it. = 20Somewhere = 20we = the = 20paper = 20methodology = 20and = 20focus
groups = for = 20kind = 20research = 20(but = 20not = 20now), = 20much = 20of = 20it = 20=
A recent report I read claimed that focus group interactions "can provide deeper insights into a subject matter" than a set of individual interviews. Does anyone know of any attempt to make a reasonably objective comparison of the results of a focus group approach and parallel results from a survey approach, taking into account both problems of sampling the same overall population and the problems of summarizing verbal evidence from both group discussions and survey data? 
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Excuse my cynicism but my experience of 360 degree review is that it is not as effective as it could be. It is important to remember that it is only one element of a comprehensive evaluation process.
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Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Excuse my cynicism but my experience is that 360 degree review is not as effective as it could be. It is important to remember that it is only one element of a comprehensive evaluation process.
in a couple of organisations that tried it has been that senior management's enthusiasm for it tends to diminish rapidly when its their turn to be reviewed. YMMV.

Iain Noble
Department for Education and Skills
Strategic Analysis: RMI 1 (YCS and Next Steps Study), W606, Moorfoot, Sheffield, S1 20PQ. 0114 20259 201180 20
For information about the Next Steps Study go to www.dfes.gov.uk/research

>-----Original Message-----
>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Amy Luo
>Sent: 2006 January 2000 00:44
>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>Subject: About 360 degree review

>All,
>We have a client interested in conducting a '360 degree review' to evaluate a project team/business process. He is thinking of conducting the study on team members who worked on the project or deal. Does anyone know of any study on it?
>In addition to literature references, I would like to include others' experience with this issue.
>As always, thank you for your input.
>Best Wishes!
>Amy Luo
>Ernst & Young LLP=20Quantitative Economics=20and=20Statistics=

Phone: 20202.327.6667=20/=20Fax: 20202.327.6740=20/EFax: 1.866.760.6256
Email: 20Amy.Luo@ey.com
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Notice required by law: This e-mail may constitute an advertisement or solicitation under U.S. law, if its primary purpose is to advertise or promote a commercial product or service. You may choose not to receive advertising and promotional messages from Ernst & Young LLP (except for Ernst & Young Online and the ey.com website, which track e-mail preferences through a separate process) at this e-mail address by forwarding this message to no-more-mail@ey.com. If you do so, the sender of this message will be notified promptly.

Our principal postal address is 5 Times Square, New York, NY 10036. Thank you.

Ernst & Young LLP
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Sender:       AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From:         "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>
Subject:      Re: About 360 degree review
Comments: To: "Iain.NOBLE@DFES.GSI.GOV.UK" <Iain.NOBLE@DFES.GSI.GOV.UK>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
I second that opinion...with the additional comment that I found it to be a Good Thing to have Senior Management express their opinions as to what the 360 review will reveal before going through the process, and then ask them to sign a disclaimer to the effect that they understand that their opinions are just their opinions, nothing more. Not an easy task, but certainly worthwhile.

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 Iain Noble
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To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: About 360 degree review

Excuse my cynicism but my experience of 360 degree review (from working in a couple of organisations that tried it) has been that senior management's enthusiasm for it tends to diminish rapidly when its their turn to be reviewed. YMMV.

Iain Noble
Department for Education and Skills
Strategic Analysis: RMI 1 (YCS and Next Steps Study),
W606, Moorfoot, Sheffield, S1 4PQ.
0114 259 1180
For information about the Next Steps Study go to www.dfes.gov.uk/research
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>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>Subject: About 360 degree review
>
>'all,
>we have a client interested in conducting a '360 degree review' to
evaluate a project team/business process. He is thinking of conducting the
>study on team members who worked on the project or deal. Does anyone know
>of any study on it?
>In addition to literature references, I would like to include
> others' experience with this issue.
>
> As always, thank you for your input.
>
> Best Wishes!
> Amy
>
> Amy Luo
>
> Ernst & Young LLP ? Quantitative Economics and Statistics
> Phone: 202.327.6667 / Fax: 202.327.6740 / EFax: 1.866.760.6256
> Email: Amy.Luo@ey.com
>
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> Our principal postal address is 5 Times Square, New York, NY 10036. Thank you. Ernst &
> Young LLP
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MIME-version: 1.0
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Thanks to all those who replied to my inquiry to aapornet readers. The inquiry was prompted by a report from a serious social action organization that has used both focus group and standard survey interview approaches in different studies, and concluded at one point that "focus group interactions 'can provide deeper insights into a subject matter' than a set of individual interviews."

Knowing that any such systematic comparison would be extremely difficult to carry out, my question was whether anyone had ever attempted to do so. I wasn't thinking of anecdotal accounts, of which there are many (including my own), nor was I questioning the value of using both approaches in tandem or in different situations.

The theoretical issue is perhaps best captured by Nick Panagakis when he writes: "The way I read this is that the writer is comparing focus groups with (hypothetically) independent interviews with the same set of individuals." However, identical individuals would not be necessary (and would raise the problem of cross-over effects), so long as the two sets of individuals could be seen as representing well the same population, much as we do regularly when drawing conclusions about change from surveys at different time points. Moreover, the outcome of such a comparison might have to be stated in terms of "conclusions," not quite specific results of the kind we expect from a survey, a point that Elihu Katz makes in his response.

As of now, I have not heard of any attempt at a systematic comparison. Again, I recognize that such a comparison would be extremely difficult even to conceptualize, let alone to carry out successfully. -Howard

Howard Schuman wrote:
> A report I recently read claimed that focus group interactions "can
> provide deeper insights into a subject matter" than a set of individual
> interviews.
> Does anyone know of any attempt to make a reasonably objective
> comparison of the results of a focus group approach and parallel results
> from a survey interview approach, taking into account both problems of
> sampling the same overall population and the problems of summarizing
> verbal evidence from both group discussions and survey data? hs
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Howard wrote: "I recognize that such a comparison would be extremely
difficult even to conceptualize, let alone to carry out successfully."

No, for future reference, this may be quite doable. The following test
design should offer a rough roadmap, though it will need some critical
reaction to ID the remaining weaknesses:

Begin with a randomly selected population -- with each participant also
having access to high speed internet (thereby, a segmentation rather than
cross-sectional study -- though in North America most adults have access to
high speed internet either at home (~40-some percentile, depending on your
source) or at work (much higher); thus, such a segmentation sample will be
screening out a minority of prospective participants).

For practical purposes described below, keep this sample as small as
practically possible (e.g. n=100).

Next, to measure differences between group interaction vs. individual
interviews, either:

a) Ask independent samples to do either a group or individual interview (and
then compare outcomes), or

b) To minimize cross-over effects, ask half of the sample to do 1) a group
then 2) individual interview. Ask the other half of the sample to do the
opposite sequence. Then compare outcomes.

Importantly, while traditional qualitative research does in-person
interviews at a central location among small, local, convenience
(non-random) samples, there are other options. Instead use a multimedia
modality, where everyone (moderator and respondents alike) sees and hears
everyone via a web cam (hence the need for high speed internet) and
telephone. This enables real interaction while also eliminating the
traditional dependence upon central location interviewing. Thereby (if the
sample design is so structured) this supports random sampling. That is, respondents can be in any geographical location. That is, a qualitative questioning strategy can be used among a randomly selected population. We've done it many times.

Alternatively, this study could also be done by telephone, though (arguably) with less vigorous interaction.

Issue 1: At minimum, the presence of group interviews in the study design introduces (at minimum) sequence issues. Specifically, a skillfully conducted group interview deliberately has, of course, far less structure than an individual interview. Respondents are (seemingly) free to influence the course (content, sequence, duration) of the discussion. Thus interviewer effects are an issue, since one moderator may (one hopes) be permissive with this group influence (so as to allow constructive interaction, thereby succeeding at the essence of insightful research: meeting them where they are at), whereas another moderator may be quite a bit less permissive/more structured. Thus, to minimize interviewer effects, the identical moderator would have to conduct all interviews.

Issue 2: The most challenging aspect here is the analysis/conclusions -- not the study design itself -- not once you see that doing group interviews is entirely possible among geographically dispersed participants.

The subjectivity of qualitative analysis certainly poses a problem. But as you've seen in this dialogue, as you hear from your own clients, there is a hunger out there for answering questions like these. Sufficient hunger that many (not all, not the purists) people would welcome a transparent, skillfully, systematically conducted analysis that compares the outcomes of individual vs. group interviews.

I'd be happy to work with anyone who wants to explore/refine/implement this study design.

Thanks,
Ron

Ron Riley, Principal
Channel M2
www.channelm2.com
26000 Hwy 74
Kittredge, CO 80457-0819
800.670.2387

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Howard Schuman
Sent: Friday, January 06, 2006 7:35 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Clarification re: focus groups and individual interviews

Thanks to all those who replied to my inquiry to aapornet readers. The inquiry was prompted by a report from a serious social action organization that has used both focus group and standard survey interview approaches in different studies, and concluded at one point
that "focus group interactions 'can provide deeper insights into a subject matter' than a set of individual interviews."

Knowing that any such systematic comparison would be extremely difficult to carry out, my question was whether anyone had ever attempted to do so. I wasn't thinking of anecdotal accounts, of which there are many (including my own), nor was I questioning the value of using both approaches in tandem or in different situations.

The theoretical issue is perhaps best captured by Nick Panagakis when he writes: "The way I read this is that the writer is comparing focus groups with (hypothetically) independent interviews with the same set of individuals." However, identical individuals would not be necessary (and would raise the problem of cross-over effects), so long as the two sets of individuals could be seen as representing well the same population, much as we do regularly when drawing conclusions about change from surveys at different time points. Moreover, the outcome of such a comparison might have to be stated in terms of "conclusions," not quite specific results of the kind we expect from a survey, a point that Elihu Katz makes in his response.

As of now, I have not heard of any attempt at a systematic comparison. Again, I recognize that such a comparison would be extremely difficult even to conceptualize, let alone to carry out successfully. -Howard

Howard Schuman wrote:
> A report I recently read claimed that focus group interactions "can
> provide deeper insights into a subject matter" than a set of individual
> interviews.
> 
> Does anyone know of any attempt to make a reasonably objective
> comparison of the results of a focus group approach and parallel results
> from a survey interview approach, taking into account both problems of
> sampling the same overall population and the problems of summarizing
> verbal evidence from both group discussions and survey data? hs
>
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I appreciate Ron's thoughtful design-oriented response, but I'm more interested in results. Having conducted focus groups and in-depth interviews (on different studies) for over 25 years, I have typically favored focus groups over in-depth interviews for the purposes of getting emotional insights and setting up the quantitative phase of the research study. Some researchers argue that in-depth interviews are as valid at achieving these objectives (and they are less costly than focus groups, so why do the latter). I'm starting to believe them, but have never seen a comparison of results from these 2 different exploratory research methods. Does anyone have solid comparative data?

Phillip E. Downs, Ph.D.
Partner, Kerr & Downs Research
Professor of Marketing, FSU
Phone: 850.906.3111
www.kerr-downs.com
Full-Time Position

Relevant Work Experience:

Career Level: Experienced

Minimum Education: Bachelor's, Master's Preferred

Category: Advertising / Marketing / PR

Location: US-Colorado-Denver

Job Description:

Experienced marketer needed to play pivotal role in a dynamic, fast growing qualitative research online organization in Denver, Colorado. Candidate should possess strong qualitative analytical skills coupled with a knowledge of how marketers think and approach marketing challenges. Candidate should also have demonstrated experience conducting, managing, and synthesizing market research, including experience moderating focus groups.

This position also requires strong analytical writing and editing skills, as well as the ability to conceptualize projects and to contribute to the fundamental thinking of the operation and of the Client Services team. Candidate must successfully uncover hidden opportunities and develop meaningful marketing implications and recommendations for clients' businesses.

Core Responsibilities:

* Understanding client objectives and developing an approach to address client needs
* Communicating research approach and objectives to moderating staff to ensure all project requirements are met
* Generating meaningful, relevant implications and strategic recommendations
* Report writing and editing
* Managing multiple projects simultaneously
* Training, managing and developing staff of moderators
* Interacting with both internal and external clients

Position Requirements:
* Minimum 3 years qualitative research experience, including moderator guide development, strategic qualitative analysis and general moderating
* 5-7 years marketing experience
* Experience managing a team
* Excellent communication and organizational skills
* Proficiency in MS Word, PowerPoint, and Excel

Please email a copy of your resume, cover letter, and scheduling requirements to HR@imoderate.com. For more information about iModerate, go to www.iModerate.com <http://www.imoderate.com/>

Michael P. Flanagan, CAE
Association Manager
Applied Measurement Professionals
8310 Nieman Road
Lenexa, KS  66214-1579
(913) 495-4470
FAX:  (913) 599-5340
www.goAMP.com <http://www.goAMP.com>
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Date:         Fri, 6 Jan 2006 11:29:09 -0700
Reply-To:     "Margaret R. Roller" <rmr@ROLLERRESEARCH.COM>
Sender:       AAPORNERT <AAPORNERT@ASU.EDU>
From:         "Margaret R. Roller" <rmr@ROLLERRESEARCH.COM>
Subject:      Re: focus groups and individual interviews

The general comment is absurd given the host of other design parameters. In qualitative research it is accepted that certain in-depths (esp., ethnographic studies that employ both on-site observation and in-depth interviewing) are more insightful, provide richer results than focus group discussions. While not documented, there are probably loads of examples of this.

--
Margaret R. Roller
Roller Marketing Research
rmr@rollerresearch.com
www.rollerresearch.com
Senior Research Analyst

National Public Radio, Washington DC

Full-Time Position

#WEB454 - Senior Research Analyst - Programming & Technology, Audience & Corporate Research Analyzes and interprets strategic implications for NPR new technology platforms; works with NPR management and programming divisions to shape program strategy development, using primary and secondary research sources.

* Collects, tabulates and aggregates data from appropriate sources to formulate analyses regarding NPR's performance relevant to support NPR's programming and other business activities

* Researches and monitors programming and technology trends

* Designs, coordinates, collaborates and manages primary research projects

* Evaluates software and data sources for purchase and creates proprietary databases; and manages research studies.

Education & Experience:

Bachelor's degree required, advanced degree in related field (i.e. statistics, marketing, business, policy or communications) preferred. Minimum of four years work experience in a related industry.

* Proven direct production of equality research reports and materials, which distill large amounts of information into key findings and recommendations

* Strong knowledge of media and market research techniques and methodology (quantitative and qualitative data analysis, including advanced statistical analysis)

* Experience designing and coordinating primary and secondary research projects; recent experience with statistical analysis packages (i.e.
SPSS, SAS)
* Recent experience with syndicated databases and sources (i.e. Arbitron, Nielsen, Simmons, MEMRI, NPD Intellect, Forrester, Jupiter) desired
* Ability to manage and create work plans for multiple projects and see projects through to completion; detail oriented with excellent organization skills
* Flexibility to adapt to changing and growing environment
* Must be able to work with a variety of people in different settings
* Strong desire to work in an intellectually challenging environment and openness to new perspectives and ideas
* Demonstrated ability to take initiative
* Proven ability to think and understand clients' needs
* Ability to work in a team environment, shifting from team leader to contributor roles as appropriate, and willingness to work toward consensus is needed
* Demonstrated ability to use independent judgment to carry out major assignments that affect business operations.
* Ability to communicate effectively in both written and verbal forms and experience presenting research results and concepts to a wide audience
* Advanced skill in spreadsheets, database management systems, presentation software, word processing and online information sources
* Knowledge of programming language a plus. Knowledge of related industry (i.e. news media, radio, print journalism, recording industry or consumer electronics) desired.

For consideration, please send cover letter and resume, indicating job title and number, to:

National Public Radio
Human Resources Department
635 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20001
Fax: (202) 513-3047
E-mail: employment@npr.org

Please note: NPR does not accept or retain general applications for employment. Individuals must apply for specific, open positions.
The original question addressed "focus group (vs.) standard survey interview approaches" -- and which produce "deeper insights into a subject matter" -- not focus groups vs. qualitative IDIs nor ethnographic interviews. The original question also sought hard data, not loads of examples.

Folks, you're unlikely to find hard data comparing "focus group (vs.) standard survey interview approaches." But, as I outlined earlier, there are potential study designs to make such comparisons -- as well as comparisons of focus groups vs. qualitative IDIs, etc.

So, since empirical data is more reliable than anecdotal observation, if at some future point you wish to collaborate on getting empirical data -- and have a project that fits -- then let's go: 800.670.2387. Otherwise, anecdotal debates usually produce more heat than light, true?

And I don't see industry consensus that IDIs -- even coupled with ethnographic interviews (which comprised only 6% of all qualitative interviews done by Fortune 2000 firms in 2004) -- "provide richer results than focus groups." All things equal, that's often true -- but I've seen it go both ways. The big variable is how skillfully each are designed, conducted, analyzed. True?

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Margaret R. Roller
Sent: Friday, January 06, 2006 11:29 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: focus groups and individual interviews

The general comment is absurd given the host of other design parameters. In qualitative research it is accepted that certain in-depths (esp., ethnographic studies that employ both on-site observation and in-depth interviewing) are more insightful, provide richer results than focus group discussions. While not documented, there are probably loads of examples of this.

--
Margaret R. Roller
Roller Marketing Research
rmr@rollerresearch.com
Although two responders said that my question as framed is meaningless, I would have been glad for ANY more specific or alternative framing accompanied by a citation of systematic empirical evidence. I appreciated Ron Riley’s suggested research design, with his recognition that the greatest challenge is probably how to state conclusions from a comparison that might be systematically and meaningfully evaluated.

Thanks again to all who responded, whether to aapornet or to me personally. The lack of evidence, whatever the formulation, is disappointing, but instructive. Howard

Dear Colleagues,

I must confess I have been puzzled by following this discussion. It's a bit like comparing apples and lettuce because although both are more qualitative methods, the goals and dynamics are different.
Most focus groups assemble several (6--12 typically) individuals who generally hold opinions about the topic but have different perspectives about it. The variations are many, including level of knowledge, strength and elaboration of opinions, and background. Unlike standard "representative" surveys, there is generally not an effort to make a focus group "representative." In fact, the goals of the FG may mitigate against it. For example, it is often a poor idea to have different strata represented in the same focus group because individuals with lower status (e.g., "labor") may be intimidated by those with higher status (e.g., "management") and clam up.

The "interview" itself is typically not standardized in FGs. The moderator has a list of suggested open-ended questions, but, depending on the discussion, may not ask them all or may deviate from the original question sequence.

To keep discussion going, some focus groups may even be asked to generate a joint group goal, statement, or opinion. In such cases, inevitably some opinions will change. Stoner's early work and followups by others on what has sometimes been called "group polarization" (the old "risky shift" stuff) addresses some of the issues involved. Even without such directions, many individuals may change their attitudes about a topic due to the group discussion and ideas brought up by others.

Thus I see focus groups as complementary to different types of individual interviews, in--depth or otherwise. Although I found the suggestions to quantify and compare the results of each method intriguing, the group versus individual difference to me suggests that different units of analysis will not generate comparable results, unless one simply wishes to see the range of opinions (focus groups generally win that one, hands down).

Happy New Year, all!
Susan

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

slish@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
850-644-8778 VOICE
850-644-8776 FAX

visit the site:
http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slish/Index.htm
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Apples and lettuce exactly. Thanks, Susan, for articulating the trees in this forest. Those of us "off point" were simply trying to stay within the boundaries of the apple orchard.

--

Margaret R. Roller
Roller Marketing Research
rmr@rollerresearch.com
www.rollerresearch.com

Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.org/
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

I received the following message after my "final posting," and since it is of some real interest and value, even though not exactly an answer to my original question, I'm forwarding it to aapornet.

-------- Original Message --------
Subject: RE: Final Posting on Focus Groups and Individual Interviews
Date: Sat, 7 Jan 2006 13:15:17 -0500
From: Scott Keeter <skeeter@pewresearch.org>
To: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>

Howard,

Michael Delli Carpini and I used focus groups in an effort to validate survey-based measures of political knowledge. While this effort was more quantitative than qualitative, it was intended to use the qualitative setting of a discussion to determine how closely a person's use of factual knowledge in their informal discussions with others was correlated with their score on a simple test of factual knowledge.
administered in a telephone survey at a different time and place.

We conducted an RDD survey in the Richmond, Virginia area and included a political knowledge battery on that survey. We then recruited participants for focus groups from among the respondents, stratifying by levels of knowledge. The experiment showed us that our survey-based measures validated quite nicely, at least to the extent that one can say that our measures of use of knowledge in the focus group are themselves valid ways of gauging political sophistication.

This was written up almost as an afterthought in our AJPS article in 1993. Here's the relevant passage from our final draft of the paper (the journal version might be slightly different due to editing). We probably should have written this up separately for publication but just didn't have the time to do it.

Hope this is helpful.

Scott

/Using Focus Groups to Validate a Survey-Based Measure of Knowledge/

Finally, we address a larger question of validity. Survey measures of political knowledge correlate reasonably well with other survey measures of political behavior. But such measures of validation are inherently limited in that they all are derived from an individual's performance in the same highly artificial setting — the survey interview. It is hard to know, based on the survey data alone, how individuals use their factual knowledge about politics, or more generally, how politically competent they would appear in a more extensive examination of their political beliefs and attitudes. This issue is sometimes referred to as /predictive validity/ (Spector 1992, 48).

To address this question we conducted an exploratory study consisting of four focus groups with individuals who had responded to one of our local telephone surveys (see the appendix for a description). The survey included a four-item knowledge test on national politics. In all, 21 individuals took part in the groups, each of which met for about two hours for a discussion of opinions on various political issues. The transcribed interviews were coded to ascertain each participant's use of factual information. Of all the social and political variables available to us (including interest in politics, media use, education, income, etc.), the national knowledge survey index was the best predictor of use of facts in the focus groups (simple r = .51; beta = .48; R-squared for the regression = .51). Considering the inherent
limitations in this method of criterion validation, the results provide
reassurance that even a short survey-based measure of political
knowledge can assay meaningful variations in the cognitive political
sophistication of survey respondents. 2

And from the appendix:

Description of the 1991 Local Survey Used to Recruit the Focus Groups

The screening survey interviewed 1,208 residents of the Richmond,
Virginia metropolitan area during March and April 1991. The focus group
participants were recruited from the 329 respondents who resided in
Chesterfield county, one of the three major jurisdictions of the metro
area. The CASRO response rate for the survey was 72 percent. A
commercial random sample was used.

Footnotes that appear above:

Our rules for coding the use of political facts were similar to those
employed in the analysis of the Bay Area Survey depth interviews,
utilized by Neuman (1981). Fact totals for each individual were
standardized according to the share of time available to each
participant in their session (based on the number of participants).
Details of this part of the study are available from the authors.

We are unaware of other efforts to use focus groups in this fashion for
scale validation. However we found them to be valuable in this process,
and encourage other researchers to experiment with them as we did.

Scott Keeter
Pew Research Center for the People & 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
Dear AAPOR members -

The January 2006 issue of Public Opinion Pros is now posted to the web. We begin our second year with a special issue devoted to the ins and outs of exit polling, along with substantially reduced subscription rates and a new student subscription program for course instructors. An overview of the issue is accessible to nonsubscribers at http://www.publicopinionpros.com/from_editor/2006/jan/from_editor.asp

We are presently scheduling articles for our March, April, and May issues. If you would like to submit an article, paper, or proposal for consideration, please contact me directly at editor@PublicOpinionPros.com.

Best wishes -

Lisa

Lisa Ferraro Parmelee, Ph.D.
Editor, Public Opinion Pros
www.PublicOpinionPros.com

-----------------------------
Date: Mon, 9 Jan 2006 14:45:53 -0700
Reply-To: Vicki Siemers <vicki.siemers@RBCDAIN.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Vicki Siemers <vicki.siemers@RBCDAIN.COM>
Subject: Wording of Likert-Type Scales to Measure Satisfaction

I would like to find a resource listing options for Likert-type scales that measure satisfaction.

We currently have a 5-point scale, anchored only on the endpoints, that measures satisfaction. The upper anchor is worded as "Very Satisfied" and
the bottom anchor is worded as "Not At All Satisfied". I'd like to change the scale to get at more than satisfaction - which generally implies just meeting expectations.

We are thinking of moving to Excellent/Poor, Delighted/Disappointed, or Extremely Satisfied/Not At All Satisfied, but realize there must be other options to consider. Is there a list in a book or on the web that provides options for these types of scales?

Thank you,

Vicki Siemers
Sr. Marketing Research Analyst
RBC Dain Rauscher
vicki.siemers@rbcdain.com

----------------------------------------------------
Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.org/
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date:         Mon, 9 Jan 2006 17:29:25 -0500
Reply-To:     Larry Luskin <Lawrence.A.Luskin@ORCMACRO.COM>
Sender:       AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From:         Larry Luskin <Lawrence.A.Luskin@ORCMACRO.COM>
Subject:      Re: Wording of Likert-Type Scales to Measure Satisfaction
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To:  <LISTSERV%200601091445537658.312B@LISTS.ASU.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Hi Vicki (and all),

Definitely not a laundry list, but here are several anchored scales that=20 may be useful. Some are more appropriate as alternatives to satisfaction=20 than others are. I pulled these examples scales from a training we offer at=20 ORC Macro. Of course, I am not advocating one scale or another. Many of=20 these have baggage (e.g., stated importance vs. derived importance). Just=20 trying to show some options.

BALANCED
Satisfaction         Very Satisfied =85=85=85=85. Very=
Dissatisfied         Strongly Agree =85=85=85=85. Strongly=
Agreement            Very Successful =85=85=85=85. Very=
Disagree             Much Better =85=85=85=85. Much Worse
Success              Very Likely =85=85=85=85. Very Unlikely
Unsuccessful         Excellent =85=85=85=85. Poor

UNBALANCED
Performance          Excellent =85=85=85=85. Poor
Also, the other possibility would be to ask satisfaction as part of a more robust construct or index-- such as loyalty. Then, you could keep satisfaction, but simply supplement it with other more behavioral measures.

Larry Luskin
ORC Macro

At 04:45 PM 1/9/2006, Vicki Siemers wrote:

> I would like to find a resource listing options for Likert-type scales that measure satisfaction.
>
> We currently have a 5-point scale, anchored only on the endpoints, that measures satisfaction. The upper anchor is worded as "Very Satisfied" and the bottom anchor is worded as "Not At All Satisfied". I'd like to change the scale to get at more than satisfaction - which generally implies just meeting expectations.
>
> We are thinking of moving to Excellent/Poor, Delighted/Disappointed, or Extremely Satisfied/Not At All Satisfied, but realize there must be other options to consider. Is there a list in a book or on the web that provides options for these types of scales?
>
> Thank you,
>
> Vicki Siemers
Sr. Marketing Research Analyst
RBC Dain Rauscher
vicki.siemers@rbcdain.com

> Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.org/
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

----------------------------------------------------
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Date: Tue, 10 Jan 2006 10:05:39 -0500
Reply-To: "Albert H. Cantril and Susan Davis Cantril"
<ascantril@MINDSPRING.COM>
You might want to consider the "self-anchoring striving scale" developed by Hadley Cantril. The way the questions are framed, responses on an eleven-point scale are "anchored" in the unique experience (hopes, fears, concerns) of the individual respondent. Ratings thus provide a way of comparing the perspectives of people in disparate situations. For a discussion of the technique, see Hadley Cantril, "The Pattern of Human Concerns" (Rutgers, 1965). We also used the scale and discuss it in "Reading Mixed Signals: Ambivalence in American Public Opinion About Government" (Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 1999).

Vicki Siemers wrote:

> I would like to find a resource listing options for Likert-type scales that
> measure satisfaction.
>
> We currently have a 5-point scale, anchored only on the endpoints, that
> measures satisfaction. The upper anchor is worded as "Very Satisfied" and
> the bottom anchor is worded as "Not At All Satisfied". I'd like to change
> the scale to get at more than satisfaction - which generally implies just
> meeting expectations.
>
> We are thinking of moving to Excellent/Poor, Delighted/Disappointed, or
> Extremely Satisfied/Not At All Satisfied, but realize there must be other
> options to consider. Is there a list in a book or on the web that provides
> options for these types of scales?
>
> Thank you,
>
> Vicki Siemers
> Sr. Marketing Research Analyst
> RBC Dain Rauscher
> vicki.siemers@rbcdain.com
>
> Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.org/
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Dear AAPOR members -

The January 2006 issue of Public Opinion Pros is now posted to the web. We begin our second year with a special issue devoted to the ins and outs of exit polling, along with substantially reduced subscription rates and a new student subscription program for course instructors. An overview of the issue is accessible to nonsubscribers at

http://www.publicopinionpros.com/from_editor/2006/jan/from_editor.asp

We are presently scheduling articles for our March, April, and May issues. If you would like to submit an article, paper, or proposal for consideration, please contact me directly at editor@PublicOpinionPros.com.

Best wishes -

Lisa

Lisa Ferraro Parmelee, Ph.D.
Manager, LFP Editorial Enterprises, LLC
Editor, Public Opinion Pros
www.PublicOpinionPros.com
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Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

-----Original Message-----
Colleagues,

It is with a very heavy heart that I notify you that Joe Waksberg, a colleague of and mentor to many of us, a dear friend, passed away Tuesday night.

Funeral services will be held tomorrow, Friday, at 10am at Danzansky-Goldberg, 1170 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD.

Friends may pay their respects by visiting with his family at Joe's late residence, 6502 Tone Drive, Bethesda. The home will be open Friday afternoon up until sundown, Saturday night after sundown, and Sunday afternoon thru the evening.

David Morganstein, V.P.
Director Westat Statistical Group
(301) 251-8215
davidmorganstein@westat.com

To subscribe/unsubscribe SRMSNet:

http://listserv.umd.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A0=3Dsrmsnet&D=3D0&F=3D0&H=3D0&O=3D0&T=3D0

SRMS website:  http://www.amstat.org/sections/srms/

The Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA) is pleased to announce the launch of its new website/webzine, WorldPublicOpinion.org (www.WorldPublicOpinion.org), to provide a source of in-depth information and analysis on public opinion from around the world on international issues. WorldPublicOpinion.org seeks to increase understanding of public
opinion in specific nations as well as to identify global patterns of world public opinion on key issues.

WorldPublicOpinion.org conducts its own polls--both in-depth polls of specific countries and global polls of 20-30 countries--working with various partners, especially the international polling firm GlobeScan. The inaugural issue reports on a new WPO poll conducted in Afghanistan as well as a GlobeScan poll of 20 nations on the free market system.

At the same time, WorldPublicOpinion.org draws on all publicly available research to provide a comprehensive source of information and analysis. Visitors to the site can explore public opinion by topics and by regions, including links to public opinion sites from around the world. The site also features digests of U.S. opinion which integrate all publicly available polling on a wide variety of issues, such as global warming, international trade, globalization, China, the Israel-Palestinian conflict and more.

In coming weeks, we will present new WPO polls from Iraq and India, global polls of more than 30 nations on a variety of topics and U.S. polling on the war in Iraq.

While in the future the site will charge a subscription fee for access to all parts of the site, full access will be free for a period.

To receive free e-alerts about new polls and new articles you can register at www.WorldPublicOpinion.org.

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Missouri Bill Threatens Marketing Research
State seeks to modify Do-Not-Call law.

The state of Missouri in December pre-filed legislation to modify its
telemarketing Do-Not-Call list, reports CMOR. One of these bills poses a
threat to marketing research. The bill modifies the definition of "telephone solicitation" to include: "for the purpose of endorsing a political candidate, requesting financial support or a vote for a political candidate, or conducting polling regarding a political candidate whether the data obtained from the polling is to be analyzed or discarded."


---20
Leo G. Simonetta
Research Director
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road, Suite 101
Baltimore MD 21209

Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.org/
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORN network.

Press Ganey Associates, the nation's leading provider of patient,
employee, and physician survey-based performance measurement/solutions
has an immediate opening for a Manager in our Research & Development
Department. This person reports to the Director of R & D and will supervise the research and development staff. The duties of the position include: leading the research process with the design, testing and maintenance of questionnaires; responding to statistical and research methodology questions from internal and external clients; analyzing and interpreting data; and writing articles for publication and presentation.

The successful candidate will have a Ph.D. in social science, business or health care with a thorough knowledge of research methods and applied statistics, demonstrated excellence in written and verbal presentations of research, and excellent organizational and interpersonal skills. This person will have previous supervisory skill with the ability to lead and motivate a team. The candidate will be comfortable in a computing environment and have excellent written and oral communication skills.
environment with the proven ability to make sound research judgments while helping the organization reach its strategic goals.

Press Ganey offers a casual work environment with full benefits and a competitive compensation package that includes medical, dental, vision, life insurance a 40(k) plan. For immediate consideration, please send a letter of application, resume or curriculum vitae to:

Press Ganey Associates
404 Columbia Place
South Bend, IN 46601
employment@pressganey.com

An Equal Opportunity Employer

Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.org/
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Thu, 12 Jan 2006 20:06:26 +0000
Reply-To: sandmtn@mindspring.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Todd Rehm <sandmtn@MINDSPRING.COM>
Subject: Re: Missouri Bill Threatens Marketing Research
Comments: To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <3248A9B21DD55774585FE52168439F43D@exchange.local.artscience.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain
Content-transfer-encoding: base64

QXMgYSBwb2xpGldjYWwgY29uc3VsdGFuZ3VwSSBsbCB5b3UgdGhhdbCBJJ2QgYmUgc2hh
Y2t1ZCBiZiBmb2NzdG9yY29uc3VsdGFuZ3WYwgdGhpcyBldmVub252YW4gdGhpcyBldmVub252YW4gdGhpcy
YW4gdGhpcyBldmVub252YW4gdGhpcyBldmVub252YW4gdGhpcyBldmVub252YW4gdGhpcyBldmVub252YW4
dGhpcyBldmVub252YW4gdGhpcyBldmVub252YW4gdGhpcyBldmVub252YW4gdGhpcyBldmVub252YW4gd

file:///C...OR%20STAFF/Marketing%20and%20Communications/Website/2022%20Redesign/aapornet%20history/2006/LOG_2006_01.txt[12/7/2023 11:20:29 AM]
T1ulIE9uZSBvZiB0aGVzZSB1c2VyIHByZXZpb3kgYm9yZSBpbnRlZCBwaWQgZGl0b3JvdW5kIGFkZCBhbGwgaW4g
Y2FsbGVkIHN0aWwu

Date: Thu, 12 Jan 2006 20:06:37 +0000
Reply-To: Bob Worcester <Bob.Worcester@MORI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Bob Worcester <Bob.Worcester@MORI.COM>
Subject: Re: Missouri Bill Threatens Marketing Research
Comments: To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Suggest=enlisting=20the=20ACLU=20straight=20away;=20clear=20violation=20of=201st=20amendment=20rights.

Bob Worcester
ex National Board Member, ACLU

From: AAPORNET on behalf of Leo Simonetta
Sent: Thu 2012/01/2006 18:57
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Missouri Bill Threatens Marketing Research

Missouri Bill Threatens Marketing Research
State seeks to modify Do-Not-Call law.

The state of Missouri in December pre-filed legislation to modify Do-Not-Call laws. The bills pose a threat to marketing research.

political=20candidate,=20requesting=20financial=20support=20or=20a=20vote=20for=20a=20political=20candidate,=20conducting=20polling=20regarding=20a=20political=20candidate,
candidate whether the data obtained from the polling is to be analyzed or discarded."


--
Leo G. Simonetta
Research Director
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road, Suite 20101
Baltimore MD 2021209
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AMEN, AMEN. This has zero legs.

Jim Robinson
Director of Government and Public Affairs, CASRO
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 Todd Rehm
Sent: Thursday, January 12, 2006 2:06 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Missouri Bill Threatens Marketing Research

As a political consultant, I can tell you that I'd be shocked beyond words if this even made it of committee.

Three reasons.

First, politicians are voracious consumers of all forms of telemarketing, especially anything that purports to measure public opinion.

Second, political speech is the most-highly protected type of free speech under the Constitution, and this measure us almost certainly unconstitutional.

Third, political consultants, whose business this will primarily affect, are particularly adept at killing legislation that will hurt their livelihood.

Best to all.
Missouri Bill Threatens Marketing Research
State seeks to modify Do-Not-Call law.

The state of Missouri in December pre-filed legislation to modify its telemarketing Do-Not-Call list, reports CMOR. One of these bills poses a threat to marketing research. The bill modifies the definition of "telephone solicitation" to include: "for the purpose of endorsing a political candidate, requesting financial support or a vote for a political candidate, or conducting polling regarding a political candidate whether the data obtained from the polling is to be analyzed or discarded."


--
Leo G. Simonetta
Research Director
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road, Suite 101
Baltimore MD 21209
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AAPOR Colleagues:
As many of you know, in trying to advance AAPOR's interests we work closely with a number of sister organizations. One of these is CMOR, the Council on Market and Opinion Research. CMOR has alerted AAPOR to a potentially consequential situation for survey researchers. There is a proposed legislative action in Missouri that would expand the applicability of the "do not call" list to cover public opinion research. (Public opinion studies are currently exempt from that list.) I am posting below CMOR's communication to its members as an information update. This is obviously an unwelcome initiative and AAPOR will also become engaged in this issue if necessary. Thanks in advance for your attention.

Cliff Zukin
President

INFORMATION FROM CMOR

CMOR has discovered a bill in the state of Missouri that could potentially impact the profession. The bill seeks to modify its current definition of "telephone solicitation" to include "for the purpose of endorsing a political candidate, requesting financial support or a vote for a political candidate, or conducting polling regarding a political candidate regardless of whether the data obtained from the polling is to be analyzed or discarded."

Potential impact

The legislation does not provide a definition of what is considered "polling." As a result, the survey research profession is to presume that all survey research related to a political candidate may be included as a "telephone solicitation" and further, such calls would be required to comply with the state do-not-call list.

CMOR is in the process of developing an industry strategy on how to address this legislation. If there are any questions or concerns regarding this bill or other government affairs issues, please contact LaToya Rembert, CMOR State Legislative Coordinator at lrembert@cmor.org, or 301-654-6602.

Status: In legislative life-line, the bill is in its infancy. It has been introduced, but not yet assigned a committee. The bill had also been introduced last year, and was sent to the House Utilities committee, where in sat and ultimately "died" at the end of session. This bill contains the same language as the one last year, and was introduced by the same sponsor.

Donna Gillin
Director of Operations
CMOR
4011 Old Stone Rd.
Charlotte, NC 28226
ph: 704-609-0448
fax: 704-341-1937
JOB POSTING

Date: January 10, 2006

Position: Survey Research Assistant

United Way of Connecticut/2-1-1

The survey research assistant is responsible for assisting in the design and implementation of surveys and analyzing survey data.

Projects will include analyzing 2-1-1 Infoline databases, measuring customer satisfaction (partner organizations and 2-1-1 users), and conducting other community surveys as they relate to the underlying mission of 2-1-1.

Skills Required:
* Master's Degree in Survey Research or related field.
* Experience in survey design and implementation.
* Experience analyzing quantitative and qualitative data.
* Knowledgeable in handling and maintaining confidential data.
* Skilled at using SPSS.
* Skilled at paying particular attention to detail.
* Practices critical thinking.
* Demonstrates strong written and verbal communication skills.
* Ability to conceptualize and present information to a variety of audiences.
* Ability to work effectively as part of a team and independently.
* Takes initiative.

Resume & cover letter to: United Way of Connecticut/2-1-1 Infoline

Attn: Recruitment

PO Box 290147

Wethersfield, CT 06129-0147

Deadline: January 27, 2006

www.ctunitedway.org
Second International Conference on e-Social Science

Paper submission for the Second International Conference on e-Social Science (28th - 30th June 2006) is now open and can be found on our website at - http://www.ncess.ac.uk/events/conference/ along with the call for papers containing formatting instructions etc.

In line with last year we will have a variety of presentations at the conference which will be preceded by a series of workshops. Further details of the First International Conference on e-Social Science can also be found on our website at - http://www.ncess.ac.uk/events/conference/2005/

We currently have 3 submission deadlines -

Full and short papers - 30th January 2006
Workshops / tutorials / panel sessions - 27th February 2006
Posters - 27th March 2006
Topics to be covered at the conference include (but are not restricted to):

Case studies of e-Social Science research methods and applications

Enabling new sources and forms of sociological data through e-Social Science

Infrastructure and tools for e-Social Science

Middleware for data collection, sharing and integration

Standards for metadata, ontologies, annotation, curation, etc.

Usability issues in the design of research tools and middleware

Case studies of (e-)Research and (e-) Social Science research practices

The benefits and challenges of large scale collaborative research

Interdisciplinary research and e-Social Science

International collaborations in e-Social Science

Socio-technical issues in the development of e-Research and the Grid

Ethical issues and challenges in the collection, integration, sharing and analysis of sociological and other personal data

We look forward to seeing you in Manchester, UK this summer.

Best wishes

Dr Gillian Sinclair

Programme Manager

ESRC National Centre for e-Social Science
I am looking for a financial literacy, or knowledge scale, that can be used to survey University students. UVa is implementing a financial literacy or education program to improve students' knowledge about financial matters. Any ideas or starting points? Thanks in advance,
To all,
I am looking for previous research testing attitudes toward environmental regulations around private property rights, notions of public good, and land use planning. I am also looking for prior research testing affective responses toward words with strong environmental connotations (i.e. pesticide, wetland, open space, conservation). Any and all suggestions appreciated.
Thanks in advance,

Steve Johnson, PhD
President, Northwest Survey & Data Services

Conference info and call for papers: 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

INNOVATORS AWARD-- CALL FOR NOMINATIONS

THE DEADLINE FOR THE INNOVATORS AWARD HAS BEEN EXTENDED TO JANUARY 20TH.

To remind you about the award:

The AAPOR Innovators Award is designed to recognize accomplishments in the field of public opinion and survey research that occurred in the past ten years (1993 or later), or that had their primary impact on the field during the past decade. These innovations could consist of new theories, ideas, applications, methodologies or technologies. To be considered for the award, these must be publicly documented. The award can be given to individuals, groups or institutions.
The winners in 2005 were: Thomas B. Jabine, Miron L. Straf, Judith M. Tanur and Roger Tourangeau for Creation of the Interdisciplinary Workshop on Cognitive Aspects of Survey Methodology.

Please email nominations and any supporting documentation to:

Susan Pinkus at susan.pinkus@latimes.com or fax it to her at 213-237-2505.

Michael P. Flanagan, CAE
Association Manager
Applied Measurement Professionals
8310 Nieman Road
Lenexa, KS 66214-1579
(913) 495-4470
FAX: (913) 599-5340
www.goAMP.com <http://www.goAMP.com>

----------------------------------------------------
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Thanks.

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

I think a good book to use is
SPSS for Windows: Step by Step. It is the sixth edition and it is for SPSS
ver. 13.0, but is usable with other versions. It is by Allyn and Bacon.
While it shows students how to use SPSS it covers all the statistics taught in
a basic Social Science Statistics course plus a few more. If you want more
discussion of the stats, you can add a small stat book to it. The text
suggests several of them.

Bill

William Divale, Ph.D.
Professor of Anthropology
Survey Research Laboratory, Director
York College, CUNY
Jamaica, NY 11451
www.york.cuny.edu
Dear Josh:

I would seriously question using SPSS these days. Under new management the software company is trying extract mucho bucks from their users. They are very, very predatory. If you want to teach statistics ala SPSS, I would sugget using Sas, STATA or Minitab.

However, there is a terrific book by Moore and McCabe, Statistics Concepts and Controversies, which is targeted at the general educations statistics market.

You should also check out the American Statistical Association little books, which frankly are much better for the actual conduct of surveys, for instance, than anything that sociologists put out.

Andrew A. Beveridge
Professor of Sociology
Queens College and Graduate Center CUNY
Office: 718-997-2837
Home: 914-337-6237
Email: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu
Suite 233 Powdermaker Hall
65-30 Kissena Blvd
Flushing, NY 11367-1597
www.socialexplorer.com

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET@asu.edu [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of DivaleBill@aol.com
Sent: Friday, January 13, 2006 6:28 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Request for textbook suggestion

Josh

I think a good book to use is
SPSS for Windows: Step by Step. It is the sixth edition and it is for SPSS ver. 13.0, but is useable with other versions. It is by Allyn and Bacon.

While it shows students how to use SPSS it covers all the statistics taught in a basic Social Science Statistics course plus a few more. If you want more discussion of the stats, you can add a small stat book to it. The text suggests several of them.

Bill
William Divale, Ph.D.
Professor of Anthropology
Survey Research Laboratory, Director
York College, CUNY
Jamaica, NY 11451
www.york.cuny.edu
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Dear All:

As I understand it, SPSS is under new management. Norman Nie, who originally developed it, has gone on to knowledge networks. It may be the Venture Capitalists who paid for the windows upgrade want their money out. Unlike STATA or SAS or Minitab (which is what I would recommend for instructional use, since it is geared to the Moore set of Statistics Books) SPSS does not handle weighting properly in surveys that require fractional weighting. It truncates weights to integers in the tabulation (but not the regression) procedures.

Their price increases for site licenses are actually breathtaking, and often are on the order of 200%. My suspicion is that their main market is instruction, so unlike SAS, which is in 998 of the Fortune 1000, or STATA, which has a large group of sophisticated statistics users, SPSS must extract their cash from academe.

More on Statistics Textbooks.

As far as statistics textbooks go, I guarantee you are better off with the
textbooks that are developed by a statistician. About 10 years ago, I reviewed about 35 statistics books to figure out which one to chose, and was appalled by most in the "Social Statistics" category. I accidentally found Moore and McCabe, and was delighted to adopt it. They don't bother with selling to social scientists, or at least they did not.

Here are several that I have used. I highly recommend them. The mother book is:

Introduction to the Practice of Statistics Fifth Edition David S. Moore (Purdue U.) George P. McCabe (Purdue U.)

With its focus on data analysis, statistical reasoning, and the way statisticians actually work, Introduction to the Practice of Statistics (IPS) helped bring the power of critical thinking and practical applications to today's statistics classroom. Unlike more traditional "plug and chug" /formula driven texts, IPS de-emphasizes probability and gives students a deeper understanding of statistics.


A book geared for General Education or Social Science Statistics.

Statistics Concepts and Controversies

The data analysis approach pioneered by David Moore was first introduced in this groundbreaking brief text for liberal arts students. By emphasizing concepts and applications to a wide range of fields (as opposed to formulas and computation) the text has become an influential bestseller, and its emphasis on ideas and data is now generally acknowledged as the most effective way to teach statistics to nonmathematical students. Featuring new coauthor, William Notz and new features, exercises, and applications, the sixth edition of Statistics: Concepts and Controversies is ready to reveal the power of statistics to a new generation of students.


There are several others, for business, for AP, etc.

I also would recommend What Is A Survey?, which is published by the American Statistical Association:

http://www.whatisasurvey.info/

This "What is a Survey" booklet is written primarily for non-specialists and is free of charge. Its overall goal is to improve survey literacy among individuals who participate in NORC Surveys or use NORC survey results.

The material is taken from the American Statistical Association (ASA) series of the same name, which I edited, that was designed to promote a better understanding of what is involved in carrying out sample surveys -
especially those aspects that have to be taken into account in evaluating the results of surveys

Fritz Scheuren

Booth Moore and Scheuren were President of the American Statistical Association.

Andrew A. Beveridge
Professor of Sociology
Queens College and Graduate Center CUNY
Office: 718-997-2837
Home: 914-337-6237
Email: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu
Suite 233 Powdlemaker Hall
65-30 Kissena Blvd
Flushing, NY 11367-1597
www.socialexplorer.com

-----Original Message-----
From: CYNTHIA NELSON [mailto:cnelson@niu.edu]
Sent: Saturday, January 14, 2006 8:27 AM
To: Andrew A Beveridge
Subject: Re: FW: Request for textbook suggestion

Predatory is a good word! I'm glad someone of your status was willing to say it on the group.

SPSS has always been incredibly expensive. I recall when one could purchase the SPSS data editor for SPSS-PC (for a mere $500) that unsuspecting users that wanted to do data entry would purchase (although a spreadsheet would do the same thing).

Of more concern to me is the unreliability of the software. One of our grad assistants use to bring us SPSS output with the following:

A regression analysis
Some frequencies
The same regression analysis

the second analysis resulted in different estimates

Because one of the investigators on our project was a dedicated SPSS user, I was using his programs (on MVS mainframe) while he was on sabbatical to carry out those tasks. I found incredible instability. These were file building tasks in which groups of variables were defined and processes with do if statements.

In both cases the issue was, I think, that the data sets were rather large.

There was no indication in the output or the documentation of any limits being exceeded.....simply results that were different at different times.
regards, Cynthia

Cynthia Nelson
College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
SSRI 148 N. Third Street
DeKalb, IL 60115

Voice 815.753.1918
Fax 815.753.2305
e-mail cnelson@niu.edu

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

On 1/13/2006 at 7:38 PM Andrew A Beveridge wrote:

>Dear Josh:
>  
>I would seriously question using SPSS these days. Under new management the
>software company is trying extract mucho bucks from their users. They are
>very, very predatory. If you want to teach statistics ala SPSS, I
>would sugget using Sas, STATA or Minitab.
>
>However, there is a terrific book by Moore and McCabe, Statistics
>Concepts
>and Controversies, which is targeted at the general educations
>statistics market.
>
>You should also check out the American Statistical Association little
>books, which frankly are much better for the actual conduct of surveys,
>for instance, than anything that sociologists put out.
>
>Andrew A. Beveridge
>Professor of Sociology
>Queens College and Graduate Center CUNY
>Office: 718-997-2837
>Home: 914-337-6237
>Email: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu
>Suite 233 Powdermaker Hall
>65-30 Kissena Blvd
>Flushing, NY 11367-1597
>www.socialexplorer.com
>
>-----Original Message-----
>From: AAPORNET@asu.edu [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of
>DivaleBill@AOL.COM
>Sent: Friday, January 13, 2006 6:28 PM
>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Request for textbook suggestion

Josh

I think a good book to use is
SPSS for Windows: Step by Step. It is the sixth edition and it is for
SPSS ver. 13.0, but is useable with other versions. It is by Allyn
and Bacon.

While it shows students how to use SPSS it covers all the statistics
taught in a basic Social Science Statistics course plus a few more.
If you want
more discussion of the stats, you can add a small stat book to it.
The text suggests several of them.

Bill

William Divale, Ph.D.
Professor of Anthropology
Survey Research Laboratory, Director
York College, CUNY
Jamaica, NY 11451
www.york.cuny.edu
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Folks:

The recent price gouging from SPSS is well noted. However, I know that in CUNY, at least, many thousand people are familiar with and have been using this program for years. Also, the Windows nature of the program makes it easy to teach undergraduates how to use it, and there is a student version available for $50 (with limits on variables and cases) for those institutions that do not have a site license.

The last copy I had of STATA was DOS based. Is there a Windows version available?

Nothing is perfect.

William Divale, Ph.D.
Professor of Anthropology
Survey Research Laboratory, Director
York College, CUNY
Jamaica, NY 11451
www.york.cuny.edu
Below is the listing for SPSS student version. It actually will cost more than this at most bookstores.

Andy

Here is the prentice-hall listing for the SPSS student version.

Publisher: Prentice Hall  
Copyright: 2005  
Format: Software  
Our Price: $93.33  

Description
Statistical analysis skills can give you an edge in today's job market. With SPSS Student Version 13.0 for Windows, you can concentrate on learning statistics, not software. KEY TOPICS: SPSS Student Version is packed with easy-to-access online help to get you up and running quickly. The intuitive and extensive data management functionality in SPSS Student Version enables you to quickly prepare data for meaningful analysis. Various table formats and presentation-quality graphs include more than 50 types of statistical, business, and quality control charts. You can also easily incorporate SPSS Student Version tables and charts into word-processing documents and electronic presentations. SPSS 13.0 For Windows Student Version will EXPIRE 4 years from the installation date.

To license the SPSS Student Version, you must be a currently enrolled student or an instructor, and using the product for educational purposes only. Installation on a network or in an academic lab is strictly prohibited by the license agreement. The SPSS student version is a full version of the SPSS Base software but is limited to 50 variables and 1500 cases. The 13.0 release of this software is only available for Windows and will expire 4 years after the software is installed. SPSS add-on modules cannot be added to this package.

From: DivaleBill@aol.com [mailto:DivaleBill@aol.com]
Sent: Saturday, January 14, 2006 11:02 AM
To: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu; AAPORNET@asu.edu
Folks:

The recent price gouging from SPSS is well noted. However, I know that in CUNY, at least, many thousand people are familiar with and have been using this program for years. Also, the Windows nature of the program makes it easy to teach undergraduates how to use it, and there is a student version available for $50 (with limits on variables and cases) for those institutions that do not have a site license.

The last copy I had of STATA was DOS based. Is there a Windows version available?

Nothing is perfect.

William Divale, Ph.D.
Professor of Anthropology
Survey Research Laboratory, Director
York College, CUNY
Jamaica, NY 11451
www.york.cuny.edu
I am a long-time fan of David S. Moore's books and his "Introduction to the Practice of Statistics" is what I always recommend to clients when they ask me for a reference book that explains the basics clearly.

I would not agree that the book "de-emphasizes probability." What it does is teach what probability means by showing how statistical analysis is used to determine the probability of an event or hypothesis. I would argue that Moore's organic approach will provide most non-mathematicians with a better fundamental understanding of probability than the formal approach found in more traditional statistics textbooks.

Moore's "Statistics: Concepts and Controversies" is, by far, the best introduction to probability and statistics for non-practitioners that I know of and should be mandatory reading for journalists, among others.

Jan Werner
________________

Andrew A Beveridge wrote:

> Dear All:
>
> As I understand it, SPSS is under new management. Norman Nie, who
> originally developed it, has gone on to knowledge networks. It may be the
> Venture Capitalists who paid for the windows upgrade want their money out.
> Unlike STATA or SAS or Minitab (which is what I would recommend for
> instructional use, since it is geared to the Moore set of Statistics
> Books) SPSS does not handle weighting properly in surveys that require
> fractional weighting. It truncates weights to integers in the tabulation
> (but not the regression) procedures.
>
> Their price increases for site licenses are actually breathtaking, and often
> are on the order of 200%. My suspicion is that their main market is
> instruction, so unlike SAS, which is in 998 of the Fortune 1000, or STATA,
> which has a large group of sophisticated statistics users, SPSS must extract
> their cash from academe.
>
> More on Statistics Textbooks.
>
> As far as statistics textbooks go, I guarantee you are better off with the
> textbooks that are developed by a statistician. About 10 years ago, I
> reviewed about 35 statistics books to figure out which one to chose, and was
> appalled by most in the "Social Statistics" category. I accidentally found
> Moore and McCabe, and was delighted to adopt it. They don't bother with
> selling to social scientists, or at least they did not.
>
> Here are several that I have used. I highly recommend them. The mother
> book is:
>
> Introduction to the Practice of Statistics Fifth Edition David S. Moore
> (Purdue U.) George P. McCabe (Purdue U.)
>
> With its focus on data analysis, statistical reasoning, and the way
> statisticians actually work, Introduction to the Practice of Statistics
> (IPS) helped bring the power of critical thinking and practical applications
to today's statistics classroom. Unlike more traditional "plug and chug"
/formula driven texts, IPS de-emphasizes probability and gives students a
deeper understanding of statistics.


> A book geared for General Education or Social Science Statistics.

> Statistics Concepts and Controversies

> The data analysis approach pioneered by David Moore was first introduced in
this groundbreaking brief text for liberal arts students. By emphasizing
concepts and applications to a wide range of fields (as opposed to formulas
and computation) the text has become an influential bestseller, and its
emphasis on ideas and data is now generally acknowledged as the most
effective way to teach statistics to nonmathematical students. Featuring new
coauthor, William Notz and new features, exercises, and applications, the
sixth edition of Statistics:
> Concepts and Controversies is ready to reveal the power of statistics to a
new generation of students.

disc_name=Statistics&@id_course=1058000207

> There are several others, for business, for AP, etc.

> I also would recommend What Is A Survey?, which is published by the American
Statistical Association:

> http://www.whatisasurvey.info/

> This "What is a Survey" booklet is written primarily for non-specialists and
is free of charge. Its overall goal is to improve survey literacy among
individuals who participate in NORC Surveys or use NORC survey results.

> The material is taken from the American Statistical Association (ASA) series
of the same name, which I edited, that was designed to promote a better
understanding of what is involved in carrying out sample surveys -
especially those aspects that have to be taken into account in evaluating
the results of surveys

> Fritz Scheuren

> Booth Moore and Scheuren were President of the American Statistical
Association.

> Andrew A. Beveridge
> Professor of Sociology
> Queens College and Graduate Center CUNY
> Office: 718-997-2837
> Home: 914-337-6237
> Email: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu
Predatory is a good word! I'm glad someone of your status was willing to say it on the group.

SPSS has always been incredibly expensive. I recall when one could purchase the SPSS data editor for SPSS-PC (for a mere $500) that unsuspecting users that wanted to do data entry would purchase (although a spreadsheet would do the same thing).

Of more concern to me is the unreliability of the software. One of our grad assistants use to bring us SPSS output with the following:

A regression analysis
Some frequencies
The same regression analysis

the second analysis resulted in different estimates

Because one of the investigators on our project was a dedicated SPSS user, I was using his programs (on MVS mainframe) while he was on sabbatical to carry out those tasks. I found incredible instability. These were file building tasks in which groups of variables were defined and processes with do if statements.

In both cases the issue was, I think, that the data sets were rather large.

There was no indication in the output or the documentation of any limits being exceeded.....simply results that were different at different times.

regards, Cynthia

Cynthia Nelson
College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
SSRI 148 N. Third Street
DeKalb, IL 60115

Voice 815.753.1918
Fax 815.753.2305
e-mail cnelson@niu.edu
On 1/13/2006 at 7:38 PM Andrew A Beveridge wrote:

>>Dear Josh:

>>I would seriously question using SPSS these days. Under new management
>>the
>>software company is trying extract mucho bucks from their users. They
>>are
>>very, very predatory. If you want to teach statistics ala SPSS, I
>>would sugget using Sas, STATA or Minitab.
>>
>>However, there is a terrific book by Moore and McCabe, Statistics
>>Concepts
>>and Controversies, which is targeted at the general educations
>>statistics market.
>>
>>You should also check out the American Statistical Association little
>>books, which frankly are much better for the actual conduct of surveys,
>>for instance, than anything that sociologists put out.
>>
>>Andrew A. Beveridge
>>Professor of Sociology
>>Queens College and Graduate Center CUNY
>>Office: 718-997-2837
>>Home: 914-337-6237
>>Email: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu
>>Suite 233 Powdermaker Hall
>>65-30 Kissena Blvd
>>Flushing, NY 11367-1597
>>www.socialexplorer.com
>>
>>-----Original Message-----
>>From: AAPORNET@asu.edu [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of
>>DivaleBill@AOL.COM
>>Sent: Friday, January 13, 2006 6:28 PM
>>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>>Subject: Re: Request for textbook suggestion
>>
>>Josh
>>
>>I think a good book to use is
>>SPSS for Windows: Step by Step. It is the sixth edition and it is for
>>SPSS ver. 13.0, but is useable with other versions. It is by Allyn
and

Bacon.

While it shows students how to use SPSS it covers all the statistics taught in a basic Social Science Statistics course plus a few more.

If you want more discussion of the stats, you can add a small stat book to it.

The text suggests several of them.

Bill

William Divale, Ph.D.
Professor of Anthropology
Survey Research Laboratory, Director
York College, CUNY
Jamaica, NY 11451
www.york.cuny.edu
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I looked at introductory statistics textbooks several years ago. On an admittedly unscientific sampling of courses in social statistics offered in sociology departments (n=29), the texts assigned more than once were:

- Frankfort-Nachmias and Leon-Guerrero, Social Statistics for a Diverse Society (6)
- Agresti and Finlay, Statistical Methods for the Social Sciences (5)
- Gravetter and Wallau, Essentials of Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (3)
- Levin and Fox, Elementary Statistics in Social Research (3)
- Healey, Statistics: A Tool for Social Research (2)

Frankfort-Nachmias and Leon-Guerrero pay a lot of attention to substantive examples from contemporary sociological research. It was a little much for my taste, potentially taking away from the statistical content. It omitted one-way ANOVA and any coverage of multiple regression. They also have detailed examples using SPSS.

Agresti and Finlay is probably a better text for a first-level grad statistics course or a two course sequence, covering a wide range of models and techniques (GLM, nonparametric regression, path analysis, logit etc) in addition to basic concepts. SPSS output was out of date, SAS was also covered extensively.

Gravetter and Wallau was an excellent text, albeit for psychology rather than sociology (e.g., an extended treatment of ANOVA rather than regression).

Healey seemed the best for first-level social stats, covering all the necessary material without intimidating the reader or condescending and had appropriate examples that didn't take away from the procedures they were demonstrating. It contains detailed instructions for SPSS and MicroCase.
I did not look at Levin and Fox.

---

Benjamin Phillips, M.A.
Research Associate
Cohen Center for Modern Jewish Studies
MS014 Brandeis University
P.O. Box 549110
Waltham, MA 02454-9110
Ph: (781) 736-3855 Fax: (781) 736-3929
bphillips@brandeis.edu
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-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Josh Klein
Date: Mon, 16 Jan 2006 12:29:28 -0500
Reply-To: "Wolf, James G" <jamwolf@IUPUI.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Wolf, James G" <jamwolf@IUPUI.EDU>
Subject: Re: Request for textbook suggestion
Comments: To: Josh Klein <jklein@IGC.ORG>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I use two books published by Allyn and Bacon for teaching stats:

Elementary Stats in Social Research (Levin & Fox)
Data Analysis with SPSS (Sweet & Grace-Martin)

My students have mentioned verbally and in their course evaluations that
these books are very lucid and helpful. Several students specifically
mention they intend to keep them both for future use.

As for SPSS: to my knowledge it is still the easiest way to introduce
students to a wide variety of statistical tools. Compare its current
cost to other packages when considering its ease of use, and I feel it
is worth the money.

Just my two cents (plus or minus 2 percent).

Jim Wolf
Director, Survey Research Center at IUPUI  (317) 278-9230
jamwolf@iupui.edu

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Josh Klein
I'm seeking suggestions for short textbooks and readers for the following undergraduate courses:
Social Statistics
All I can think of is South End Press' Statistics for Social Change, which I fear uses overly dated examples.

Thanks.

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

Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.org/
Problems? Don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

Good day to all:
Does anyone have any recommendations for field services in Poland, The Czech Republic and Russia?
Thanks to everyone, if you want to reply to me off the group site I can be reached at:
Paul A. Braun
-----Original Message-----
From: Andrew.Beveridge@qc.cuny.edu [mailto:Andrew.Beveridge@qc.cuny.edu]
Sent: Monday, January 16, 2006 1:44 PM
To: jamwolf@IUPUI.EDU; AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: RE: Request for textbook suggestion

Actually SPSS as a package for Dummies is massively overpriced costing about
60 times minitab, and 30 times that of SAS.

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET@asu.edu [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Wolf, James G
Sent: Monday, January 16, 2006 12:29 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Request for textbook suggestion

I use two books published by Allyn and Bacon for teaching stats:

Elementary Stats in Social Research (Levin & Fox) Data Analysis with SPSS
(Sweet & Grace-Martin)

My students have mentioned verbally and in their course evaluations that
these books are very lucid and helpful. Several students specifically
mention they intend to keep them both for future use.

As for SPSS: to my knowledge it is still the easiest way to introduce
students to a wide variety of statistical tools. Compare its current cost
to other packages when considering its ease of use, and I feel it is worth the money. Just my two cents (plus or minus 2 percent).

=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=

Jim Wolf
Director, Survey Research Center at IUPUI (317) 278-9230
jamwolf@iupui.edu

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Josh Klein
Sent: Friday, January 13, 2006 5:59 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Request for textbook suggestion

I'm seeking suggestions for short textbooks and readers for the following undergraduate courses:
Social Statistics
All I can think of is South End Press' Statistics for Social Change, which I fear uses overly dated examples.

Thanks.

Dr. Josh Klein
Iona College
92 Brookdale Ave.
New Rochelle, NY 10801
914 576 5285
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Dear Jim:

Gee at CUNY, SAS is available to take home for students, and costs the institution about 20K for 210,000 students, while SPSS wants over 300K for a renewal and one college is paying over 60K for SPSS. Sounds like the university is heavily subsidising SPSS.

Andy

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET@asu.edu [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Wolf, James G  
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2006 1:16 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Request for textbook suggestion

Hmmm. At Indiana University, SPSS costs our students $25.  

Where can they get SAS for 83 cents?

==================================
Jim Wolf  
Director, Survey Research Center at IUPUI  (317) 278-9230  
jamwolf@iupui.edu

-----Original Message-----
From: Andrew.Beveridge@qc.cuny.edu [mailto:Andrew.Beveridge@qc.cuny.edu]  
Sent: Mon 1/16/06 1:44 PM  
To: Wolf, James G; AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Cc:  
Subject: RE: Request for textbook suggestion

Actually SPSS as a package for Dummies is massively overpriced costing about 60 times minitab, and 30 times that of SAS.

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET@asu.edu [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Wolf, James

Sent: Monday, January 16, 2006 12:29 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Request for textbook suggestion

I use two books published by Allyn and Bacon for teaching stats:

Elementary Stats in Social Research (Levin & Fox) Data Analysis with SPSS (Sweet & Grace-Martin)

My students have mentioned verbally and in their course evaluations that these books are very lucid and helpful. Several students specifically mention they intend to keep them both for future use.

As for SPSS: to my knowledge it is still the easiest way to introduce students to a wide variety of statistical tools. Compare its current cost to other packages when considering its ease of use, and I feel it is worth the money.

Just my two cents (plus or minus 2 percent).

=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=
Jim Wolf
Director, Survey Research Center at IUPUI  (317) 278-9230
jamwolf@iupui.edu

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Josh Klein
Sent: Friday, January 13, 2006 5:59 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Request for textbook suggestion

I'm seeking suggestions for short textbooks and readers for the following undergraduate courses: Social Statistics
All I can think of is South End Press' Statistics for Social Change, which I fear uses overly dated examples.

Thanks.

Dr. Josh Klein
The Washington/Baltimore Chapter of AAPOR is pleased to announce the winner of its 2005 Student Paper Competition.

Hyunjoo Park, a recent graduate of the University of Michigan, is recognized for the outstanding quality of her paper, entitled "The influence of question wording on the reporting of contraceptive method use." Hyunjoo will be presenting her paper at this year's AAPOR conference as one of the Regional Student Paper Award Winners.

Papers by Tarek al-Baghal (JSPM) and Magdalena Wojcieszak (University of Pennsylvania) have also been recognized as honorable mentions.

The review committee judged entries based on research design, originality, significance/relevance, organization, and presentation, a task made more difficult by the impressive level of analysis demonstrated by all authors. Among an extremely competitive field, the Park, al-Baghal, and Wojcieszak papers in particular stood out for their high quality of writing, clarity of thought, and potential to contribute to the topics explored. For those interested, the winning paper and honorable mentions are available for download from the DC-AAPOR website.
Announcing The Charles Cannell Fund in Survey Methodology Competition for 2006

The Charles Cannell Fund in Survey Methodology of the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan was established by students, colleagues and friends of Charlie to honor him as a mentor and to further research and training on the interviewer-respondent interaction and its effects on the validity and quality of survey data.

Overview

In making awards, special emphasis will be placed on efforts to develop social psychological theories, test hypotheses and techniques derived from these theories, and develop techniques for measuring and improving the interaction between the respondent and the interviewer. Possible uses of the funds include, but are not limited to, support related to dissertation research by a graduate student, small experimental studies by graduate students or junior
researchers, or visiting scholars conducting related research. Special attention will be given to activities that will produce results that are visible in the field and that will attract or sustain interest in research related to the interaction between the interviewer and the respondent. Funds requested can include support for dissemination of research findings. Awardees will be invited to present findings from their research to the research staff of the Survey Research Center.

Eligibility

Junior researchers, including Graduate Students, Assistant Research Scientists, Assistant Professors, Research Investigators, and Postdoctoral Fellows are eligible. Other things being equal, preference will be given to graduate students for research or training carried out at the University of Michigan.

Form and Scope of Awards

The Committee expects to make awards up to $10,000 per year with the number and size of awards determined by the availability of funds and the merits of the candidate proposals. Funds may be awarded for a single project, or split among several applicants or projects. Awards are intended for use within one year, but may be extended upon request for six more months.

Application Procedure and Deadlines

Applications for the 2006-2007 year will be due on Wednesday March 1 at 5:00 p.m. Applications will be reviewed according to the procedures that have been established by the Cannell Fund Committee. Final decisions will be made by Friday April 1st. Funds will be available as early as June.

For details concerning the application process, please visit:

http://www.isr.umich.edu/training/cannell.html
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Date:         Tue, 17 Jan 2006 06:32:04 -0800
Reply-To:     draughon.research@insightbb.com
Sender:       AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From:         "Katherine Draughon, PhD, MPH" <draughon.research@INSIGHTBB.COM>
Subject:      Web survey software - for an academic setting
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 8bit
I am looking for recommendations for web survey software to be used primarily for internal academic surveys.

Please sent suggestions to me directly --

draughon.research@insightbb.com

Thanks, Kat Draughon

Dr. Katherine "Kat" Draughon
Draughon Research, LLC
www.draughonresearch.com
draughon.research@insightbb.com
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Zogby poll: Majority supports impeaching Bush for wiretapping

WASHINGTON, D.C. - By a margin of 52 to 43 percent, citizens want Congress to impeach President Bush if he wiretapped American citizens without a judge's approval, according to a new poll commissioned by AfterDowningStreet.org, a grassroots coalition that supports a Congressional investigation of Pres. Bush's decision to invade Iraq in 2003.

The poll was conducted by Zogby International.

SNIP

http://www.zogby.com/Soundbites/ReadClips.dbm?ID=3D12528

Leo G. Simonetta
Research Director
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road, Suite 101
Somewhere in this thread, there was an assertion that SPSS rounds to whole numbers in weighting cross-tabulations and similar procedures. That is not true. I have used SPSS for years and work with large cross-national samples with fractional weights in the first and second decimal places and the weighting is always accurate. In the Eurobarometer data sets, for example, the 1000 interviews in Denmark produce individual case weights that never exceed .25 when weighted to the total N for the study and adjusted for the relative size of each country. If SPSS rounded these weights, Denmark would have zero cases, which they do not.

The SPSS statement WEIGHT BY VARNAME. allows the use of any user-specified value as a weight, including decimal values.

Also, for file construction purposes, I find the SPSS table lookup function to be very useful. I have not used SAS for several years, but it did not have a similar feature when I last used it.

Jon

Jon D. Miller
Professor and Director
Center for Biomedical Communication
Feinberg School of Medicine
Northwestern University
Room 18-142
303 East Chicago Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60611

312-503-1431 (tel)
312-503-2521 (fax)
j-miller8@northwestern.edu
I know that correlation isn't causation, etc., etc., but I just
discovered an interesting factoid: the correlation coefficient for
the Gallup Bush approval rating and the average price of gasoline from
Jan 2001-Jan 2006 (monthly averages on both) is -0.81.

--

Doug Henwood
Left Business Observer
38 Greene St - 4th fl.
New York NY 10013-2505 USA
<dhenwood@panix.com>
<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>

voice +1-212-219-0010
fax +1-212-219-0098
cell +1-917-865-2813

producer, Behind the News
Thursdays, 5-6 PM, WBAI, New York 99.5 FM

------------------------------------------------------------------------
download my book Wall Street (for free!) at
<http://www.wallstreetthebook.com>

------------------------------------------------------------------------
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--

Ehrlich, Nathaniel <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>

I think you'll find a corresponding statistical correspondence between

Date: Wed, 18 Jan 2006 01:17:25 -0500
Reply-To: Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU
From: Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU
Subject: Re: factoid
Comments: To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

I think you'll find a corresponding statistical correspondence between

Date: Wed, 18 Jan 2006 01:35:46 -0500
Reply-To: Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU
From: Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU
Subject: Re: factoid
Comments: To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

I think you'll find a corresponding statistical correspondence between
consumer satisfaction with the economy and gas prices. You do have to be careful to adjust monthly median gas price to reflect its relation to monthly median earnings in geographical areas.

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 Doug Henwood
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2006 11:47 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: factoid

I know that correlation isn't causation, etc., etc., but I just discovered an interesting factoid: the correlation coefficient for the Gallup Bush approval rating and the average price of gasoline from Jan 2001-Jan 2006 (monthly averages on both) is -0.81.

--
Doug Henwood
Left Business Observer
38 Greene St - 4th fl.
New York NY 10013-2505 USA
<dhenwood@panix.com>
<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>
voice  +1-212-219-0010
fax    +1-212-219-0098
cell   +1-917-865-2813

producer, Behind the News
Thursdays, 5-6 PM, WBAI, New York 99.5 FM
-------------------------------------------------------------
download my book Wall Street (for free!) at
<http://www.wallstreetthebook.com>

-------------------------------------------------------------
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Truly a model of unbiased sample construction.

Phil
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I'll chime in. For those of you who did not read the full release... the
"impeachment" question was worded as follows:

"If President Bush wiretapped American citizens without the approval of a
disable or disagree that Congress should consider holding him
accountable through impeachment."

Further proof that, if you have an inherently and intentionally leading
question, it doesn't matter if you balance it with "agree or disagree". My
only hope is that I don't see this poll quoted by the national media
without the necessary caveats. I would love to have Zogby now ask the same
question as: [I'm just keeping it simple... the beginning is somewhat
inflammatory as well]
"If President Bush wiretapped American citizens without the approval of a judge, do you believe that Congress should pursue impeachment hearings or should they not pursue impeachment hearings?"

I'm betting the impeachment percentage would get sliced in half.

I'm not prompting a political discussion here... I have little allegiance either way, I just hate that an intentionally flawed study floats out there as if it were legitimate.

Larry Luskin
ORC Macro

At 02:34 PM 1/17/2006, Philip Harding wrote:
>
> _http://www.afterdowningstreet.org/?q=taxonomy/term/15_
> (http://www.afterdowningstreet.org/?q=taxonomy/term/15)
>
> Truly a model of unbiased sample construction.
>
> Phil
>
> ----------------------------------------------------
> Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.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

Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.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, 17 Jan 2006 14:28:29 -0600
Reply-To:     jimr@rma-inc.com
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Point right on target. On the other hand I saw another poll from the right side of the track that added this wording: "American citizens suspected of involvement with international terrorism." Those results were predictably low. All in what the person trying to prove a point does instead of trying to get at some common, measurable fact.
I'll chime in. For those of you who did not read the full release... the "impeachment" question was worded as follows:

"If President Bush wiretapped American citizens without the approval of a judge, do you agree or disagree that Congress should consider holding him accountable through impeachment."

Further proof that, if you have an inherently and intentionally leading question, it doesn't matter if you balance it with "agree or disagree". My only hope is that I don't see this poll quoted by the national media without the necessary caveats. I would love to have Zogby now ask the same question as: [I'm just keeping it simple... the beginning is somewhat inflammatory as well]

"If President Bush wiretapped American citizens without the approval of a judge, do you believe that Congress should pursue impeachment hearings or should they not pursue impeachment hearings?"

I'm betting the impeachment percentage would get sliced in half.

I'm not prompting a political discussion here... I have little allegiance either way, I just hate that an intentionally flawed study floats out there as if it were legitimate.

Larry Luskin
ORC Macro

At 02:34 PM 1/17/2006, Philip Harding wrote:
>
> http://www.afterdowningstreet.org/?q=taxonomy/term/15
>(http://www.afterdowningstreet.org/?q=taxonomy/term/15)
>
>Truly a model of unbiased sample construction.
>
>Phil
>
>
>----------------------------------------------------
Larry,

You say that you have no axe to grind, but I would say you've missed half the truth of what is going on here. I'm ok with the doubling verbiage asking whether for or against Congress taking action (in your re-write). But the question is still biased in blurring the facts. Why not put the facts up front instead of some bogus "if". "President Bush apparently violated the (insert the actual name of the law. Is it ARISA?) law by wiretapping many citizens without seeking approval of a secret intelligence court established to protect both national security and individual rights. Should Congress bring up impeachment charges against him or should Congress not bring impeachment charges based upon his admission and defense of this practice?" This whole deal about Executive "unitary powers" is what the Alito appointment is focused on and it's far from trivial as to whether or not the American public is willing to give away the separation of powers doctrine. Gore's surprisingly strong speech yesterday details clearly everything that is at stake here (going back to Washington and Jefferson and so on). Moreover, people who think there isn't strong support for impeachment right now (regardless of the wording) probably don't have their ear to the rail. You may reduce the % by 5 or 10% but you won't cut that 52% in half as you claim with any unbiased question you come up with. I'll wager a few thousand on that.

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

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNENET [mailto:AAPORNENET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Larry Luskin
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2006 12:13 PM
To: AAPORNENET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Zogby poll: Majority supports impeaching Bush for wiretapping

I'll chime in. For those of you who did not read the full release... the
"impeachment" question was worded as follows:

"If President Bush wiretapped American citizens without the approval of a
judge, do you agree or disagree that Congress should consider holding him
accountable through impeachment."

Further proof that, if you have an inherently and intentionally leading question, it doesn't matter if you balance it with "agree or disagree". My
only hope is that I don't see this poll quoted by the national media without the necessary caveats. I would love to have Zogby now ask the same
question as: [I'm just keeping it simple... the beginning is somewhat inflammatory as well]

"If President Bush wiretapped American citizens without the approval of a judge, do you believe that Congress should pursue impeachment hearings or
should they not pursue impeachment hearings?"

I'm betting the impeachment percentage would get sliced in half.

I'm not prompting a political discussion here... I have little allegiance
either way, I just hate that an intentionally flawed study floats out there
as if it were legitimate.

Larry Luskin
ORC Macro

At 02:34 PM 1/17/2006, Philip Harding wrote:
>
> http://www.afterdowningstreet.org/?q=taxonomy/term/15
>(http://www.afterdowningstreet.org/?q=taxonomy/term/15)
>
>Truly a model of unbiased sample construction.
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To AAPORnetters -

I'm pleased to forward the job announcement below. To any who may wonder
how it is related to my current title, I am cutting back my time at AFB,
taking on the new title of "Senior Research Scientist." The job
announcement thus is a "replacement" with a slightly different title.

I'll be glad to answer questions about the position, if desired;
however, interested applicants can contact Mark Richert, as noted below,
since he will be the person to whom the position will report.

Belated Happy New Year to all,
Corinne

Corinne Kirchner, Ph.D.
Director of Policy Research & Program Evaluation
American Foundation for the Blind
Colleagues:

I am pleased to share with you a description for a new position within the American Foundation for the Blind (AFB) Public Policy Center. We are seeking an Associate Director, Policy Research, who will play a lead role in the formation and promotion of public policy advancing AFB's mission to expand possibilities for people with vision loss. This senior-level experienced professional will advise and assist AFB Public Policy and other staff in the analysis and evaluation of policy and programmatic initiatives intended to address critical issues in service delivery, environmental and information access, public health, demographics and trends, and related key issues.

To apply, send a cover letter (with salary requirements), resume and/or CV via email to mrichert@afb.net; please CC Lesa Boothe in AFB's Human Resources department at lesab@afb.net when you transmit your application. Do not hesitate to contact me by phone if you would like additional information or background about this exciting new position before you apply - 202-408-8175.

Mark Richert, Esq.
Director, Public Policy
American Foundation for the Blind

ACCOUNTABILITIES:

Provides leadership and direction for AFB's policy research priorities, including research-related aspects of identifying critical issues, undertaking or overseeing their analysis, and establishing recommendations for their resolution. Develops research funding proposals, manages outside-funded research projects (federal, state,
and/or private), and provides support and assistance for AFB research proposals. Develops, designs, conducts and oversees research projects involving both original data collection and secondary data analysis for the purposes of: policy research, demographic analyses, service delivery methods, program evaluation, needs assessments, market research and other applications of social research techniques. Recruits and directs performance and progress of outside consultants, including proposal evaluation, contract negotiation, budget management and oversight of outside consultants. Assists other AFB groups/departments in designing and conducting research projects and activities. Serves as a national advocate, spokesperson and resource on policy and related research concerning programs and services meeting the unique educational, rehabilitative and independent living needs of people with vision loss. Provides information, consultation, and leadership to directors and key administrative staff in private and public service agencies, the public health and corporate sectors, consumers, policymakers/opinion leaders, and members of the community regarding research-supported policies and best practices. Writes articles, chapters, books, and professional research reports for publication or other distribution in scholarly and lay dissemination outlets, makes oral presentations on research findings, and develops content and interactive services for AFB's Web site. Serves as member of AFB intra-organizational teams, committees, etc. as needed; and, serves as AFB representative to related disability and discipline-based organizations. Performs other duties and special projects, as assigned.

QUALIFICATIONS: Graduate degree or equivalent in a social science (doctorate preferred); 5-10 years' experience in social or policy research related to human service, preferably in the disability field. Knowledge and training in policy analysis and quantitative or qualitative research methods; exceptional oral and written communication skills; organizational skills for coordinating efforts among groups of professionals; experience in writing and managing grant proposals.

An Equal Opportunity Employer
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If you are going to delve substantively into the appropriateness of the administration's actions in "wiretapping" US citizens without court oversight, I keep thinking that time has to be a consideration. The justification as I understand it has basically come down to "we are at war". However, this war is against no definable nation or group (it's a war against terrorism and is not confined to Bin Laden's organization) and with no realistically discernible criterion for when that war will be over. So, people may agree or disagree with Bush's action and justification, but if they agree, I would be interested to here how far in the future and how many presidents might be allowed to exercise these powers. In other words, are we in a virtually permanent state of emergency by which similar unilateral actions by the executive branch may be justified? That, in my mind, is where the constitutional question really comes into play. Have we already tacitly (expressly?) agreed to suspension of constitutional rights and protections by unilateral decision of the President on an ongoing, indefinite basis?

Lance M. Pollack, PhD
University of California, San Francisco (UCSF)
Center for AIDS Prevention Studies (CAPS)
Health Survey Research Unit (HSRU)
50 Beale Street, Suite 1300
San Francisco, CA 94105
tel: 415-597-9302
fax: 415-597-9213
e-mail: Lance.Pollack@ucsf.edu

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Marc Sapir
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2006 12:57 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: Zogby poll: Majority supports impeaching Bush for wiretapping

Larry,

You say that you have no axe to grind, but I would say you've missed half the truth of what is going on here. I'm ok with the doubling verbiage asking whether for or against Congress taking action (in your re-write). But the question is still biased in blurring the facts. Why not put the facts up front instead of some bogus "if". "President Bush apparently violated the (insert the actual name of the law. Is it ARISA?) law by wiretapping many citizens without seeking approval of a secret intelligence court established to protect both national security and individual rights. Should Congress bring up impeachment charges against him or should Congress not bring impeachment charges based upon his admission and defense of this practice?" This whole deal about Executive "unitary powers" is what the Alito appointment is focused on and it's far from trivial as to whether or not the American public is willing to give away the separation of powers doctrine. Gore's
surprisingly strong speech yesterday details clearly everything that is at stake here (going back to Washington and Jefferson and so on). Moreover, people who think there isn't strong support for impeachment right now (regardless of the wording) probably don't have their ear to the rail. You may reduce the % by 5 or 10% but you won't cut that 52% in half as you claim with any unbiased question you come up with. I'll wager a few thousand on that.

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

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Larry Luskin
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2006 12:13 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Zogby poll: Majority supports impeaching Bush for wiretapping

I'll chime in. For those of you who did not read the full release... the

"impeachment" question was worded as follows:

"If President Bush wiretapped American citizens without the approval of a judge, do you agree or disagree that Congress should consider holding him accountable through impeachment."

Further proof that, if you have an inherently and intentionally leading question, it doesn't matter if you balance it with "agree or disagree". My only hope is that I don't see this poll quoted by the national media without the necessary caveats. I would love to have Zogby now ask the same question as: [I'm just keeping it simple... the beginning is somewhat inflammatory as well]

"If President Bush wiretapped American citizens without the approval of a judge, do you believe that Congress should pursue impeachment hearings or should they not pursue impeachment hearings?"

I'm betting the impeachment percentage would get sliced in half.

I'm not prompting a political discussion here... I have little allegiance either way, I just hate that an intentionally flawed study floats out there as if it were legitimate.
Larry Luskin
ORC Macro

At 02:34 PM 1/17/2006, Philip Harding wrote:
>
> _http://www.afterdowningstreet.org/?q=3Dtaxonomy/term/15_
>(http://www.afterdowningstreet.org/?q=3Dtaxonomy/term/15)
>
>Truly a model of unbiased sample construction.
>
>Phil
>
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The Harvard University Program on Survey Research

presents:
Eric M. Mindich Encounters with Authors Symposium

The Handbook of Questionnaire Design: Insights from Social and Cognitive Psychology
by Jon Krosnick, Stanford University

January 19-21, 2006

1737 Cambridge Street, Room N354, Harvard University

http://www.iq.harvard.edu/NewsEvents/Conferences/EWA/

Free and Open to the Public

Schedule of Sessions

Thursday 8:30 - 9:00 am
Breakfast

Thursday 9:00 - 10:45 am
Introduction to Survey Response Process

Thursday 10:45 - 11:00 am
Break

Thursday 11:00 am - 12:00 pm
Open versus Closed Questions - Discussant: Gary Langer, ABC News

Thursday 12:00 - 1:00 pm
Lunch

Thursday 1:00 - 2:30 pm
Response Choice Order Effects - Discussant: Norbert Schwarz, University of Michigan

Thursday 2:30 - 4:00 pm
"Don't Know" Response Options - Discussant: Adam Berinsky, MIT

Thursday 4:00-4:15 pm
Break

Thursday 4:15-5:45 pm
Agree/Disagree, True/False, and Yes/No Questions: The Problem of Acquiescence
Discussant: Stanley Presser, University of Maryland

Friday 8:30-9:00 am
Breakfast
Friday 9:00 - 10:30 am
Designing Rating Scales: Number of Scale Points - Discussant: Jack F. Fowler, University of Massachusetts, Boston

Friday 10:30 - 10:45 am
Break

Friday 10:45 am - 12:15 pm
Designing Rating Scales: Verbal versus Numeric Scale Point Labels - Discussant: Herb Weisberg, The Ohio State University

Friday 12:15 - 1:15 pm
Lunch

Friday 1:15 - 2:15 pm
Rating versus Ranking - Discussant: Bob Groves, University of Michigan

Friday 2:15 - 3:15 pm
Question Wording - Discussant: Barry Burden, Harvard University

Friday 3:15 - 3:30 pm
Break

Friday 3:30 - 5:00 pm
Public Panel on "The Future of Survey Research" featuring Bob Groves, Gary Langer and Jon Krosnick
Location: 1730 Cambridge Street, Tsai Auditorium (Room S010)

Friday 5:00 - 6:00 pm
Reception

Saturday 9:00 - 9:30 am
Breakfast

Saturday 9:30 - 10:30 am
Attitude Recall and Introspection about Causality

Saturday 10:30 - 10:45 am
Break

Saturday 10:45 - 11:45 am
Mode Comparisons: Face-to-Face versus Telephone versus Paper versus Internet

Saturday 11:45 am - 12:00 pm
Concluding Discussion

Saturday 12:00 pm
Lunch

Please note that space is limited. If you plan on attending this conference, please e-mail Kimberly Popielski Kriz, IQSS Assistant
I disagree with Marc that you can load up a question with biased language like "apparently violated the law," but there is a question that could be fairly asked. It might read something like this:

If Congress or the courts determine that President Bush authorized the wiretapping of people within the United States without legal authority, should Congress (randomize 1-3...should Congress...or should Congress...)

1 conclude that the president was doing what had to be done to protect Americans from terrorism
2 give the president the legal authority to authorize wiretaps within the United States
3 impeach the president and, if he is found guilty of a crime, remove him from office
   Do not read, but also accept
   4 censure the president but give him legal authority for future wiretaps
   5 censure the president but leave the law as it is
   6 do nothing
   7 other ________________
   8 don't know/refused

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

To: AAPORNENET@asu.edu
cc: 
Subject: Re: Zogby poll: Majority supports impeaching Bush for wiretapping

Larry,

You say that you have no axe to grind, but I would say you've missed half the truth of what is going on here. I'm ok with the doubling verbiage asking whether for or against Congress taking action (in your re-write). But the question is still biased in blurring the facts. Why not put the facts up front instead of some bogus "if". "President Bush apparently violated the (insert the actual name of the law. Is it ARISA?)law by wiretapping many citizens without seeking approval of a secret intelligence court established to protect both national security and individual rights. Should Congress bring up impeachment charges against him or should Congress not bring impeachment charges based upon his admission and defense of this practice?" This whole deal about Executive "unitary powers" is what the Alito appointment is focused on and it's far from trivial as to whether or not the American public is willing to give away the separation of powers doctrine. Gore's surprisingly strong speech yesterday details clearly everything that is at stake here (going back to Washington and Jefferson and so on). Moreover, people who think there isn't strong support for impeachment right now (regardless of the wording) probably don't have their ear to the rail. You may reduce the % by 5 or 10% but you won't cut that 52% in half as you claim with any unbiased question you come up with. I'll wager a few thousand on that.

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

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNENET [mailto:AAPORNENET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Larry Luskin
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2006 12:13 PM
To: AAPORNENET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Zogby poll: Majority supports impeaching Bush for wiretapping

I'll chime in. For those of you who did not read the full release... the

"impeachment" question was worded as follows:

"If President Bush wiretapped American citizens without the approval of a judge, do you agree or disagree that Congress should consider holding him
accountable through impeachment."

Further proof that, if you have an inherently and intentionally leading question, it doesn't matter if you balance it with "agree or disagree". My only hope is that I don't see this poll quoted by the national media without the necessary caveats. I would love to have Zogby now ask the same question as: [I'm just keeping it simple... the beginning is somewhat inflammatory as well]

"If President Bush wiretapped American citizens without the approval of a judge, do you believe that Congress should pursue impeachment hearings or should they not pursue impeachment hearings?"

I'm betting the impeachment percentage would get sliced in half.

I'm not prompting a political discussion here... I have little allegiance either way, I just hate that an intentionally flawed study floats out there as if it were legitimate.

Larry Luskin
ORC Macro

At 02:34 PM 1/17/2006, Philip Harding wrote:

> _http://www.afterdowningstreet.org/?q=taxonomy/term/15_
> (http://www.afterdowningstreet.org/?q=taxonomy/term/15)
> 
> Truly a model of unbiased sample construction.
> 
> Phil
> 
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________________________________________
Andy

Wow. Those charges for SPSS seem outrageous. Is SAS as good as SPSS? I think I will look into it.

Bill

William Divale, Ph.D.
Professor of Anthropology
Survey Research Laboratory, Director
York College, CUNY
Jamaica, NY 11451
www.york.cuny.edu
The American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) will award its 40th annual student paper award at its Annual Conference in Montreal, Canada, 18-21 May 2006. The award is in memory of Seymour Sudman; it recognizes his many important contributions to AAPOR as well as his teaching and mentoring students in the survey research profession.

AAPOR will consider papers in any field related to the study of public opinion, broadly defined, or to the theory and methods of survey research, including statistical techniques used in such research. Paper topics might include: methodological issues in surveys; public opinion or market research; theoretical issues in the formation, quality, or change in public opinion; or substantive findings about public opinion. The competition committee encourages submissions that deal with this year's conference theme, "Confronting Core Values and Cultural Conflict."

The committee also encourages authors to review the Call for Papers, which can be found on the AAPOR website. Entries typically are 15-25 pages in length. A prize of $500 will be awarded to the winning paper at the conference in Montreal, and the author(s) of the paper will deliver it as a part of the conference program. For a winning paper with one author, AAPOR will pay for the author's travel expenses to and from the conference. However, for a winning submission with multiple authors, AAPOR will pay only for the primary author (or his/her designee, who must be a co-author) to present the paper in Montreal. Other papers may receive an Honorable Mention designation.

All authors must be current students (graduate or undergraduate) at the time of the submission, or must have received their degree during the calendar year 2005. The research must have been substantially completed while all authors were enrolled in a degree program. AAPOR will give preference to papers based on research not presented elsewhere, but will consider papers presented at other conferences (not related to AAPOR) that have been substantially revised for this competition. Manuscripts submitted to AAPOR chapter student paper competitions may also be submitted for the Seymour Sudman Student Paper Award. A panel of public opinion researchers from AAPOR's membership - drawn from academic, professional, and governmental backgrounds - will select the award winner.
government, and commercial sectors - will judge the papers. Authors should submit the completed paper by electronic submission, in MS-WORD or PDF format, by 5 pm EST on Wednesday, 1 February, to this year's Associate Conference Chair Patricia Moy (pmoy@u.washington.edu).

Submissions should include the author's (or authors') name(s), telephone number(s), and e-mail address(es). A note accompanying the submission should explain why each author of the paper meets the eligibility criteria. Submitters will receive confirmation of the receipt of the paper and will be notified by 15 March of the committee's decision.

Patricia Moy, Ph.D.
Christy Cressey Associate Professor
Department of Communication
Adjunct Faculty, Political Science
University of Washington, Box 353740
Seattle, WA 98195-3740 U.S.A.

(v) 1 206 543 9676
(f) 1 206 543 9285
(e) pmoy@u.washington.edu
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I think Phil Troustine's is an interesting approach. To his answer choices I would add only a single word to #2. The word "unrestricted" could be inserted i.e. authorize unrestricted wiretaps. Any President already has authority to wiretap us with approval of the FIZA court.
The reason this President's approach to such laws is raising legal eyebrows is because using the FIZA court places little or no restriction on his authority yet he says he can ignore the law if he so deems it advisable.

On the other hand, it's hard to know a fact when you see one these days when the President signs a law saying the U.S. will not torture or send to torture any captives or arrestees; and then in the next breath claims the right to do the proscribed activity should he deem it necessary. Are Phil and others really claiming that President Bush did not violate the FISA? He quite clearly and publicly admitted that he did, but claimed he has the legal authority to do so. Whether or not his ignoring the act warrants being brought on charges, censure, or praise for boldness may be a matter of opinion. But I don't understand how one can argue that he didn't factually and willfully ignore the provisions of the act.

Marc

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

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Philip J. Trounstine
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2006 5:19 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Zogby poll: Majority supports impeaching Bush for wiretapping

I disagree with Marc that you can load up a question with biased language like "apparently violated the law," but there is a question that could be fairly asked. It might read something like this:

If Congress or the courts determine that President Bush authorized the wiretapping of people within the United States without legal authority, should Congress (randomize 1-3...should Congress...or should Congress...)
1 conclude that the president was doing what had to be done to protect Americans from terrorism
2 give the president the legal authority to authorize wiretaps within the United States
3 impeach the president and, if he is found guilty of a crime, remove him from office
Do not read, but also accept
4 censure the president but give him legal authority for future wiretaps
5 censure the president but leave the law as it is
6 do nothing
Larry,

You say that you have no axe to grind, but I would say you've missed half the truth of what is going on here. I'm ok with the doubling verbiage asking whether for or against Congress taking action (in your re-write). But the question is still biased in blurring the facts. Why not put the facts up front instead of some bogus "if". "President Bush apparently violated the (insert the actual name of the law. Is it ARISA?) law by wiretapping many citizens without seeking approval of a secret intelligence court established to protect both national security and individual rights. Should Congress bring up impeachment charges against him or should Congress not bring impeachment charges based upon his admission and defense of this practice?" This whole deal about Executive "unitary powers" is what the Alito appointment is focused on and it's far from trivial as to whether or not the American public is willing to give away the separation of powers doctrine. Gore's surprisingly strong speech yesterday details clearly everything that is at stake here (going back to Washington and Jefferson and so on). Moreover, people who think there isn't strong support for impeachment right now (regardless of the wording) probably don't have their ear to the rail. You may reduce the % by 5 or 10% but you won't cut that 52% in half as you claim with any unbiased question you come up with. I'll wager a few thousand on that.

Marc Sapir MD, MPH
Executive Director
Retro Poll
www.retropoll.org
I'll chime in. For those of you who did not read the full release... the

"impeachment" question was worded as follows:

"If President Bush wiretapped American citizens without the approval of a
judge, do you agree or disagree that Congress should consider holding him
accountable through impeachment."

Further proof that, if you have an inherently and intentionally leading question, it doesn't matter if you balance it with "agree or disagree". My

only hope is that I don't see this poll quoted by the national media without the necessary caveats. I would love to have Zogby now ask the same

question as: [I'm just keeping it simple... the beginning is somewhat inflammatory as well]

"If President Bush wiretapped American citizens without the approval of a
judge, do you believe that Congress should pursue impeachment hearings or
should they not pursue impeachment hearings?"

I'm betting the impeachment percentage would get sliced in half.

I'm not prompting a political discussion here... I have little

allegiance
either way, I just hate that an intentionally flawed study floats out there
as if it were legitimate.

Larry Luskin
ORC Macro

At 02:34 PM 1/17/2006, Philip Harding wrote:
>
> _http://www.afterdowningstreet.org/?q=taxonomy/term/15_
> (http://www.afterdowningstreet.org/?q=taxonomy/term/15)
> 
> Truly a model of unbiased sample construction.
>
> Phil
>
Lance,

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

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Pollack, Lance  
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2006 2:29 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Zogby poll: Majority supports impeaching Bush for wiretapping

If you are going to delve substantively into the appropriateness of the administration's actions in "wiretapping" US citizens without court oversight, I keep thinking that time has to be a consideration. The justification as I understand it has basically come down to "we are at war". However, this war is against no definable nation or group (it's a war against terrorism and is not confined to Bin Laden's organization) and with no realistically discernible criterion for when that war will be over. So, people may agree or disagree with Bush's action and justification, but if they agree, I would be interested to here how far in the future and how many presidents might be allowed to exercise these powers. In other words, are we in a virtually permanent state of emergency by which similar unilateral actions by the executive branch may be justified? That, in my mind, is where the constitutional question really comes into play. Have we already tacitly (expressly?) agreed to suspension of constitutional rights and protections by unilateral decision of the President on an ongoing, indefinite basis?

Lance M. Pollack, PhD  
University of California, San Francisco (UCSF)  
Center for AIDS Prevention Studies (CAPS)  
Health Survey Research Unit (HSRU)  
50 Beale Street, Suite 1300  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
tel: 415-597-9302  
fax: 415-597-9213  
email: Lance.Pollack@ucsf.edu

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Marc Sapir  
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2006 12:57 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Zogby poll: Majority supports impeaching Bush for wiretapping

Larry,  

You say that you have no axe to grind, but I would say you've missed half the truth of what is going on here. I'm ok with the doubling verbiage asking whether for or against Congress taking action (in your re-write). But the question is still biased in blurring the facts. Why not put the facts up front instead of some bogus "if". "President Bush
apparently violated the (insert the actual name of the law. Is it ARISA?) law by wiretapping many citizens without seeking approval of a secret intelligence court established to protect both national security and individual rights. Should Congress bring up impeachment charges against him or should Congress not bring impeachment charges based upon his admission and defense of this practice?" This whole deal about Executive "unitary powers" is what the Alito appointment is focused on and it's far from trivial as to whether or not the American public is willing to give away the separation of powers doctrine. Gore's surprisingly strong speech yesterday details clearly everything that is at stake here (going back to Washington and Jefferson and so on). Moreover, people who think there isn't strong support for impeachment right now (regardless of the wording) probably don't have their ear to the rail. You may reduce the % by 5 or 10% but you won't cut that 52% in half as you claim with any unbiased question you come up with. I'll wager a few thousand on that.

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

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Larry Luskin
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2006 12:13 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Zogby poll: Majority supports impeaching Bush for wiretapping

I'll chime in. For those of you who did not read the full release... the "impeachment" question was worded as follows:

"If President Bush wiretapped American citizens without the approval of a judge, do you agree or disagree that Congress should consider holding him accountable through impeachment."

Further proof that, if you have an inherently and intentionally leading question, it doesn't matter if you balance it with "agree or disagree". My only hope is that I don't see this poll quoted by the national media without the necessary caveats. I would love to have Zogby now ask the same question as: [I'm just keeping it simple... the beginning is somewhat inflammatory as well]

"If President Bush wiretapped American citizens without the approval of a judge, do you believe that Congress should pursue impeachment hearings or should they not pursue impeachment hearings?"
I'm betting the impeachment percentage would get sliced in half.

I'm not prompting a political discussion here... I have little allegiance either way, I just hate that an intentionally flawed study floats out there as if it were legitimate.

Larry Luskin
ORC Macro

At 02:34 PM 1/17/2006, Philip Harding wrote:
>
> _http://www.afterdowningstreet.org/?q=taxonomy/term/15_
> (http://www.afterdowningstreet.org/?q=taxonomy/term/15)
> 
> Truly a model of unbiased sample construction.
> 
> Phil
>
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They all pretty much do the same things these days. Years ago there were marked differences between SAS, SPSS and Minitab particularly in the language but with the drop down menus they all use that's just not the case any more.

Jack...

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of William Divale
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2006 8:21 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: FW: Request for textbook suggestion

Andy

=20
Wow. Those charges for SPSS seem outrageous. Is SAS as good as SPSS?
I=20
think i will look into it.

=20
Bill

William Divale, Ph.D.
Professor of Anthropology
Survey Research Laboratory, Director
York College, CUNY
Jamaica, NY 11451
www.york.cuny.edu

Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.org/
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Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu
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We are getting ready to do a survey of parents of students in grades K, 1, 3, 6, 7. We need to get consent forms signed by parents so that we can link the survey responses with some student data.

I had intended to send the consent forms to parents by mail, with an enclosed BRE. It was suggested that it might be more cost effective to send the consent forms home with the children and allow consent forms could be returned either by the child or in an enclosed BRE.

Does anyone have experience with this? Which is better? And does it vary by grade?

Finally if in either case, is a preapproach letter useful here, or can the materials that would go in that just be included in the initial packet sent to parents (with a letter from the superintendent and school principals). The consent letter is kind of a preapproach for the survey that will follow.

Thanks.

Ron Rapoport
College of William and Mary

Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.org/
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNENET.
The notion of impeaching the president is itself laden with many emotional, political, "partisan" meanings. This naming of this particular president is itself infused with values and pre-determined meanings. Perhaps this is best addressed by breaking the question into two parts, one on impeachment of ANY president, a separate question on the impeachment of Bush. For example:

There are many possible reasons for impeaching a President of the United States. For each of the following, please tell me if you agree or disagree that it is a legitimate reason to impeach a president. (Randomize)

a. Illegal activities such as drug use.
b. Refusal to comply with the directives of congress
c. Misrepresenting intelligence in order to achieve consensus on declaring war
d. Misrepresenting intelligence in order to manipulate political support
e. Wiretapping American citizens without a warrant
f. Lying under oath about a non-criminal act, such as a consensual sexual relationship
g. Others??

Before and after asking this series, ask:

In your opinion, should the Congress impeach President George W Bush?
Yes/No

It would be interesting to see if there is a change in support for impeachment given the listing of possible reasons, and it would also provide a prioritization of the public's perception of the import of the various reasons for impeachment.

Amy Flowers

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Marc Sapir
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2006 10:38 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Zogby poll: Majority supports impeaching Bush for wiretapping

I think Phil Troustine's is an interesting approach. To his answer choices I would add only a single word to #2. The word "unrestricted" could be inserted i.e. authorize unrestricted wiretaps. Any President already has authority to wiretap us with approval of the FIZA court. The reason this President's approach to such laws is raising legal eyebrows is because using the FIZA court places little or no restriction on his authority yet he says he can ignore the law if he so deems it advisable.

On the other hand, it's hard to know a fact when you see one these days
when the President signs a law saying the U.S. will not torture or send
torture any captives or arrestees; and then in the next breath claims
the right to do the proscribed activity should he deem it necessary. Are
Phil and others really claiming that President Bush did not violate the
FISA? He quite clearly and publicly admitted that he did, but claimed
he has the legal authority to do so. Whether or not his ignoring the
act warrants being brought on charges, censure, or praise for boldness
may be a matter of opinion. But I don't understand how one can argue
that he didn't factually and willfully ignore the provisions of the act.

Marc

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

Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.org/
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Hi everyone,

I am doing the data analysis on a gender audit for an organization here in
D.C. I'm getting involved a bit late in the game and the primary researcher
has a strong background in qualitative research, but not quantitative. They
have asked me for some advice about sampling their membership for the
survey. They have three subpopulations they are trying to reach, staff,
volunteer leaders, and general members, but they only have contact
information for staff and their volunteer leaders. Compiling a list of
their general membership to draw a random sample from would be very
challenging and it is unlikely they would be able to include everyone. They
are thinking about posting the questionnaire on their members-only website
and asking members to fill it out in a number of their publications,
newsletters, etc. This seems like a sample of convenience to me and I'm
worried that my hands would be tied when I get to the data analysis.

I'm interested in what folks think about the implications of doing the
convenience sample and also alternative suggestions.
You can email me directly, off-list if you want.

Thanks,

Janel

Janel Kasper-Wolfe
Research Associate
Office of Member Information
American Chemical Society
1155 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
202-872-6120
j_kasper-wolfe@acs.org

Is it possible to have teachers distribute and collect consent forms?
Not only would this be more cost-effective but compliance should be higher.
Re: "so that we can link the survey responses with some student data".
Will parents be informed of this?

Nick

Ronald B. Rapoport wrote:

> We are getting ready to do a survey of parents of students in grades K, 1, 3, 6, 7. We need to get consent forms signed by parents so that we can link the survey responses with some student data.
> 
> I had intended to send the consent forms to parents by mail, with an enclosed BRE. It was suggested that it might be more cost effective to send the consent forms home with the children and allow consent forms could be returned either by the child or in an enclosed BRE.
> 
> Does anyone have experience with this? Which is better? And does it vary by grade?
>
> Finally if in either case, is a preapproach letter useful here, or can the materials that would go in that just be included in the initial packet sent to parents (with a letter from the superintendent and school principals). The consent letter is kind of a preapproach for the survey that will follow.
>
> Thanks.
>
> Ron Rapoport
> College of William and Mary
>
> Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.org/
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>
> Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.org/
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

The data obtained will describe those who saw the posting on
the website and chose to respond. They may be suggestive but should not be assumed to reflect the views of the membership.

The interesting question to me, about which I would like to hear from someone more statistically sophisticated, is what descriptive statistics should be used?

I have reported a frequency, rather than a percentage in such cases, thinking that (in spite of my caveats in the text) readers of the results might easily take the leap and infer 30% of the membership from 30% of the respondents. What about a Chi-Square as a purely descriptive statistic--my reading of Chi-Square says it is based on the assumptions of inferential statistics, but I have been told it can be used to describe a sample, and I'd be interested in feedback about this.

Cynthia Nelson
College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
SSRI 148 N. Third Street
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, IL 60115
e-mail cnelson@niu.edu

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

On 1/18/2006 at 11:06 AM Janel Kasper-Wolfe wrote:

> Hi everyone,
> 
> 
> I am doing the data analysis on a gender audit for an organization here in
> D.C. I'm getting involved a bit late in the game and the primary
> researcher
> has a strong background in qualitative research, but not quantitative.
> They
> have asked me for some advice about sampling their membership for the
> survey. They have three subpopulations they are trying to reach, staff,
> volunteer leaders, and general members, but they only have contact
> information for staff and their volunteer leaders. Compiling a list of
> their general membership to draw a random sample from would be very
> challenging and it is unlikely they would be able to include everyone.
> They
> are thinking about posting the questionnaire on their members-only website
> and asking members to fill it out in a number of their publications,
> newsletters, etc. This seems like a sample of convenience to me and I'm
> worried that my hands would be tied when I get to the data analysis.
> 
>
I'm interested in what folks think about the implications of doing the convenience sample and also alternative suggestions.

You can email me directly, off-list if you want.

Thanks,

Janel

Janel Kasper-Wolfe
Research Associate
Office of Member Information
American Chemical Society
1155 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
202-872-6120
j_kasper-wolfe@acs.org
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Date: Wed, 18 Jan 2006 16:38:29 +0000
Reply-To: iain.NOBLE@DFES.GSI.GOV.UK
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Iain Noble <Iain.NOBLE@DFES.GSI.GOV.UK>
Subject: Re: Surveys for parents of school children
Comments: To: rbrapo@WM.EDU, AAPORNET@asu.edu
Ron

Why aren't you asking the students themselves (at least the older ones) for their permission as well?

Iain Noble
Department for Education and Skills
Creating opportunity, releasing potential, achieving excellence

Strategic Analysis: RMI 201 - YCS and Next Steps Study, W606, Moorfoot, Sheffield, S1 204PQ
0114 20259 201180
For information about the Next Steps Study go to
www.dfes.gov.uk/research

>-----Original Message-----
>From: AAPORNET@asu.edu On Behalf Of Ronald B. Rapoport
>Sent: 2006 15:30
>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>Subject: Surveys for parents of school children

We are getting ready to do a survey of parents of students in grades K, 1, 3, 6, 7. We need to get consent forms signed by parents so that we can link the survey responses with some student data.

I had intended to send the consent forms to parents by mail, with an enclosed BRE. It was suggested that it might be more cost effective to send the consent forms home with the children and allow consent forms could be returned either by the child or in an enclosed BRE.

Does anyone have experience with this? Which is better? And does it vary by grade?

Finally if in either case, is a preapproach letter useful here, or can
the materials that would go in that just be included in the initial packet sent to parents (with a letter from the superintendent and school principals). The consent letter is kind of a preapproach for the survey that will follow.

Thanks.

Ron Rapoport
College of William and Mary

----------------------------------------------------
Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.org/
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

PLEASE NOTE: THE ABOVE MESSAGE WAS RECEIVED FROM THE INTERNET.
On entering the GSi, this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intranet (GSi) virus scanning service supplied exclusively by Cable & Wireless in partnership with Message Labs.
In case of problems, please call your organisational IT helpdesk

**********************************************************************
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager. This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept by MIMEsweeper for the presence of computer viruses.
www.mimesweeper.com
**********************************************************************
I'm not clear who you're suggesting the teachers distribute the forms to, but if one wants to receive consent forms back there is no way around sending them directly to the parents. If you send anything home with the children, be sure and kiss it goodbye before you do so because the chances you'll see it again are slim to none (they are slim enough as it is sending directly to parents).

- Diana Lynn

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Nick Panagakis
Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2006 8:08 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Surveys for parents of school children

Is it possible to have teachers distribute and collect consent forms? Not only would this be more cost-effective but compliance should be higher.

Re: "so that we can link the survey responses with some student data". Will parents be informed of this?

Nick

Ronald B. Rapoport wrote:

> We are getting ready to do a survey of parents of students in grades K, 1, 3, 6, 7. We need to get consent forms signed by parents so that we can link the survey responses with some student data.
> I had intended to send the consent forms to parents by mail, with an
> enclosed BRE. It was suggested that it might be more cost effective to
> send the consent forms home with the children and allow consent forms
> could be returned either by the child or in an enclosed BRE.
>
> Does anyone have experience with this? Which is better? And does it
> vary by grade?
>
> Finally if in either case, is a preapproach letter useful here, or can
> the materials that would go in that just be included in the initial
> packet sent to parents (with a letter from the superintendent and school
> principals). The consent letter is kind of a preapproach for the survey
> that will follow.
>
> Thanks.
>
> Ron Rapoport
> College of William and Mary
>
> Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.org/
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>
> Iain Noble
> Department for Education and Skills
Creating opportunity, releasing potential, achieving excellence...

Strategic Analysis: RMI = 201 = 20 (YCS = 20 and Next = 20 Steps = 20 Study), = 20
W606, = 20 Moorfoot, = 20 Sheffield, = 20 S1 = 20 PQ = 20
0114 = 20 259 = 20 1180 = 20
For information about the Next Steps Study go to www.dfes.gov.uk/research

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET = [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of CYNTHIA =
NELSON
Sent: 2018-01-20 01:35
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Looking for advice on a sample of convenience.

The data obtained will describe those who saw the posting on
the website and chose to respond. They may be suggestive
but should not be assumed to reflect the views of the
membership.

The interesting question to me, about which I would like to hear
from some
more statistically sophisticated, is what descriptive statistics
should
be used?
I have reported a frequency, rather than a percentage in such
cases, thinking that (in spite of my caveats in the text) readers of
the results
might easily take the leap and infer 30% of the membership
from 30% of the respondents.
What about a Chi-Square as a purely descriptive statistic--my reading of
Chi-Square says it is based on the assumptions
of inferential statistics, but I have been told it can be used to describe
a sample,
and I'd be interested in feedback about this.

Cynthia Nelson
College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
SSRI 148 N. Third Street
> Northern=20Illinois=20University
> DeKalb,=20IL=20=20=20=20=2060115
> e-mail=20=20cnelson@niu.edu
> >
> >***********=20REPLY=20SEPARATOR=20=20***********
> >
> On=201/18/2006=20at=2011:06=20AM=20Janel=20Kasper-Wolfe=20wrote:
> > >>Hi=20everyone,
> >>
> >>I=20am=20doing=20the=20data=20analysis=20on=20a=20gender=20audit=20for=20an=20organization
> here=20in=20D.C.=20I'm=20getting=20involved=20a=20bit=20late=20in=20the=20game=20and=20the=20primary
> researcher
> has=20a=20strong=20background=20in=20qualitative=20research=20but=20not=20quantitative.
> They
> have=20asked=20me=20for=20some=20advice=20about=20sampling=20the=20members=20in=20the
> survey.=20They=20have=20three=20subpopulations=20they=20are=20trying=20to=20reach,
> staff,
> volunteer=20leaders=20and=20general=20members=20but=20they=20only=20have=20contact
> information=20for=20staff=20and=20their=20volunteer=20leaders.
> Compiling=20a=20list
> of
> their=20general=20membership=20to=20draw=20a=20random=20sample=20from=20would=20be=20very
> challenging=20and=20is=20unlikely=20they=20would=20be=20able=20to=20include=20everyone.
> They
> are=20thinking=20about=20posting=20the=20questionnaire=20on=20the=20members=20only
> website
> and=20asking=20members=20to=20fill=20out=20a=20number=20of=20their=20publications,
> newsletters=20etc.
> This=20seems=20likely=20sample=20convenience=20to=20me=20and
> I'm
> worried=20that=20my=20hands=20would=20be=20tied=20when=20get=20the=20data=20analysis.
> >>
> >>
> >>I'm=20interested=20in=20what=20folks=20think=20about=20the=20implication=20of=20the=20convenience=20sample=20and=20alternative=20suggestions.
> >>
Thanks,

Janel

Janel Kasper-Wolfe
Research Associate
Office of Member Information
American Chemical Society
1155 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
202-872-6120
j_kasper-wolfe@acs.org

----------------------------------------------------
Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.org/
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

PLEASE NOTE: THE ABOVE MESSAGE WAS RECEIVED FROM THE INTERNET.

On entering the GSi, this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intranet (GSi) virus scanning service supplied by Cable & Wireless in partnership with...
Ask any elementary school teacher about the efficiency of sending a form home with kids and they will laugh themselves silly. Send the consent letter to the parents. Twice.

Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.org/
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Ronald B. Rapoport  
College of William and Mary  

----- Original Message -----  
From: "Ronald B. Rapoport" <rbrapo@WM.EDU>  
To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2006 10:29 AM  
Subject: Surveys for parents of school children

We are getting ready to do a survey of parents of students in grades K, 1,  
3, 6, 7. We need to get consent forms signed by parents so that we can  
link the survey responses with some student data.

I had intended to send the consent forms to parents by mail, with an  
enclosed BRE. It was suggested that it might be more cost effective to  
send the consent forms home with the children and allow consent forms  
could be returned either by the child or in an enclosed BRE.

Does anyone have experience with this? Which is better? And does it vary  
by grade?

Finally if in either case, is a preapproach letter useful here, or can the  
materials that would go in that just be included in the initial packet  
sent to parents (with a letter from the superintendent and school  
principals). The consent letter is kind of a preapproach for the survey  
that will follow.

Thanks.

Ron Rapoport  
College of William and Mary  

Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.org/
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Hi Janel -- For the general membership study design, this sounds like the familiar situation of attempting a CENSUS (i.e. invite the entire general membership to participate) -- and then ending up with a self-selected SAMPLE, true?

If so, the projectability issue may have less to do with the former (assuming that the entire general membership gets invited, a census (at least at a conceptual level here) is sound methodology) than the latter (a self-selected sample: familiar issues that we all deal with in mail, internet and (to a lesser extent) telephone surveys).

In short, you're trying to minimize the likelihood of the leadership drawing seriously flawed conclusions about member wants/needs/perceptions, etc. Well, practical constraints exist to doing a random sampling of the membership. So you'll proceed to instead do a census. The resulting error from possibly low response rates will be unknowable (unless you can compare, and then weight characteristics of the general membership with the resulting sample). But we all face these issues routinely and most would agree that the outcomes (self-selected samples) are usually directionally accurate, if not proportionally accurate.

Even with all the serious and emerging obstacles facing telephone-based survey research, we still see that most credible surveys done 1-2 days prior to an election are proportionally accurate when compared with actual vote counts. Not surgical precision -- and precision that seems less than the good old days -- but still quite proportionally close given all the obstacles we face.

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Janel Kasper-Wolfe
Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2006 9:07 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Looking for advice on a sample of convenience . . .

Hi everyone,

I am doing the data analysis on a gender audit for an organization here in D.C. I'm getting involved a bit late in the game and the primary researcher has a strong background in qualitative research, but not quantitative. They have asked me for some advice about sampling their membership for the survey. They have three subpopulations they are trying to reach, staff, volunteer leaders, and general members, but they only have contact information for staff and their volunteer leaders. Compiling a list of their general membership to draw a random sample from would be very challenging and it is unlikely they would be able to include everyone. They are thinking about posting the questionnaire on their members-only website and asking members to fill it out in a number of their publications, newsletters, etc. This seems like a sample of convenience to me and I'm
worried that my hands would be tied when I get to the data analysis.

I'm interested in what folks think about the implications of doing the convenience sample and also alternative suggestions.

You can email me directly, off-list if you want.

Thanks,

Janel

Janel Kasper-Wolfe
Research Associate
Office of Member Information
American Chemical Society
1155 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
202-872-6120
j_kasper-wolfe@acs.org

Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.org/
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.org/
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Wed, 18 Jan 2006 13:23:11 -0500
Reply-To: Alice Robbin <arobbin@INDIANA.EDU>
I started a note that said the same things as Diana wrote, but cancelled the message. Do not depend on children to bring anything home; at least half of them lose the stuff along the way. Send materials for the parents to sign directly to the parents; no intermediary should be charged with distributing a researcher's project.

Good luck.

On Wed, 18 Jan 2006, Lynn, Diana J wrote:

> I'm not clear who you're suggesting the teachers distribute the forms
> to, but if one wants to receive consent forms back there is no way
> around sending them directly to the parents. If you send anything home
> with the children, be sure and kiss it goodbye before you do so because
> the chances you'll see it again are slim to none (they are slim enough
> as it is sending directly to parents).
> 
> - Diana Lynn
> 
> -----Original Message-----
> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Nick Panagakis
> Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2006 8:08 AM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: Re: Surveys for parents of school children
>
> Is it possible to have teachers distribute and collect consent forms?
> Not only would this be more cost-effective but compliance should be
> higher.
>
> Re: "so that we can link the survey responses with some student data".
> Will parents be informed of this?
>
> Nick
>
> Ronald B. Rapoport wrote:
>
> >> We are getting ready to do a survey of parents of students in grades K,
> > 1, 3, 6, 7. We need to get consent forms signed by parents so that we
> > can link the survey responses with some student data.
> >>
> >> I had intended to send the consent forms to parents by mail, with an
> > enclosed BRE. It was suggested that it might be more cost effective to
> > send the consent forms home with the children and allow consent forms
could be returned either by the child or in an enclosed BRE.

>>
>> Does anyone have experience with this? Which is better? And does it vary by grade?
>>
>> Finally if in either case, is a preapproach letter useful here, or can the materials that would go in that just be included in the initial packet sent to parents (with a letter from the superintendent and school principals). The consent letter is kind of a preapproach for the survey that will follow.
>>
>> Thanks.
>>
>> Ron Rapoport
>> College of William and Mary
>> _______________________________________________________
>> Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.org/
>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>>
> Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.org/
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>
> Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.org/
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Alice Robbin, Associate Professor
School of Library & Information Science
Indiana University
021 Main Library
1320 East 10th Street
Bloomington, IN 47405-3907
Office: (812) 855-5389 Fax: (812) 855-6166
Email: arobbin@indiana.edu
Web Page: http://ella.slis.indiana.edu/~arobbin/

Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.org/
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Wed, 18 Jan 2006 11:29:17 -0800
Reply-To: stevej@NSDSSURVEY.ORG
I did exactly this last year for a school district. We sent the consent forms home with the kids - HOWEVER each kid received some sort of treat if they returned the letter - parents could mark yes or no. We got about 95% of these back within 3 days. The school district has done things like this before and takes very little flack, although I can imagine a situation where they would catch hell for it. This district sends stuff home with kids almost every week and most things seem to make the trip to the parents with not much loss.

Steve Johnson, PhD
President, NOrthwest Survey & Data Services

> I started a note that said the same things as Diana wrote, but cancelled the message. Do not depend on children to bring anything home; at least half of them lose the stuff along the way. Send materials for the parents to sign directly to the parents; no intermediary should be charged with distributing a researcher's project.
> Good luck.

On Wed, 18 Jan 2006, Lynn, Diana J wrote:

I'm not clear who you're suggesting the teachers distribute the forms to, but if one wants to receive consent forms back there is no way around sending them directly to the parents. If you send anything home with the children, be sure and kiss it goodbye before you do so because the chances you'll see it again are slim to none (they are slim enough as it is sending directly to parents).

- Diana Lynn

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Nick Panagakis
Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2006 8:08 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Surveys for parents of school children

Is it possible to have teachers distribute and collect consent forms? Not only would this be more cost-effective but compliance should be higher.
Re: "so that we can link the survey responses with some student data".

Will parents be informed of this?

Nick

Ronald B. Rapoport wrote:

We are getting ready to do a survey of parents of students in grades K, 1, 3, 6, 7. We need to get consent forms signed by parents so that we can link the survey responses with some student data.

I had intended to send the consent forms to parents by mail, with an enclosed BRE. It was suggested that it might be more cost effective to send the consent forms home with the children and allow consent forms could be returned either by the child or in an enclosed BRE.

Does anyone have experience with this? Which is better? And does it vary by grade?

Finally if in either case, is a preapproach letter useful here, or can the materials that would go in that just be included in the initial packet sent to parents (with a letter from the superintendent and school principals). The consent letter is kind of a preapproach for the survey that will follow.

Thanks.

Ron Rapoport
College of William and Mary

Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.org/
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Alice Robbin, Associate Professor
School of Library & Information Science
Hello,

I am contacting you to tell you about a Project Director position that has opened at the UW Survey Center. Would you please post, distribute and otherwise share this widely with people that you think might be interested.

We are looking to hire someone who is organized, motivated and enthusiastic about conducting social science research. The Center is well established, in its 19th year of operation. The position joins a team of 8 project directors that manage projects here at the Center.

The position is posted at:  http://www.ohr.wisc.edu/pvl/pv_052445.html

Details follow. Thank you very much!

--

John Stevenson
Associate Director
UW Survey Center
1800 University Ave
Madison, WI 53726
608.262.9032 (office)
608.262.8432 (fax)
stevenso@ssc.wisc.edu
www.uwsc.wisc.edu

~
Working title:

PROJECT DIRECTOR

Official title:

ASST RESEARCHER(E05LN)

Degree and area of specialization:

Master's Degree required

Minimum number of years and type of relevant work experience:

One year of experience required; 3 or more years of progressively responsible survey research experience preferred; particular emphasis on managing data collection activities, (especially computer-assisted telephone interviewing), questionnaire design, data management, report writing and client relations. Experience in conduction research in Spanish, written & oral fluency strongly desired

Experience conducting focus groups a plus.

Principal duties:

UWSC is an organization which collects data for social science survey research projects. Interviews are conducted by telephone, mail, web, through focus groups or in person. Most non-mail interviews are conducted on a sophisticated computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) system.

This position, which reports to the Associate Director of the Center, will involve a wide variety of duties associated with data collection activities for all types of survey projects. These duties will include:

30% Consul with clients on survey research and sampling methodologies; serving as the liaison between UWSC and clients; developing survey questionnaires in consultation with clients at the UW and for other universities and state government agencies.

35% Manage and coordinate all aspects of survey projects; innovating methodological solutions; training and supervising staff.

30% Manage data through the use of statistical software packages such as SPSS, SAS and other tools; write descriptive reports of survey findings, writing technical documentation of survey methods and response rate reports for projects.

5% Misc. tasks.
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The Survey Research Laboratory of the University of Illinois has an immediate opening for a Visiting Senior Project Coordinator in its Champaign-Urbana office. For a detailed job description and instructions on how to apply, please visit our web site: http://www.srl.uic.edu/jobs/jobs.htm The University of Illinois is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer.

Conference info and call for papers: 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

Democratic public opinion research and political consulting firm seeks talented and motivated individual for entry-level analytical position assisting foundation and organization project based teams (little to no campaign based work) - excellent second or third job out of college. The qualified candidate must be: hardworking, detail oriented, organized, personable and an excellent multi-tasker. Preference given to candidates with experience in qualitative and quantitative research, statistical analysis, writing advice from data, project management, and the political process. The position's duties are wide ranging and include assisting senior analytical staff with: project management, creating research designs, questionnaire development, data verification and analysis, report/presentation and proposal writing, and client management. Email to tundem@lakeresearch.com =
The Survey Research Laboratory of the University of Illinois has an immediate opening for a Visiting Senior Project Coordinator in its Champaign-Urbana office. For a detailed job description and instructions on how to apply, please visit our web site: http://www.srl.uic.edu/jobs.htm

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

Dear AAPOR members,

If in the throes of submitting your conference abstract last month, you forgot to volunteer to be a chair or discussant, please forward me your name, affiliation, areas of expertise, and whether you'd like to be a chair and/or discussant. We're still looking for individuals to serve in both capacities, and would greatly appreciate your help.

Many thanks for your time,

Patricia Moy
Patricia Moy, Ph.D.
Christy Cressey Associate Professor

Department of Communication
Adjunct Faculty, Political Science
University of Washington, Box 353740
Seattle, WA 98195-3740  U.S.A.

(v) 1 206 543 9676
(f) 1 206 543 9285
(e) pmoy@u.washington.edu
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Date:         Thu, 19 Jan 2006 12:53:30 -0800
Reply-To:     "Dillman, Don A" <dillman@WSU.EDU>
Sender:       AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From:         "Dillman, Don A" <dillman@WSU.EDU>
Subject:      Re: AAPOR Conference: Call for chairs and discussants
Comments:     To: "P. Moy" <pmoy@U.WASHINGTON.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I'm happy to discuss--web or mixed-mode, or visual desing of there are =
any such papers.  Don

*******************************************************************************
* Don A. Dillman, Regents Professor and *
* The Thomas S. Foley Distinguished Professor of Government and Public Policy *
* in the Departments of Sociology and Community and Rural Sociology and=20*
* Deputy Director=A0of the Social and Economic Sciences Research Center *
* Washington State University *
* Pullman, WA 99164-4014 *
* dillman@wsu.edu *
* http://www.sesrc.wsu.edu/dillman/ *
* (Tel) 509-335-1511 (Fax) 509-335-0116 *
*******************************************************************************

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of P. Moy
Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2006 12:42 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: AAPOR Conference: Call for chairs and discussants

Dear AAPOR members,

If in the throes of submitting your conference abstract last month, you forgot to volunteer to be a chair or discussant, please forward me your name, affiliation, areas of expertise, and whether you'd like to be a chair and/or discussant. We're still looking for individuals to serve in both capacities, and would greatly appreciate your help.

Many thanks for your time,

Patricia Moy

-----------------------------------------------------

Patricia Moy, Ph.D.
Christy Cressey Associate Professor
Department of Communication
Adjunct Faculty, Political Science
University of Washington, Box 353740
Seattle, WA 98195-3740 U.S.A.

(v) 1 206 543 9676
(f) 1 206 543 9285
(e) pmoy@u.washington.edu
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Date:         Thu, 19 Jan 2006 13:09:42 -0800
Reply-To:     "Pinkus, Susan" <Susan.Pinkus@LATIMES.COM>
Sender:       AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From:         "Pinkus, Susan" <Susan.Pinkus@LATIMES.COM>
Subject:      Re: AAPOR Conference: Call for chairs and discussants
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Hi Patricia: Count me in on being a Chair person on any panel that is political.

Susan Pinkus
-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNEDT [mailto:AAPORNEDT@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Dillman, Don A
Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2006 12:54 PM
To: AAPORNEDT@asu.edu
Subject: Re: AAPOR Conference: Call for chairs and discussants

I'm happy to discuss--web or mixed-mode, or visual desing of there are any such papers. Don

******************************************************************************
**
Don A. Dillman, Regents Professor and
The Thomas S. Foley Distinguished Professor of Government and Public Policy
in the Departments of Sociology and Community and Rural Sociology and Deputy Director of the Social and Economic Sciences Research Center
Washington State University
Pullman, WA 99164-4014
dillman@wsu.edu
http://www.sesrc.wsu.edu/dillman/
(Tel) 509-335-1511 (Fax) 509-335-0116
******************************************************************************

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNEDT [mailto:AAPORNEDT@asu.edu] On Behalf Of P. Moy
Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2006 12:42 PM
To: AAPORNEDT@asu.edu
Subject: AAPOR Conference: Call for chairs and discussants

Dear AAPOR members,

If in the throes of submitting your conference abstract last month, you forgot to volunteer to be a chair or discussant, please forward me your name, affiliation, areas of expertise, and whether you'd like to be a chair and/or discussant. We're still looking for individuals to serve in both capacities, and would greatly appreciate your help.

Many thanks for your time,

Patricia Moy

-----------------------------------------------------

Patricia Moy, Ph.D.
Christy Cressey Associate Professor
I'm looking for a set of questions to measure overall acceptance of alternative or minority religions. Does anyone know of such a scale? Any references or other leads would be appreciated.

Craig C. New, Ph.D.
Tsongas Litigation Consulting
When I tried to reply to Patricia's Moy's email, I got a bounce back saying she's on sabbatical. Where does she want us to reply?
(fran)

Fran Featherston
National Science Foundation
4201 Wilson Blvd.
Arlington, VA 22230
703-292-4221
ffeather@nsf.gov

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNENET [mailto:AAPORNENET@asu.edu]On Behalf Of P. Moy
Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2006 3:42 PM
To: AAPORNENET@asu.edu
Subject: AAPOR Conference: Call for chairs and discussants

Dear AAPOR members,

If in the throes of submitting your conference abstract last month, you forgot to volunteer to be a chair or discussant, please forward me your name, affiliation, areas of expertise, and whether you'd like to be a chair and/or discussant. We're still looking for individuals to serve in both capacities, and would greatly appreciate your help.

Many thanks for your time,

Patricia Moy

-----------------------------------------------------
Patricia Moy, Ph.D.
Christy Cressey Associate Professor
Department of Communication
Adjunct Faculty, Political Science
University of Washington, Box 353740
Seattle, WA 98195-3740  U.S.A.

(v) 1 206 543 9676
(f) 1 206 543 9285
(e) pmoy@u.washington.edu

-----------------------------------------------------
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Date: Thu, 19 Jan 2006 16:02:10 -0600
Reply-To: "Moore, David" <David_Moore@GALLUP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Moore, David" <David_Moore@GALLUP.COM>
Subject: Re: Patricia's email for Call for chairs and discussants?
Comments: To: "Featherston, Fran A." <ffeather@NSF.GOV>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

You can reply to her or to me...
Thanks!
David=20

David W. Moore
2006 AAPOR Program Chair

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Featherston, Fran A.
Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2006 4:50 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Patricia's email for Call for chairs and discussants?

When I tried to reply to Patricia's Moy's email, I got a bounce back
saying she's on sabbatical. Where does she want us to reply?
(fran)

Fran Featherston
National Science Foundation
4201 Wilson Blvd.
Arlington, VA 22230
703-292-4221
ffeather@nsf.gov

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu]On Behalf Of P. Moy
Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2006 3:42 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: AAPOR Conference: Call for chairs and discussants

Dear AAPOR members,

If in the throes of submitting your conference abstract last month, you
forgot to volunteer to be a chair or discussant, please forward me your
name, affiliation, areas of expertise, and whether you'd like to be a
chair and/or discussant. We're still looking for individuals to serve in
both capacities, and would greatly appreciate your help.

David W. Moore
2006 AAPOR Program Chair
Many thanks for your time,

Patricia Moy

-----------------------------------------------------

Patricia Moy, Ph.D.
Christy Cressey Associate Professor

Department of Communication
Adjunct Faculty, Political Science
University of Washington, Box 353740
Seattle, WA 98195-3740 U.S.A.

(v) 1 206 543 9676
(f) 1 206 543 9285
(e) pmoy@u.washington.edu

-----------------------------------------------------
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Date:      Thu, 19 Jan 2006 14:06:40 -0800
Reply-To:  "P. Moy" <pmoy@U.WASHINGTON.EDU>
Sender:    AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From:      "P. Moy" <pmoy@U.WASHINGTON.EDU>
Subject:   Re: Patricia's email for Call for chairs and discussants?
Comments:  cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <06C64DE644F85843A90884803225A8070EF5B256@exchng12.noam.gallup.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII; format=flowed

Anyone who writes me in the next six months will receive my automated reply. Being on sabbatical means that I'm relieved only of teaching and other university responsibilities. Life, including AAPOR, goes on.

Patricia Moy

----------------------------------------------------------------------
It seems that Patricia is getting her email and replying even though there is a bounce back message.

(fran)

Fran Featherston
National Science Foundation
4201 Wilson Blvd.
Arlington, VA 22230
703-292-4221
ffeather@nsf.gov

-----Original Message-----
From: Moore, David [mailto:David_Moore@gallup.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2006 5:02 PM
To: Featherston, Fran A.; AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: RE: Patricia's email for Call for chairs and discussants?

You can reply to her or to me...
Thanks!
David

David W. Moore
2006 AAPOR Program Chair

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Featherston, Fran A.
Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2006 4:50 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Patricia's email for Call for chairs and discussants?

When I tried to reply to Patricia's Moy's email, I got a bounce back saying she's on sabbatical. Where does she want us to reply?

(fran)

Fran Featherston
National Science Foundation
4201 Wilson Blvd.
Arlington, VA 22230
703-292-4221
ffeather@nsf.gov

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu]On Behalf Of P. Moy
Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2006 3:42 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: AAPOR Conference: Call for chairs and discussants

Dear AAPOR members,

If in the throes of submitting your conference abstract last month, you forgot to volunteer to be a chair or discussant, please forward me your name, affiliation, areas of expertise, and whether you'd like to be a chair and/or discussant. We're still looking for individuals to serve in both capacities, and would greatly appreciate your help.

Many thanks for your time,

Patricia Moy

Patricia Moy, Ph.D.
Christy Cressey Associate Professor

Department of Communication
Adjunct Faculty, Political Science
University of Washington, Box 353740
Seattle, WA 98195-3740  U.S.A.

(v) 1 206 543 9676
(f) 1 206 543 9285
(e) pmoy@u.washington.edu

Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.org/
Econometrician/Statistician

We need someone to do some econometric modeling for us.

This person should be very familiar with SAS and possibly STATA as well as PROBIT modeling.

The person should be available for conversations/discussions during the day and we would prefer someone in the Baltimore/DC area though we could certainly do most of this long-distance.

Right now this is just for one short-term project but it has the potential to become a continuing relationship with multiple future assignments each year.

If you have someone you would like to recommend (or if you are interested in this position) please have them email their vita or resume and a cover letter to me.

Please have them use Econometrician in the email subject and no phone calls, please.

Thanks
---
Leo G. Simonetta
Research Director
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road, Suite 101
Baltimore MD 21209
Hard to tell from the data provided whether this is actually a push poll.

Group tries to sway Winter Park mayoral race
Misleading, anonymous mailers attack candidate
Christopher Sherman
Sentinel Staff Writer
(TINYURL appears to be down)

January 20, 2006

A shadowy group is trying to influence Winter Park's upcoming mayoral election with misleading mailers.

There are no names involved, just a post office box, a Web site registered to a strange house and an out-of-service phone, but Winter Park Taxpayers for Truth may not be able to keep its identity secret much longer.

SNIP

Last week, several Winter Park residents reported receiving calls from an out-of-state pollster that tried to smear Strong.

The poll asked potential voters their opinion of several possible candidates, including Mayor Kenneth "Kip" Marchman and Strong. It then followed up with disparaging questions about Strong. Only Marchman and Strong qualified as candidates for the March 14 election.

Those familiar with campaigns said the technique is known as a push poll, or an attempt to sway voters with damaging information disguised as a poll. Typically push polls come out shortly before an election, making the timing odd on this one.

The pollsters did not identify the sponsor. The Parker Group of
Birmingham, Ala., which conducted the poll, did not return a reporter's call.

Christopher Sherman can be reached at csherman@orlandosentinel.com or 407-650-6361.

Copyright (c) 2006, Orlando Sentinel | Get home delivery - up to 50% off

---
Leo G. Simonetta
Research Director
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road, Suite 101
Baltimore MD  21209
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Date:         Fri, 20 Jan 2006 13:26:44 -0600
Reply-To:     Timothy Johnson <tjohnson@SRL.UIC.EDU>
Sender:       AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From:         Timothy Johnson <tjohnson@SRL.UIC.EDU>
Subject:      Senior Research Specialist Position
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu, lindao@srl.uic.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable
Content-disposition: inline

The Survey Research Laboratory (SRL) of the University of Illinois has an immediate opening in its Chicago office for a full-time Senior Research Specialist for conducting research and advanced statistical analyses of health and social data gathered and processed by SRL and other survey centers. Some travel to SRL's Urbana office and to professional meetings is required.

Responsibilities require knowledge of appropriate statistical methods for complex survey data and advanced knowledge of health behaviors and related social processes.

Minimum Requirements: Ph.D. in Sociology with a specialization in health-related behaviors and at least 2 years experience working in a survey environment.

For full consideration, send your resume and a detailed cover letter outlining your qualifications by February 19, 2006 to:

Marguerite Harris, Associate Director Survey Research Laboratory
University of Illinois at Chicago
412 S. Peoria, 6th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60607

Please NO phone calls or faxes. The University of Illinois is an Affirmative Action/Equal opportunity Employer.
We are looking for a recommendation for a phone room in Finland to conduct a national survey. If anyone has worked with a company there that they were happy with please let me know.

Thanks.

Joe Lenski
Executive Vice President
Edison Media Research
6 West Cliff Street
Somerville, NJ 08876
908-707-4707
jlenski@edisonresearch.com
analyses of the polls.

Tomorrow, we will know whether the polls were true...

Best,

Claire Durand

Link for polls - Canadian election campaign 2005-2006:

https://www.webdepot.umontreal.ca/Usagers/durandc/MonDepotPublic

professeur titulaire et directrice des Études supérieures

http://www.mapageweb.umontreal.ca/durandc

DÉpartement de sociologie,

Université de Montréal

C.P. 6128, succ. Centre-ville,

Montréal H3C 3J7

----------------------------------------------------
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Date:         Mon, 23 Jan 2006 13:46:44 -0500
Reply-To:     Michel Rochon <mrochon@SURVEYSAMPLER.COM>
Sender:       AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From:         Michel Rochon <mrochon@SURVEYSAMPLER.COM>
Subject:      Re: Canadian electoral polls
Comments: To: Claire Durand <Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

This is a first class compilation and summary of all polls conducted in the ongoing Canadian election. As Mrs Durand states we will know tonight whether the pollsters were right. This is really the acid test and it's good to have the summaries in advance so that no one can rewrite history to look better. (It has been known to happen!!!).

Thanks to Claire Durand on this. There are some labels in French in the tables but generally understandable even if your only language is English.

Michel Rochon

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Claire Durand
Sent: January 23, 2006 11:39 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Canadian electoral polls
Hi,

For those interested in how the polls fare, if you follow the first link below, you will get information and graphs for all the polls published during the Canadian election campaign and this, for Canada as a whole as well as for Ontario and Quebec, the two most important provinces. There are graphs and information for the polls themselves and for time-series analyses of the polls.

Tomorrow, we will know whether the polls were true...

Best,

Claire Durand

Link for polls - Canadian election campaign 2005-2006:

https://www.webdepot.umontreal.ca/Usagers/durandc/MonDepotPublic

professeur titulaire et directrice des Études supérieures
http://www.mapageweb.umontreal.ca/durandc
Département de sociologie,
Université de Montréal
C.P. 6128, succ. Centre-ville,
Montréal, H3C 3J7
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I thought AAPORnet members would be interested in Dr. Jeffrey Jones' analysis of 2005 Party ID trends. It highlights shifts and state by state analysis based on over 40,000 Gallup Poll interviews conducted in 2005.

Frank Newport
Gallup Poll
Princeton

http://poll.gallup.com/content/?ci=3D21004
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Date:         Mon, 23 Jan 2006 17:08:40 -0500
Reply-To:     david_ginsburg@choicehotels.com
Sender:       AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From:         David Ginsburg <david_ginsburg@CHOICEHOTELS.COM>
Subject:      Job Posting: Customer Experience Research Analyst, Choice Hotels International
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

Following is information for a new Analyst position in our Research department. To view the online posting or apply, please visit:
http://erecruit.choicehotels.com/index.html The position is within the Marketing department, based out of Silver Spring, MD.

Summary Statement: Analyze, interpret and report results of ongoing Guest Insight System (GIS) survey. Act as primary data resource for this project for brand strategy, franchise services, marketing management, franchise sales, customer relations and IT staff. Provide additional analytical and reporting support to manager for other ongoing satisfaction research programs, including telephone reservations satisfaction and franchisee satisfaction.

Reports to: Manager, Customer Experience Research – Consumer Marketing
Primary Duties and Accountabilities

a.. Analyze, interpret and report results of ongoing GIS survey at the corporate, brand, regional and property level. Act as primary data resource in response to daily requests for GIS data for the brand strategy, franchise services, marketing management, franchise sales, customer relations and IT staff. Provide data to key internal customers to assist in identifying top performing hotels for award consideration, identifying underperforming properties, as well as key focus areas for improvement system-wide. Serve as liaison with research vendor regarding data management, and assist in development of enhanced online reporting for both licensee and corporate use. Assist with preparation and delivery of internal and external GIS-related communications and presentations.

a.. Provide analytical and reporting support to manager for other research programs including reservations satisfaction and franchisee satisfaction.

a.. Oversee day-to-day operations of the Guest Insight System survey. This includes the monitoring and tracking of daily survey outgo and monthly response rate, serving as key contact for Auxiliary Functions, Customer Relations and Property Support for questions or issues regarding survey operations, technical issues and guest concerns.

a.. Assist with syndicated and primary research efforts including implementation, table proofing, analysis and report writing associated with qualitative and quantitative studies.

a.. Serve as key member of GIS Survey Team and various other task forces and committees related to the GIS and guest satisfaction. Work closely with survey vendor to oversee beta testing of new reporting systems, including licensee and Choice associate input.

Skills, Educational Background and Experience

a.. Two to four years of experience in data analysis, with experience in marketing research analysis preferred. Experience in customer satisfaction research a plus.

a.. Experience with survey research tabulation software including Wincross or similar survey tabulation software required. SPSS or similar software experience a plus.

a.. Knowledge of basic statistics and strong analytical skills required.
a. Ability to interpret survey data and summarize in written report.

a. Experience working with outside survey research vendors preferred.

a. Ability to comfortably interact at all levels within the organization and demonstrated ability to work in a team environment.

a. Experience in the hotel industry a plus.

a. Strong communication and organizational skills with attention to detail needed.


a. BS or BA required, with a major in marketing, research, statistics or social sciences preferred.

David Ginsburg
Director, Consumer Information Systems
Choice Hotels International
(301) 592-5000
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Some colleagues at the U of MN wanted me to post this notice. It may represent an opportunity/venue to publish something you've done in area of state-relevant health survey research methods. Small area estimation at the state and county level comes to mind.

Health Services Research (HSR) Call for Papers:

SPECIAL ISSUE on 20
State-Level Health Service Delivery, Access, and Practice:
Improving Research and Policy:

(Abstracts due Feb. 15, 2006)

The Journal of Health Services Research invites papers and abstracts for consideration in a special issue on health services research to improve state health service delivery, access and practice with two goals: to inform state health policy and to advance the field of health services research. SHADAC is working with HSR on this special issue and I will serve as guest editor. This is a great opportunity to highlight the great research and policy applications at the state level.

The Journal is interested in the following types of submissions:

Research Papers presenting the results of original health services research at the state level addressing issues of health service delivery, health care costs, coverage, health disparities, and access to care.

Policy Analyses presenting results of evaluations of demonstration projects, new initiatives, or innovations in service delivery, quality, access and coverage.

Comparative Analyses with multi-state data collected at the state-level or state-level estimates from national data sources.

Research Methods Papers focusing on methods and challenges in data collection, analysis, and the ability to obtain reliable state and national data to inform state policy.

Brief Reports or Commentary Papers on current issues related to the collection and use of state-level data in health services research.

Visit the notice at:
http://www.hret.org/hret/publications/call.html

Key Dates:

Abstracts and/or Manuscripts Due = September 15, 2006
Notification of an invitation to submit full manuscript = March 3, 2006
Full Manuscripts Due = July 1, 2006
Notification = Fall 2006
Publication Date = Fall 2007

This special issue is supported by a grant from The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation.

We look forward to your submissions!

Regards,
Lynn A. Blewett  
Principal Investigator  
State Health Access Data Assistance Center (SHADAC)  

SHADAC is a research and policy center at the University of Minnesota that provides technical assistance to state analysts and policy makers across the country in the areas of survey design, data collection and policy development, as well as research on factors contributing to health care coverage and access in the United States. SHADAC is funded by The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. For more information see http://www.shadac.org
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Date: Tue, 24 Jan 2006 06:29:20 -0500  
Reply-To: Ken Sherrill <ken@KENSHERRILL.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Ken Sherrill <ken@KENSHERRILL.COM>  
Subject: FW: [*M*] UK: Sexual orientation questions to feature in mainstream surveys

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

Meanwhile, in the US, ...

-----Original Message-----  
From: marriage-bounces@lists.qrd.org [mailto:marriage-bounces@lists.qrd.org]  
On Behalf Of John Wilkinson  
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2006 9:33 PM  
To: marriage@lists.qrd.org  
Subject: [*M*] UK: Sexual orientation questions to feature in mainstream surveys

Financial Times, UK, January 24, 2006  
Sexual orientation questions to feature in mainstream surveys By Simon Briscoe, Statistics Editor

Questions about sexual orientation are to be asked for the first time in mainstream government surveys this year in response to recent legislation, plugging a gap highlighted by campaigners for years.

Surveys relating to contraceptives and sexual diseases already include questions about sexual practices, and other surveys ask about cohabitation, but the appearance of questions about sexual identity and orientation in mainstream surveys will be more controversial.

Employment equality regulations protecting gay men and women from discrimination and harassment, introduced in 2003, and civil partnerships...
legislation, which led to the first "gay marriages" last month, have created a demand for statistics on the gay and lesbian population.

The Department of Trade and Industry, which is responsible for the legislation, has added sexual orientation questions to surveys on fair treatment at work, to measure perceptions of unfair discrimination, and to its survey on the awareness of employment rights.

The Department of Health has added a question on sexual identity to its survey of mental health in-patients, and is testing questions in other surveys.

Campaigners also expect a question to be added to the British crime survey to identify those crimes where gay men and women are more likely to be victims. Government statisticians also admit to pressure from the European Union to add a sexual orientation question to the labour force survey.

There are concerns over whether the data will be accurate and useful.

Supporters of the development say that most people have no trouble being asked whether they are gay, lesbian or bisexual, and that such questions will quickly be accepted in the same way as other once-controversial questions on ethnicity and religion. A test carried out in advance of the next population census is reported to have indicated that response rates were unaffected by the addition of a question on sexual orientation.

Getting the phraseology of the questions right is vital due to the sensitivity of the issue and the need to reflect the wide range of personal circumstances. Roger Jowell, professor at City University, argued that sexual orientation was a "hazardous area" and that outright questions were likely to fail.

One survey from the National Centre for Social Research found that one-third of homosexuals kept their sexuality secret from their employers and colleagues. The DTI says that 5 per cent to 7 per cent of the working age population is gay, lesbian or bisexual. The most recent census found fewer than 100,000 people cohabit as same-sex couples.

marriage mailing list
To post to the list, send to:  
marriage@lists.qrd.org
To subscribe/unsubscribe/change options:
  http://lists.qrd.org/mailman/listinfo/marriage
admin/moderator contact:
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Date:       Tue, 24 Jan 2006 07:22:16 -0500
It looks as though the Canadian election polls were pretty good. All
had the PC ahead by margins of 6, 9 and 10 points.

Total Elected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>36.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>30.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BQ</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.05%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Updated: January 24, 3:14:13 AM EST
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Below are several paragraphs from my Gotham Gazette Topic this month, which is on Higher Ed Teachers in NYC.

There are two comprehensive tables. One includes numbers and pay at virtually all colleges in NYC as of 2003. There is a second, that looks at change in number of faculty and pay from 1980 to 2003 for most colleges. Including all CUNY branches reporting, etc.

Some of the figures are quite shocking.

Here is the link.

http://www.gothamgazette.com/article/demographics/20060124/5/1732

Teachers In NYC's Institutions Of Higher Learning

by Andrew Beveridge
January, 2006

Although few people would see New York City as a college town, the truth is that the city has the most institutions of higher learning in the entire nation, as well as the most students -- and the most teachers as well. At least 25,000 academics teach about 425,000 students in the city's 57 colleges and universities.

These teachers do much for the city, not just educating the next generation of New Yorkers, but also enhancing the city's cultural reputation and strengthening its economy.

But what does the city do for them? As a whole, teachers of higher learning in New York earn less than the city's elementary school teachers. This helps explain some of the current turmoil in academia, with a strike by graduate students having resumed at New York University, and stalled contract negotiations between the administration of the City University of New York and the Professional Staff Congress, the 20,000-member union that represents the faculty and staff of the university.

It Doesn't Pay To Be An Academic

Table 1 (click here) lists most of the institutions of higher learning in New York City, with the numbers of students enrolled, the number of faculty, and their average salary. This varies widely. As a full professor at New York University, you could make $135,000; as an assistant professor at Boricua College, you could make under $35,000. But the truth is, more teachers make toward the lower end than toward the higher. The median income for full-time professors with at least a Master's degree is $57,000 - which is $3,000 less than the median income for all New Yorkers with Master's degrees.
And this is only the full-time faculty; there are no more than 16,000 people who teach full-time in New York at the university level. Another 11,000 who call academia their primary occupation nevertheless teach only part-time; their median income is only $22,000.

Put these two together and the median earnings in the year 2000 of New Yorkers whose primary occupation was academia (and who had at least a Master's degree) was $45,000 - or a thousand dollars less than the median income for elementary and secondary school teachers in the city.

<http://www.gothamgazette.com/graphics/demo01-06/table3.jpg>

And then there are the many academics who are forced to accept "adjunct positions," which often pay roughly $3,000 per course, or "visiting" (non-permanent) appointments, which also usually are not well paid. (Many of these teachers hold non-academic jobs as well.) In addition, many graduate students do some teaching while pursuing their degrees.

Other sections at how the pay has changed public versus private, and characteristics.
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Pretty good indeed although the time series analysis shows a very slight=20 underestimation of the Liberal Party. In Ontario however, the time-series=20 show the Liberals and Conservatives equal at 37. The Liberals finished=20 ahead by 5 points (40 to 35). Finally, in Quebec, the Quebec pollsters and=20 Ses research were very good. The other Canadian pollsters seriously=20 overestimated the vote for the Bloc quebecois and underestimated the vote=20 for the Liberals, as anticipated, most probably because they do not take=20 language into account in their adjustment of data in Quebec and language is=20
highly related to vote.

Best,

Le 07:22 2006-01-24, Warren Mitofsky=E9crit:
It looks as though the Canadian election polls were pretty good. All had=20
the PC ahead by margins of 6, 9 and 10 points.

Total Elected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Seats</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>36.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>30.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BQ</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.05%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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January 24, 3:14:13 AM EST
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Claire Durand

Lien pour sondages de la pr=E9sente campagne =E9lectorale:

https://www.webdepot.umontreal.ca/Usagers/durandc/MonDepotPublic

professeur titulaire et directrice des =E9tudes sup=E9rieures
http://www.mapageweb.umontreal.ca/durandc
D=E9partement de sociologie,
Universit=E9 de Montr=E9al
C.P. 6128, succ. Centre-ville,
Montr=E9al, H3C 3J7 =20
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Date: Tue, 24 Jan 2006 10:59:57 -0500
Reply-To: John Mitchell <john@BUZZBACK.COM>
If anyone is interested in the implications of this, since it's a question I was working on yesterday I've got a reference at hand from the US.

The 2002 National Survey of Family Growth (NSFG) conducted by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) asked about sexual orientation. As reported in Advanced Data from Vital and Health Statistics Number 362; September 15, 2005, "Sexual Behavior and Selected Health Measures: Men and Women 15-44 Years of Age, United States, 2002" authors William D. Mosher, Ph.D.; Anjani Chandra, Ph.D.; and Jo Jones, Ph.D., Division of Vital Statistics] the reporting of sexual identity seems (perhaps not surprisingly) to be a little complex and possibly confusing, given the results...

"The question was asked as follows:
"Do you think of yourself as
   Heterosexual
   Homosexual
   Bisexual
   Or something else?"

"The wording of these items was based on wording used in previous studies (13-18), along with consultations with the directors of many of those studies and other experts (36). In the rest of this report, when the text says that respondents were "asked" something in ACASI, it means that they saw the question on the computer screen, or heard the question through headphones, or both."

As the authors noted, 'something else' tops 'homosexual' or 'bisexual' in the results:
"90 percent of men 18-44 years of age responded that they think of themselves as heterosexual. About 2.3 percent of men answered homosexual, 1.8 percent bisexual, 3.9 percent "something else," and 1.8 percent did not give an answer (figure 8). "Among women 18-44 years of age, 90 percent said they think of themselves as heterosexual, 1.3 percent homosexual, 2.8 percent bisexual, 3.8 percent "something else," and 1.8 percent did not answer the question. The category something else (other than heterosexual, homosexual, or bisexual) deserves further study using the NSFG and other surveys; it may reflect a lack of understanding of these terms by some respondents, a preference for other terms to describe sexual orientation, or both [...]"

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Ken Sherrill
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2006 6:29 AM
To: AAPORNENET@asu.edu
Subject: FW: [*M*] UK: Sexual orientation questions to feature in mainstream surveys

Meanwhile, in the US, ...

-----Original Message-----
From: marriage-bounces@lists.qrd.org
[mailto:marriage-bounces@lists.qrd.org]
On Behalf Of John Wilkinson
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2006 9:33 PM
To: marriage@lists.qrd.org
Subject: [*M*] UK: Sexual orientation questions to feature in mainstream surveys

Financial Times, UK, January 24, 2006
Sexual orientation questions to feature in mainstream surveys By Simon Briscoe, Statistics Editor

Questions about sexual orientation are to be asked for the first time in mainstream government surveys this year in response to recent legislation, plugging a gap highlighted by campaigners for years.

Surveys relating to contraceptives and sexual diseases already include questions about sexual practices, and other surveys ask about cohabitation, but the appearance of questions about sexual identity and orientation in mainstream surveys will be more controversial.

Employment equality regulations protecting gay men and women from discrimination and harassment, introduced in 2003, and civil partnerships legislation, which led to the first "gay marriages" last month, have created a demand for statistics on the gay and lesbian population.

The Department of Trade and Industry, which is responsible for the legislation, has added sexual orientation questions to surveys on fair treatment at work, to measure perceptions of unfair discrimination, and to its survey on the awareness of employment rights.

The Department of Health has added a question on sexual identity to its survey of mental health in-patients, and is testing questions in other surveys.

Campaigners also expect a question to be added to the British crime survey to identify those crimes where gay men and women are more likely to be victims. Government statisticians also admit to pressure from the European
Union to add a sexual orientation question to the labour force survey.

There are concerns over whether the data will be accurate and useful.

Supporters of the development say that most people have no trouble being asked whether they are gay, lesbian or bisexual, and that such questions will quickly be accepted in the same way as other once-controversial questions on ethnicity and religion. A test carried out in advance of the next population census is reported to have indicated that response rates were unaffected by the addition of a question on sexual orientation.

Getting the phraseology of the questions right is vital due to the sensitivity of the issue and the need to reflect the wide range of personal circumstances. Roger Jowell, professor at City University, argued that sexual orientation was a "hazardous area" and that outright questions were likely to fail.

One survey from the National Centre for Social Research found that one-third of homosexuals kept their sexuality secret from their employers and colleagues. The DTI says that 5 per cent to 7 per cent of the working age population is gay, lesbian or bisexual. The most recent census found fewer than 100,000 people cohabit as same-sex couples.
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Date:         Tue, 24 Jan 2006 11:57:45 -0500
Reply-To:     Melissa Marcello <mmarcello@PURSUANTRESEARCH.COM>
Sender:       AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From:         Melissa Marcello <mmarcello@PURSUANTRESEARCH.COM>
Subject:      Job Announcement:  Research Position at Kaiser Permanente
Dear All,

I am posting this job announcement for a colleague. Please forward this e-mail to colleagues whom you think may be interested in the position. Do have them respond directly to Kate Turner, Regional Director, Market Research and Strategic Analysis, Kaiser Permanente: kathryn.j.turner@kp.org.

Position Title: Consultant or Senior Consultant

The Consultant provides guidance and support to Senior Leadership at the Regional and local market level in answering questions about the marketplace. Maintains thorough knowledge of current research on key health care market issues, current internal Kaiser Permanente market research, and relevant research conducted outside the Program. Functions as an expert on available information and plays a key role in communicating findings across Divisions. Designs and executes new, critical, primary research when new questions and problems arise.

Responsibilities include keeping current on health care market research and knowledge across the Program and relevant research outside the Program. Communicate current research activities to colleagues across the Program, share research findings and implications, help train new Program colleagues, and assimilate new findings from those colleagues. Actively participate in setting national market research priorities. Serve as Regional expert on current health care market research/knowledge. Initiate contact with Regional senior management and alert those to critical issues. Communicate, interpret, and present key findings and complications/recommendations to Regional and local market leaders. Help identify key gaps in knowledge =
needed research for Program and Divisions. Obtain research services from National Market Research to leverage services and knowledge whenever possible, or manage local vendors when not possible. Guide Regional clients to strategic, cost-effective research. Evaluate size, scope and costs of research. Initiate and design high priority primary research activities on behalf of the Divisions. Set priorities for all ad-hoc projects and analysis with key clients, manage and coordinate Regional and ad-hoc research projects and participate in Program-wide projects. Assist Divisions and local markets in strategic planning, marketplace and image analysis, growth potential, product research, brand identification, and service performance and improvements. May manage one or more Market Research Analysts.

Requirements for this position include a Master's degree with thorough training in qualitative and quantitative analysis and research methods. Ten years experience in the health care market, and awareness of national health care issues. Experience in both research and business operations preferred. Strong knowledge of survey research methodologies. Strong understanding of significance tests and basic statistics. Proficient in MS Office. The Consultant must have superior interpersonal, presentation, persuasion, and consulting skills. Ability to translate complex findings into understandable, operationally relevant summaries. Ability to interact comfortably with Senior Management on wide ranges of issues. Superior written and verbal communication skills. Ability to manage large projects, oversee multiple projects simultaneously and prioritize and resolve conflicting demands. Proven ability in both independent and collaborative decision-making. Superior ability in reading, understanding, and interpreting graphs and tables.

This position consistently supports compliance and the Principles of Responsibility (Kaiser Permanente's Code of Conduct) by maintaining the privacy and confidentiality of information, protecting the assets of the organization, acting with ethics and integrity, reporting non-compliance, and adhering to applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations.
accreditation and licensure requirements (if applicable), and Kaiser Permanente's policies and procedures. For immediate consideration, please e-mail your resume to kathryn.j.turner@kp.org.

Thanks,

Melissa Marcello

Pursuant, Inc.
2141 P Street NW
Suite 105
Washington, DC  20037
p 202.887.0070
f  800.567.1723
c 202.352.7462

Visit our website at www.pursuantresearch.com
A GSA-certified vendor
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This news story on gallup.com weaves together a variety of data from ongoing Gallup polling in Canada from 2003-2005 that I think offers some useful insights into the conservative victory. (It will only be free to non-subscribers this week, I think)
http://poll.gallup.com/content/default.aspx?ci=3D20986

I would welcome any feedback about the extent to which domestic issues carried the day (crime and taxes versus backlash from the Liberal scandals). Also, I'm wondering how important it was that Harper somewhat reversed his support for the Iraq war and downplayed his social conservatism. Were those essential, threshold moves for making himself palatable to the Canadian electorate, or were they ready to elect him anyway?

Lydia Saad

Lydia K. Saad
Senior Editor, The Gallup Poll
502 Carnegie Center, Suite 300
Princeton, NJ 08540
(609) 924-9600
lydia_saad@gallup.com=20

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Warren Mitofsky
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2006 7:22 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Canadian election

It looks as though the Canadian election polls were pretty good. All had the PC ahead by margins of 6, 9 and 10 points.

Total Elected
[]

[]

[]

[]

CON 124 0 36.25%
LIB 103 0 30.22%
BQ  51 0 10.48%
NDP  29 0 17.49%
IND  1 0 .52%
OTH  0 0 5.05%
Updated:
January 24, 3:14:13 AM EST
Date: Tue, 24 Jan 2006 12:36:12 -0500
Reply-To: Keith Neuman <Keith.Neuman@ENVIRONICS.CA>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Keith Neuman <Keith.Neuman@ENVIRONICS.CA>
Subject: Re: Canadian election
Comments: To: Lydia_Saad@GALLUP.COM, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

This election was not so much about any of these specific issues though =
  some of them were election issues (though international issues were =
  almost invisible). This election was about Canadians desire for change =
  after 12 years of Liberal government, which in the end was heavily =
  tarred by scandal and lacking in a coherent vision or direction. Voters =
  opted for change but in a typically cautious fashion and in no way =
  reflects a shift to the right. The conservatives will have a modest =
  minority mandate and no natural allies among other parties. Canada's =
  lef-wing NDP had its best showing in almost 20 years.

Keith Neuman
Environics Research Group
Ottawa, Canada

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Sent: Tue Jan 24 12:18:46 2006
Subject: Re: Canadian election

This news story on gallup.com weaves together a variety of data from
ongoing Gallup polling in Canada from 2003-2005 that I think offers some
useful insights into the conservative victory. (It will only be free to
non-subscribers this week, I think)
http://poll.gallup.com/content/default.aspx?ci=3D20986

I would welcome any feedback about the extent to which domestic issues
carried the day (crime and taxes versus backlash from the Liberal
scandals). Also, I'm wondering how important it was that Harper
somewhat reversed his support for the Iraq war and downplayed his social
conservatism. Were those essential, threshold moves for making himself
palatable to the Canadian electorate, or were they ready to elect him anyway?

Lydia Saad

Lydia K. Saad
Senior Editor, The Gallup Poll
502 Carnegie Center, Suite 300
Princeton, NJ 08540
(609) 924-9600
lydia_saad@gallup.com

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Warren Mitofsky
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2006 7:22 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Canadian election

It looks as though the Canadian election polls were pretty good. All had the PC ahead by margins of 6, 9 and 10 points.

Total Elected

CON 124 0 36.25%
LIB 103 0 30.22%
BQ 51 0 10.48%
NDP 29 0 17.49%
IND 1 0 .52%
OTH 0 0 5.05%

Updated:
January 24, 3:14:13 AM EST

Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.org/
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Thank you for the reply. It's hard for me, used to the U.S. system, to interpret the meaning of parliamentary results when the winner prevails with barely a third of the vote. As you point out, the left-wing can simultaneously have its strongest showing. In the U.S. it's much more of a zero-sum game.

-----Original Message-----
From: Keith Neuman [mailto:Keith.Neuman@environics.ca]
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2006 12:36 PM
To: Saad, Lydia; AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Canadian election

This election was not so much about any of these specific issues though some of them were election issues (though international issues were almost invisible). This election was about Canadians desire for change after 12 years of Liberal government, which in the end was heavily tarred by scandal and lacking in a coherent vision or direction. Voters opted for change but in a typically cautious fashion and in no way reflects a shift to the right. The conservatives will have a modest minority mandate and no natural allies among other parties. Canada's left-wing NDP had its best showing in almost 20 years.

Keith Neuman
Environics Research Group
Ottawa, Canada

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Sent: Tue Jan 24 12:18:46 2006
Subject: Re: Canadian election

This news story on gallup.com weaves together a variety of data from ongoing Gallup polling in Canada from 2003-2005 that I think offers some useful insights into the conservative victory. (It will only be free to non-subscribers this week, I think)
http://poll.gallup.com/content/default.aspx?ci=3D20986
I would welcome any feedback about the extent to which domestic issues carried the day (crime and taxes versus backlash from the Liberal scandals). Also, I'm wondering how important it was that Harper somewhat reversed his support for the Iraq war and downplayed his social conservatism. Were those essential, threshold moves for making himself palatable to the Canadian electorate, or were they ready to elect him anyway?

Lydia Saad

Lydia K. Saad
Senior Editor, The Gallup Poll
502 Carnegie Center, Suite 300
Princeton, NJ 08540
(609) 924-9600
lydia_saad@gallup.com

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Warren Mitofsky
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2006 7:22 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Canadian election

It looks as though the Canadian election polls were pretty good. All had the PC ahead by margins of 6, 9 and 10 points.

Total Elected
[]
[]
[]
[]

CON 124 0 36.25%
LIB 103 0 30.22%
BQ 51 0 10.48%
NDP 29 0 17.49%
IND 1 0 .52%
OTH 0 0 5.05%

January 24, 3:14:13 AM EST
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January 23, 2006
Special Report: Many States Shift Democratic During 2005
Rhode Island, Delaware most Democratic; Utah, Wyoming most Republican
by Jeffrey M. Jones

GALLUP NEWS SERVICE

http://poll.gallup.com/content/default.aspx?ci=3D21004

---20
Leo G. Simonetta
Research Director
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road, Suite 101
Baltimore MD 21209

Zogby impeachment poll hits mainstream media

Some activists, politicians speaking openly about impeachment

By Jim Puzzanghera
WASHINGTON - The word "impeachment" is popping up increasingly these days and not just off the lips of liberal activists spouting predictable bumper-sticker slogans.

After the unfounded claims about Iraq's weapons of mass destruction and recent news of domestic spying without warrants, mainstream politicians and ordinary voters are talking openly about the possibility that President Bush could be impeached. So is at least one powerful Republican senator, Sen. Arlen Specter, R-Pa., chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

SNIP

But a poll released last week by Zogby International showed 52 percent of American adults thought Congress should consider impeaching Bush if he wiretapped U.S. citizens without court approval, including 59 percent of independents and 23 percent of Republicans. (The survey had a margin of error of 2.9 percentage points.)

SNIP

(c) 2006 KR Washington Bureau and wire service sources. All Rights Reserved.

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

Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.org/
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

[Thought some people might be interested in this, which was just posted to a listserv I run by an American journalist who's been living in Russia for the last decade.]
Date: Tue, 24 Jan 2006 08:56:14 -0800 (PST)
From: Chris Doss <lookoverhere1@yahoo.com>
To: lbo-talk@lbo-talk.org
Subject: [lbo-talk] Russian public opinion today

I translate the results of the latest VTsIOM poll as reported in this week's issue of Itogi. The actual results go back organized by month to January of last year, but I'm just going to do December. (Note the ratings of the West's favorite political parties!) (I have my doubts as to the accuracy of the last set of stats.)

Do you in general approve or disapprove of the activity of Vladimir Putin in the position of President of Russia?

Approve 76%
Disapprove 16%
Hard to answer 8%

Do you in general approve or disapprove of the activity of the government of Russia?

Approve 38%
Disapprove 46%
Hard to answer 16%

For which of the following parties would you likely vote for for the State Duma, if elections were to be held next Sunday?

United Russia (CD -- Putin's party, basically) 40%
Communist Party of the Russia Federation 8%
Rodina (People's Patriotic Union) 3%
LDPR (CD -- Zhirinovsky's Party) 7%
Union of Right Forces (CD -- "Pro-Western" party) 1%
Yabloko (CD -- "Pro-Western" party) 1%
Agrarian Party of Russia 2%
Other 9%
Against All 11%
I would not participate in the elections 10%
Hard to answer 15%

In what group of the population would you incline to say you located?

We barely make ends meet. There is no money 13%
even for groceries

There is enough money for groceries, but buying 36% clothes poses financial problems

There is enough money for groceries and clothes, 38% but items of long use (a television, refrigerator) poses financial problems

We can buy items of long use. However it is 11% difficult for use to obtain truly expensive things

We can allow ourselves rather expensive items-- 2% an apartment, dacha, etc.

http://mailman.lbo-talk.org/mailman/listinfo/lbo-talk

Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.org/ Archives: http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html . Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Looking at the data from 1992 to 2004, Shellenberger and Nordhaus found a country whose citizens are increasingly authoritarian while at the same time feeling evermore adrift, isolated, and nihilistic. They found a society at once more libertine and more puritanical than in the past, a society where solidarity among citizens was deteriorating, and, most worrisomely to them, a progressive clock that seemed to be unwinding backward on broad questions of social equity. Between 1992 and 2004, for example, the percentage of people who said they agree that "the father of the family must be the master in his own house" increased ten points, from 42 to 52 percent, in the 2,500-person Environics survey. The percentage agreeing that "men are naturally superior to women" increased from 30 percent to 40 percent. Meanwhile, the fraction that said they discussed local problems with people they knew plummeted from 66 percent to 39 percent. Survey respondents were also increasingly accepting of the value that "violence is a normal part of life" -- and that figure had doubled
even before the al-Qaeda terrorist attacks.

Lumping specific survey statements like these together into related groups, Nordhaus and Shellenberger arrived at what they call "social values trends," such as "sexism," "patriotism," or "acceptance of flexible families." But the real meaning of those trends was revealed only by plugging them into the "values matrix" -- a four-quadrant plot with plenty of curving arrows to show direction, which is then overlaid onto voting data. The quadrants represent different worldviews. On the top lies authority, an orientation that values traditional family, religiosity, emotional control, and obedience. On the bottom, the individuality orientation encompasses risk-taking, "anomie-aimlessness," and the acceptance of flexible families and personal choice. On the right side of the scale are values that celebrate fulfillment, such as civic engagement, ecological concern, and empathy. On the left, there's a cluster of values representing the sense that life is a struggle for survival: acceptance of violence, a conviction that people get what they deserve in life, and civic apathy. These quadrants are not random: Shellenberger and Nordaus developed them based on an assessment of how likely it was that holders of certain values also held other values, or "self-clustered."

Over the past dozen years, the arrows have started to point away from the fulfillment side of the scale, home to such values as gender parity and personal expression, to the survival quadrant, home to illiberal values such as sexism, fatalism, and a focus on "every man for himself." Despite the increasing political power of the religious right, Environics found social values moving away from the authority end of the scale, with its emphasis on responsibility, duty, and tradition, to a more atomized, rage-filled outlook that values consumption, sexual permissiveness, and xenophobia. The trend was toward values in the individuality quadrant.

Any reader remotely familiar with American popular culture will immediately recognize the truth of this analysis. Ariel Levy recently grappled with one aspect of it in her book Female Chauvinist Pigs: Women and the Rise of Raunch Culture, writing about a hypersexualized culture that encourages its young women to be Girls Gone Wild and its young men to be piggish voyeurs. She describes a new anti-feminist vision of "liberation" that eschews both traditional constraints and any concern for gender equality. "Despite the rising power of Evangelical Christianity and the political right in the United States, this trend has only grown more extreme and more pervasive," notes Levy. Indeed, the coarse, brawny, self-centered new philosophy could take as its exemplar television personality Bill O'Reilly, a man who, it was alleged in a sexual harassment lawsuit, is as interpersonally crude as he is politically rough and bullying. Americans, writes Environics founder Michael Adams in his 2005 book American Backlash: The Untold Story of Social Change in the United States, increasingly reject traditionalism and progressivism alike.

"While American politics becomes increasingly committed to a brand of conservatism that favors traditionalism, religiosity, and authority,"
Adams writes, "the culture at large [is] becoming ever more attached to hedonism, thrill-seeking, and a ruthless, Darwinist understanding of human competition." This behavior is particularly prevalent among the vast segment of American society that is not politically or civically engaged, and which usually fails to even vote. This has created what must be understood at the electoral level as a politics of backlash on the part of both Republican and Democratic voters: Voters of both parties, Environics data show, have developed an increasingly moralistic politics as a reaction to the new cultural order.

[...]
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Hi all,

That looks intriguing at first glance, Doug (H.), but it would be helpful if you could provide some information about the source of the survey data, and anything about the survey methodology. For example, according to the article you link to, Environics was only just founded in 2005, so where did they get the time series data going back to 1992? And are the methodologies of the other, earlier survey(s) such as to allow it to be comparable with Environics 2005 survey?

Thanks for any further information along those lines.

Best,
Doug Strand

Douglas Strand, Ph.D.
Research Analyst
Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC)
500 Washington St., Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94111
415-291-4437
strand@ppic.org
www.ppic.org
Looking at the data from 1992 to 2004, Shellenberger and Nordhaus found a country whose citizens are increasingly authoritarian while at the same time feeling evermore adrift, isolated, and nihilistic. They found a society at once more libertine and more puritanical than in the past, a society where solidarity among citizens was deteriorating, and, most worrisomely to them, a progressive clock that seemed to be unwinding backward on broad questions of social equity. Between 1992 and 2004, for example, the percentage of people who said they agree that "the father of the family must be the master in his own house" increased ten points, from 42 to 52 percent, in the 2,500-person Environics survey. The percentage agreeing that "men are naturally superior to women" increased from 30 percent to 40 percent. Meanwhile, the fraction that said they discussed local problems with people they knew plummeted from 66 percent to 39 percent. Survey respondents were also increasingly accepting of the value that "violence is a normal part of life" -- and that figure had doubled even before the al-Qaeda terrorist attacks.

Lumping specific survey statements like these together into related groups, Nordhaus and Shellenberger arrived at what they call "social values trends," such as "sexism," "patriotism," or "acceptance of flexible families." But the real meaning of those trends was revealed only by plugging them into the "values matrix" -- a four-quadrant plot with plenty of curving arrows to show direction, which is then overlaid onto voting data. The quadrants represent different worldviews. On the top lies authority, an orientation that values traditional family, religiosity, emotional control, and obedience. On the bottom, the individuality orientation encompasses risk-taking, "anomie-aimlessness," and the acceptance of flexible families and personal choice. On the right side of the scale are values that celebrate fulfillment, such as civic engagement, ecological concern, and empathy. On the left, there's a cluster of values representing the sense that life is a struggle for survival: acceptance of violence, a conviction that people get what they deserve in life, and civic apathy. These quadrants are not random: Shellenberger and Nordhaus developed them based on an assessment of how likely it was...
that holders of certain values also held other values, or "self-clustered."

Over the past dozen years, the arrows have started to point away from the fulfillment side of the scale, home to such values as gender parity and personal expression, to the survival quadrant, home to illiberal values such as sexism, fatalism, and a focus on "every man for himself." Despite the increasing political power of the religious right, Environics found social values moving away from the authority end of the scale, with its emphasis on responsibility, duty, and tradition, to a more atomized, rage-filled outlook that values consumption, sexual permissiveness, and xenophobia. The trend was toward values in the individuality quadrant.

Any reader remotely familiar with American popular culture will immediately recognize the truth of this analysis. Ariel Levy recently grappled with one aspect of it in her book Female Chauvinist Pigs: Women and the Rise of Raunch Culture, writing about a hypersexualized culture that encourages its young women to be Girls Gone Wild and its young men to be piggish voyeurs. She describes a new anti-feminist vision of "liberation" that eschews both traditional constraints and any concern for gender equality. "Despite the rising power of Evangelical Christianity and the political right in the United States, this trend has only grown more extreme and more pervasive," notes Levy. Indeed, the coarse, brawny, self-centered new philosophy could take as its exemplar television personality Bill O'Reilly, a man who, it was alleged in a sexual harassment lawsuit, is interpersonally crude as he is politically rough and bullying. Americans, writes Environics founder Michael Adams in his 2005 book American Backlash: The Untold Story of Social Change in the United States, increasingly reject traditionalism and progressivism alike.

"While American politics becomes increasingly committed to a brand of conservatism that favors traditionalism, religiosity, and authority," Adams writes, "the culture at large is becoming ever more attached to hedonism, thrill-seeking, and a ruthless, Darwinist understanding of human competition." This behavior is particularly prevalent among the vast segment of American society that is not politically or civically engaged, and which usually fails to even vote. This has created what must be understood at the electoral level as a politics of backlash on the part of both Republican and Democratic voters. Voters of both parties, Environics data show, have developed an increasingly moralistic politics as a reaction to the new cultural order.

[...]
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Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.org/
Doug Henwood wrote:

>Hi all,
>That looks intriguing at first glance, Doug (H.), but it would be
>helpful if you could provide some information about the source of the
>survey data, and anything about the survey methodology. For example,
>according to the article you link to, Environics was only just founded
>in 2005, so where did they get the time series data going back to 1992?
>And are the methodologies of the other, earlier survey(s) such as to
>allow it to be comparable with Environics 2005 survey?
>
>Thanks for any further information along those lines.

I've got no idea - I know no more than what's in the article.

Doug

Environics was founded in 1970, and has been collecting data on social values since 1983 in Canada and 1992 in the US. Further details on the methodology can be provided upon request.

Keith Neuman
Environics Research Group
--------------------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld
Hi all,

That looks intriguing at first glance, Doug (H.), but it would be helpful if you could provide some information about the source of the survey data, and anything about the survey methodology. For example, according to the article you link to, Environics was only just founded in 2005, so where did they get the time series data going back to 1992? And are the methodologies of the other, earlier survey(s) such as to allow it to be comparable with Environics 2005 survey?

Thanks for any further information along those lines.

Best,
Doug Strand

Douglas Strand, Ph.D.
Research Analyst
Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC)
500 Washington St., Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94111
415-291-4437
strand@ppic.org
www.ppic.org

Any opinions expressed in this message are those of the author alone and do not necessarily reflect any position of the Public Policy Institute of California.

Looking at the data from 1992 to 2004, Shellenberger and Nordhaus found a country whose citizens are increasingly authoritarian while...
at the same time feeling evermore adrift, isolated, and nihilistic.

They found a society at once more libertine and more puritanical than in the past, a society where solidarity among citizens was deteriorating, and, most worrisomely to them, a progressive clock that seemed to be unwinding backward on broad questions of social equity. Between 1992 and 2004, for example, the percentage of people who said they agree that "the father of the family must be the master in his own house" increased ten points, from 42 to 52 percent, in the 2,500-person Environics survey. The percentage agreeing that "men are naturally superior to women" increased from 30 percent to 40 percent. Meanwhile, the fraction that said they discussed local problems with people they knew plummeted from 66 percent to 39 percent. Survey respondents were also increasingly accepting of the value that "violence is a normal part of life" -- and that figure had doubled even before the al-Qaeda terrorist attacks.

Lumping specific survey statements like these together into related groups, Nordhaus and Shellenberger arrived at what they call "social values trends," such as "sexism," "patriotism," or "acceptance of flexible families." But the real meaning of those trends was revealed only by plugging them into the "values matrix" -- a four-quadrant plot with plenty of curving arrows to show direction, which is then overlaid onto voting data. The quadrants represent different worldviews. On the top lies authority, an orientation that values traditional family, religiosity, emotional control, and obedience. On the bottom, the individuality orientation encompasses risk-taking, "anomie-aimlessness," and the acceptance of flexible families and personal choice. On the right side of the scale are values that celebrate fulfillment, such as civic engagement, ecological concern, and empathy. On the left, there's a cluster of values representing the sense that life is a struggle for survival: acceptance of violence, a conviction that people get what they deserve in life, and civic apathy. These quadrants are not random: Shellenberger and Nordaus developed them based on an assessment of how likely it was that holders of certain values also held other values, or "self-clustered."

Over the past dozen years, the arrows have started to point away from the fulfillment side of the scale, home to such values as gender parity and personal expression, to the survival quadrant, home to illiberal values such as sexism, fatalism, and a focus on "every man for himself." Despite the increasing political power of the religious right, Environics found social values moving away from the authority end of the scale, with its emphasis on responsibility, duty, and tradition, to a more atomized, rage-filled outlook that values consumption, sexual permissiveness, and xenophobia. The trend was toward values in the individuality quadrant.

Any reader remotely familiar with American popular culture will immediately recognize the truth of this analysis. Ariel Levy recently grappled with one aspect of it in her book Female Chauvinist Pigs: Women and the Rise of Raunch Culture, writing about a hypersexualized culture that encourages its young women to be Girls Gone Wild and its young men to be piggish voyeurs. She describes a new anti-feminist
vision of "liberation" that eschews both traditional constraints and any concern for gender equality. "Despite the rising power of Evangelical Christianity and the political right in the United States, this trend has only grown more extreme and more pervasive," notes Levy. Indeed, the coarse, brawny, self-centered new philosophy could take as its exemplar television personality Bill O'Reilly, a man who, it was alleged in a sexual harassment lawsuit, is as interpersonally crude as he is politically rough and bullying.

Americans, writes Environics founder Michael Adams in his 2005 book American Backlash: The Untold Story of Social Change in the United States, increasingly reject traditionalism and progressivism alike. Adams writes, "the culture at large [is] becoming ever more attached to hedonism, thrill-seeking, and a ruthless, Darwinist understanding of human competition." This behavior is particularly prevalent among the vast segment of American society that is not politically or civically engaged, and which usually fails to even vote. This has created what must be understood at the electoral level as a politics of backlash on the part of both Republican and Democratic voters: Voters of both parties, Environics data show, have developed an increasingly moralistic politics as a reaction to the new cultural order.

[...]
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Date:         Tue, 24 Jan 2006 18:56:04 -0600
Reply-To:     "Moore, David" <David_Moore@GALLUP.COM>
Sender:       AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From:         "Moore, David" <David_Moore@GALLUP.COM>
Subject:      Re: remapping the culture debate
Comments: To: Keith Neuman <Keith.Neuman@ENVIRONICS.CA>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

The plenary speaker at the annual AAPOR conference in Montreal this May will be Michael Adams, founder of Environics in Canada, and author of
American Backlash: The Untold Story of Social Change in the United States. He will be talking specifically about the issues outlined below.

David

David W. Moore
The Gallup Organization
2006 AAPOR Program Chair

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Keith Neuman
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2006 6:09 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: remapping the culture debate

Environics was founded in 1970, and has been collecting data on social values since 1983 in Canada and 1992 in the US. Further details on the methodology can be provided upon request.

Keith Neuman
Environics Research Group
--------------------------
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Sent: Tue Jan 24 17:46:29 2006
Subject: Re: remapping the culture debate

Hi all,

That looks intriguing at first glance, Doug (H.), but it would be helpful if you could provide some information about the source of the survey data, and anything about the survey methodology. For example, according to the article you link to, Environics was only just founded in 2005, so where did they get the time series data going back to 1992? And are the methodologies of the other, earlier survey(s) such as to allow it to be comparable with Environics 2005 survey?

Thanks for any further information along those lines.

Best,
Doug Strand

Douglas Strand, Ph.D.
Research Analyst
Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) 500 Washington St., Suite
800 San Francisco, CA 94111
415-291-4437
strand@ppic.org
Looking at the data from 1992 to 2004, Shellenberger and Nordhaus found a country whose citizens are increasingly authoritarian while at the same time feeling evermore adrift, isolated, and nihilistic. They found a society at once more libertine and more puritanical than in the past, a society where solidarity among citizens was deteriorating, and, most worrisomely to them, a progressive clock that seemed to be unwinding backward on broad questions of social equity. Between 1992 and 2004, for example, the percentage of people who said they agree that "the father of the family must be the master in his own house" increased ten points, from 42 to 52 percent, in the 2,500-person Environics survey. The percentage agreeing that "men are naturally superior to women" increased from 30 percent to 40 percent. Meanwhile, the fraction that said they discussed local problems with people they knew plummeted from 66 percent to 39 percent. Survey respondents were also increasingly accepting of the value that "violence is a normal part of life" -- and that figure had doubled even before the al-Qaeda terrorist attacks.

Lumping specific survey statements like these together into related groups, Nordhaus and Shellenberger arrived at what they call "social values trends," such as "sexism," "patriotism," or "acceptance of flexible families." But the real meaning of those trends was revealed only by plugging them into the "values matrix" -- a four-quadrant plot with plenty of curving arrows to show direction, which is then overlaid onto voting data. The quadrants represent different worldviews. On the top lies authority, an orientation that values traditional family, religiosity, emotional control, and obedience. On the bottom, the individuality orientation encompasses risk-taking, "anomie-aimlessness," and the acceptance of flexible families and personal choice. On the right side of the scale are values that celebrate fulfillment, such as civic engagement, ecological concern, and empathy. On the left, there's a cluster of values representing the sense that life is a struggle for survival: acceptance of violence, a conviction that people get what they deserve in life, and civic apathy. These quadrants are not random:
Shellenberger and Nordaus developed them based on an assessment of how likely it was that holders of certain values also held other values, or "self-clustered."

Over the past dozen years, the arrows have started to point away from the fulfillment side of the scale, home to such values as gender parity and personal expression, to the survival quadrant, home to illiberal values such as sexism, fatalism, and a focus on "every man for himself." Despite the increasing political power of the religious right, Environics found social values moving away from the authority end of the scale, with its emphasis on responsibility, duty, and tradition, to a more atomized, rage-filled outlook that values consumption, sexual permissiveness, and xenophobia. The trend was toward values in the individuality quadrant.

Any reader remotely familiar with American popular culture will immediately recognize the truth of this analysis. Ariel Levy recently grappled with one aspect of it in her book Female Chauvinist Pigs: Women and the Rise of Raunch Culture, writing about a hypersexualized culture that encourages its young women to be Girls Gone Wild and its young men to be piggish voyeurs. She describes a new anti-feminist vision of "liberation" that eschews both traditional constraints and any concern for gender equality. "Despite the rising power of Evangelical Christianity and the political right in the United States, this trend has only grown more extreme and more pervasive," notes Levy. Indeed, the coarse, brawny, self-centered new philosophy could take as its exemplar television personality Bill O'Reilly, a man who, it was alleged in a sexual harassment lawsuit, is as interpersonally crude as he is politically rough and bullying. Americans, writes Environics founder Michael Adams in his 2005 book American Backlash: The Untold Story of Social Change in the United States, increasingly reject traditionalism and progressivism alike.

"While American politics becomes increasingly committed to a brand of conservatism that favors traditionalism, religiosity, and authority," Adams writes, "the culture at large [is] becoming ever more attached to hedonism, thrill-seeking, and a ruthless, Darwinist understanding of human competition." This behavior is particularly prevalent among the vast segment of American society that is not politically or civically engaged, and which usually fails to even vote. This has created what must be understood at the electoral level as a politics of backlash on the part of both Republican and Democratic voters.

Voters of both parties, Environics data show, have developed an increasingly moralistic politics as a reaction to the new cultural order.

[...]
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----------------------------------------------------
We'd like to survey the public in New York State on their understanding of Land Grant schools, if people understand what the mission is of these types of schools. If anyone knows of existing questions around this topic, I'd greatly appreciate if they could be shared.

Thank you,
Yasamin

Yasamin Miller, Director
Survey Research Institute - SRI
168 Ives Hall
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853
* yd17@cornell.edu
( 607-255-0148
fax: 607-255-7118
www.sri.cornell.edu
Ruy Teixeira comments on the Nordhaus/Shellenberger research, and Franke-Ruta's American Prospect article, in his weekly newsletter: <http://www.tcf.org/list.asp?type=NC&pubid=1197#values>.

----

Values to the Left of Me, Values to the Right of Me, and Nary a Strategy in Sight

Sometimes I think there are more values than voters out there. At least one might be forgiven this thought, given all the head-scratching about values taking place in progressive circles and the many, many nominees for the values progressives should be stressing-right now!-in their efforts to build a majority coalition.

I've always felt quite ambivalent about this values obsession. On the one hand, I can only applaud the general concept that values should be taken seriously as the prism through which voters view policies and politics. Just thinking about issues and how well different ones poll is certainly an inadequate way to formulate political strategy.

On the other, discussions about values tend to become awfully squishy awfully fast. Instead of the suspect assertion that simply talking about the right issue(s) will take progressives from hell to hallelujah, values-talk tends toward the equally suspect assumption that simply talking about the right value(s)-linkage to actual, feasible politics unspecified-will lead progressives to the promised land. Well, I don't believe that either and neither should you.

Let me illustrate my concerns by discussing one recent offering in this ongoing values discussion, Garance Franke-Ruta's article, "Remapping the Culture Debate," in the latest issue of the American Prospect. Franke-Ruta's article starts by discussing the values work of Ted Nordhaus and Michael Shellenberger, well-known in progressive circles for their essay, "The Death of Environmentalism." Nordhaus and Shellenberger, now principals in American Environics, the American branch of the Canadian market research firm, Environics Research, have been pushing a values scheme based entirely on their analysis of an Environics in-home consumer survey that has been conducted since 1992.

Their presentations of their work to various progressive organizations and politicians have met with a generally favorable reception and Franke-Ruta's views on their work are no exception. She portrays their analysis as path-breaking empirical work that will (or at least should) completely recast the way progressives look at politics.
I am not so sure. Begin with the fact that their data are drawn from only one survey series—their own—and no attempt has been made so far to compare their findings to those from other series. This does not inspire confidence. Take, for example, two of the few actual data points that are mentioned in Franke-Ruta's article:

Between 1992 and 2004, for example, the percentage of people who said they agree that "the father of the family must be the master in his own house" increased ten points, from 42 to 52 percent, in the 2,500-person Environics survey. The percentage agreeing that "men are naturally superior to women" increased from 30 percent to 40 percent.

Could be, but check out this finding from the premier American academic political science survey, the National Election Study (NES). The NES asked respondents to place themselves on a 7-point scale relative to the following statements: "Some people feel that women should have an equal role with men in running business, industry and government. Others feel that women's place is in the home." For this statement, 1 indicates the strongest support for the women's equal role and 7 indicates the strongest support for women's place being in the home. In 1992, 51 percent selected 1, the strongest support for women's equal role; in 2004, 57 percent selected 1. So support for women's equal role appears to be strengthening in the NES. Indeed, in the 2004 survey, a total of 78 percent of respondents picked 1, 2 or 3 on the 7-point scale, indicating they felt closer to the equal role statement that to the women's place in the home statement.

But at the same time we're supposed to believe that 40 percent now believe men are superior to women and that 52 percent believe the father should be the master of the house—increases of 10 points in each case over the same period covered by the NES data? I guess we could reconcile the data from the two surveys by positing a trend toward believing women are equal but dumb and subservient. But pardon me if I'm a little skeptical—-a skepticism that's reinforced by trend data from the General Social Survey, the premier academic sociology survey, showing fewer, not more, people believing that women should take care of the home and leave running the country to men and fewer, not more, people believing that men are better suited for politics than women.

This illustrates the perils of relying on one survey for one's data about Americans' values—or anything else for that matter. Especially when that one survey is a consumer market research survey designed not for political research, but for very different purposes.

So why are observers like Franke-Ruta and others so captivated by the Nordhaus/Shellenberger analysis, when it relies on only one data source—a data source, moreover, whose superiority over other sources is simply an assertion lacking any supporting evidence? Several reasons:

1. The very fact that it is a consumer marketing survey actually adds to the survey's cachet. We now realize values are important, the
thinking runs, and who's been paying attention to values all these years? Why corporations and market researchers, of course, so they (or their data) might already have the answers for which we're so frantically looking.

2. Since the Environics survey tracks over a hundred different values, there's a ton of value trends to look at and everyone can find at least one trend (or several) that confirms their suspicions, based on pop culture/reading/hunches/whatever, about where the country is really going. In effect, the Nordhaus/Shellenberger presentation of these data functions as a sort of Rorschach test for progressives interested in values, where people see in the data what they wanted to believe to begin with.

This is especially the case since they cluster- and factor-analyze their data to death, showing in various "maps" how all these values relate to underlying value dimensions (survival versus fulfillment; authority versus individuality) both overall and for a multiplicity of different values-defined "constituencies of opportunity" for progressives. The result is many complex grids-some of them for groups whose sample size cannot be more than 25 or so in their data-with dozens of multicolored values sprinkled in different patterns on each grid.

Well, if you can't find something you agree with or find significant with this much to choose from, you're just not looking hard enough! And my sense is people do just that, hence the recent popularity of their analysis.

But the question must be asked: what, exactly, are we getting out of this analysis that we couldn't get elsewhere? Here's an example from Franke-Ruta's article:

By focusing on "bridge values," [Nordhaus and Shellenberger] say, progressives can reach out to constituents of opportunity who share certain fundamental beliefs, even if the targeted parties don't necessarily share progressives' every last goal.

In other words, when reaching out to swing voters, emphasize beliefs swing voters and your base have in common, rather than beliefs they don't. Now, if one was going to choose to talk about values instead of, or in addition, to issues in one's political work, I can't imagine you'd take any other approach. So I'm not sure we need a zillion color-coded values maps to make that case.

But perhaps Franke-Ruta was entranced by the specific bridge values Nordhaus and Shellenberger advocate using? I can find no evidence of this in her article, comparing its content to either this public Nordhaus/Shellenberger document or what I generally know of their work. Indeed, the best insight of the article—which I really do recommend, despite her excessive enthusiasm for Nordhaus/Shellenberger—is this, which bears little, if any, relation that I can see to their analysis:
The growing conflation of the economic and the cultural in the minds of voters has been a cause of great perplexity for thinkers who have long seen the two realms as distinct, and the cultural realm as the secondary concern of unserious men who don't know where their self-interest lies. Thomas Frank, in his 2005 What's the Matter with Kansas?, sketched a portrait of lower- and middle-income voters who, socially at odds with a liberal elite they accuse of moral dissipation, have forged an alliance with a conservative fiscal elite whose economic policies, paradoxically, do little to support their worldview or shore up families. Yet the broader social reality suggests that the focus of these middle-income voters on cultural traditionalism is not entirely separate from their economic aspirations. Social solidarity and even simple familial stability have become part of the package of private privileges available to the well-to-do. Behavioral surveys consistently show that, regardless of their political leanings, the better-off and better-educated live more traditional personal lives: They are more likely to marry, far less likely to divorce, less likely to have children outside of marriage, and more likely to remarry when they do divorce than their less accomplished peers. In addition, their kids are more likely to be academically successful and go to college, repeating the cycle.

The new Puritanism and cultural conservatism Frank described can also been seen as symptoms of how, in today's society, traditional values have become aspirational. Lower-income individuals simply live in a much more disrupted society, with higher divorce rates, more single moms, more abortions, and more interpersonal and interfamily strife, than do the middle- and upper-middle class people they want to be like. It should come as no surprise that the politics of reaction is strongest where there is most to react to. People in states like Massachusetts, for example, which has very high per capita incomes and the lowest divorce rate in the country, are relatively unconcerned about gay marriage, while those in Southern states with much higher poverty, divorce, and single-parenthood rates feel the family to be threatened because family life is, in fact, much less stable in their communities. In such environments, where there are few paths to social solidarity and a great deal of social disruption, the church frequently steps into the breach, further exacerbating the fight.

American voters have taken shelter under the various wings of conservative traditionalism because there has been no one on the Democratic side in recent years to defend traditional, sensible middle-class values against the onslaught of the new nihilistic, macho, libertarian lawlessness unleashed by an economy that pits every man against his fellows. Yet in private conversations, progressives recognize that there is a need to do something about broad social changes that they, too, find objectionable.

I think this is remarkably astute and potentially points progressives in a very fruitful direction. And if it took the Nordhaus/Shellenberger Rorschach test to get her thinking along these lines, that is certainly a point in their favor. However, if we wish to be really guided by values research in formulating political
strategy, we will have to go beyond the Rorschach test stage and engage critically with the widest possible range of data. If values are truly important—and I think they are—we just can't afford any other approach.
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Company: Phillip Morris

Location: Richmond, VA

Job Title: Senior Research Analyst

Job Description

Philip Morris USA Inc., a global leader in the manufacturing and marketing of consumer products made for adults, seeks an experienced Senior Research Analyst to work in our Corporate Responsibility Department in Richmond, Virginia.

Position Specific Duties:

Support company communications efforts by designing, implementing and analyzing research studies. Responsible for planning, designing, executing and interpreting qualitative and quantitative research on company communications - including the company website and corporate responsibility communications and advertisements. Provide research support to help develop further the company's corporate brand identity. Also required to commission issues-based exploratory research and general communications research to support the development of company
messaging on important business topics. In many instances, research needs to be conducted within a very small window of time. Results have to be analyzed and presented in a timely manner to assist in strategic decision making. This requires the ability to manage a multitude of tasks simultaneously, including overseeing research vendors, coordinating with advertising agencies and working with a variety of internal teams and departments.

Effectively engage in vendor management: maintain/cultivate relationships and collaborate with outside suppliers, consultants and vendors who conduct qualitative and quantitative research for the Corporate Responsibility Research Department in an effort to ensure timely, cost effective, high quality deliverables. Plan and manage multiple projects. For qualitative research, design research specifications, attend research and report on the findings/implications. For quantitative research, participate in and oversee questionnaire design, data tabulation plan development, data analysis, report writing, presentation creation and execution.

Work with communications teams to assess strategy and research needs. Execute important departmental infrastructure which can include contracts, budgets, and other organization development efforts.

Experience/Skills:

College degree preferred (advance degree desirable), with focus on applied research design, communications research, public policy research or public opinion research preferred. A minimum of 3 years planning and conducting qualitative and quantitative research studies to support the development of corporate/company communications is strongly preferred. Experience conducting research in such areas as corporate brand development, corporate affairs, government affairs, public relations, public policy and/or public opinion is helpful.

Must have a strong understanding of communications research design and methodologies. Must be able to design, implement and analyze qualitative and quantitative studies that provide critical insights for the development and evaluation of company communications across a variety of vehicles including speeches, TV, print and web. Must have strong analytical skills, including a basic understanding of statistical applications. Must have survey/questionnaire design and analysis experience. Must be able to write and edit research-based reports and presentations.

Must possess strong PC skills. Must have excellent oral and written communication skills and be able to work in a fast paced environment with shifting deadlines and priorities. Strong organizational skills and attention to detail are required. Must use sound, independent reasoning and judgment to establish work priorities, handle questions, and be flexible to respond to constantly changing priorities. Must be able to work in a team environment and be willing to work constructively with
others to achieve team goals. Must have excellent client service and consultative skills. Must have solid vendor management/relationship skills.

Philip Morris USA is an equal opportunity/affirmative action employer (M/F/V/D). We support diversity in our workforce. Philip Morris USA is a drug-free workplace.

Interested?
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Company: Phillip Morris
Location: Richmond, VA
Job Title: Manager, Research

Philip Morris USA Inc., a global leader in the manufacturing and marketing of consumer products made for adults, seeks an experienced Research Manager to work in our Youth Smoking Prevention Department in Richmond, Virginia.
Position Specific Duties:

* Support YSP & CR Communications efforts by envisioning, recommending, designing, implementing and analyzing research studies - mostly in support of paid, mass advertising efforts, as well as periodic web and print-based resources.
* Identify and delegate work to appropriate resources - including internal and external partners.
* Effectively manage vendors: maintain/cultivate relationships and collaborate with outside suppliers, consultants and vendors who conduct qualitative and quantitative research for YSP and CR in an effort to ensure timely, cost effective, high quality deliverables.
* For qualitative research, oversee and participate in developing research specifications, planning the discussion guide, interpreting data, and reporting on the findings and implications.
* For quantitative research, oversee and participate in developing research specifications, designing the questionnaire/survey instrument, planning the data tabulation and analysis, and reporting on the findings and implications.
* Create and sustain infrastructure to connect and integrate various data, research, and information streams on the subject of YSP and CR Communications and to engage and share such information with key internal and external stakeholders.
* Maintain and improve infrastructure to track comparative advertising in the marketplace.
* Identify and bring relevant syndicated research in house.
* Execute management responsibilities for junior staff member(s).
* Plan and administer an annual operating budget of approximately 3-5 million dollars.
* Maintain and improve research department infrastructure, which can include contracts, budgets, business plans, and organization development efforts.

Specific Skills:

* Advanced degree with focus in applied research design, communications, market or public opinion research strongly preferred.
* A minimum of 5 years of experience in planning and conducting qualitative and quantitative research studies is strongly preferred.
* Must have a strong understanding of research design and methodologies.
* Must be able to envision, design, implement and analyze studies that provide critical insights for the development and evaluation of Youth Smoking Prevention and Corporate Responsibility (YSP & CR) Communications.

* Must have strong analytical skills, including a fundamental understanding of statistical applications. (e.g., SPSS, SAS)

* Must have survey/questionnaire design and analysis experience.

* Must be able to write and edit research-based reports and presentations.

* Must have excellent oral communication skills and be able to present to large audiences.

* Must be able to plan, prioritize and allocate resources against key business initiatives.

* Must use sound, independent reasoning and judgment to establish work priorities, handle questions, and be flexible to respond to constantly changing priorities.

* Must develop strong, collaborative and effective partnerships internally and externally - including with other YSP and CR departments, external vendors/researchers, the academic community, ad agencies, as well as other managers in such departments as Law, Finance, and Communications.

Philip Morris USA is an equal opportunity/affirmative action employer (M/F/V/D). We support diversity in our workforce. Philip Morris USA is a drug-free workplace.

Interested? Log on to: http://www.philipmorrisusa.com and apply to job number 6652.
An academic client of ours is inquiring about automated/interactive voice response phone systems. I would appreciate learning of others experiences and recommendations for reliable firms or "do-it-yourself" software implementations.

If you wish, reply off-list and I will summarize all responses next week.

Thanks,

Jim Wolf
jamwolf@iupui.edu

Director, Survey Research Center at IUPUI

Indiana University School of Liberal Arts

719 Indiana Ave - Suite 260

Indianapolis, IN 46202

Voice: (317) 278-9230  Fax: (317) 278-2383

http://src.iupui.edu
Does anyone know of a sample size table like the handy ones for random samples with population sizes in a column and confidence intervals showing sample sizes but done for clusters?

Jack...

Jack Bishop
Director Office of Institutional Effectiveness,
Planning and Research
Georgia Highlands College
3175 Hwy 27 South
Rome, GA 30162
706-802-5403

Jack...
Dear Colleagues,

I am looking for recommendations for a national RDD omnibus, with ~1000 respondents. Who do you use, and what is their typical cost per question? I don't want to use an online omnibus and/or any with a panel.

Please e-mail me directly, and I can compile a list for anyone who is interested.

Thanks much,
Melissa

Melissa Marcello
Pursuant, Inc.
2141 P Street NW
Suite 105
Washington, DC  20037
p 202.887.0070
f  800.567.1723
c 202.352.7462

Visit our website at www.pursuantresearch.com

A GSA-certified vendor
Dear Colleagues,

One of our clients is looking to add some political knowledge questions to an RDD Omnibus that is representative of Pennsylvania. Any recommendations for PA?

Thanks!

Brian J. Grim, Ph.D.
Faculty Researcher
Survey Research Center
Social Science Research Institute
http://www.ssri.psu.edu/survey/
Pennsylvania State University
328 Pond Laboratory
University Park, PA 16802
Tel: (814) 865-0667
Fax: (814) 865-3098
Email: grim@psu.edu

Hi Melissa, Brian and others,

Wow, two questions about RDD omnibuses in 45 minutes!
FOR THE NATIONAL SURVEY

ORC has Caravan, which is (I believe the oldest telephone omnibus out there). We do 2 RDD 1,000-household surveys per week (Thurs-Sun, Fri-Mon). I have attached a one-pager on it (includes pricing).

FOR THE PENNSYLVANIA SURVEY

Don't know any, but I'm sure there are some out there. I did a quick look on the web out of curiosity and had trouble pulling one up.

Larry Luskin
ORC (Macro)

At 01:47 PM 1/26/2006, Melissa Marcello wrote:
>Dear Colleagues,
>
> I am looking for recommendations for a national RDD omnibus, with ~1000 respondents. Who do you use, and what is their typical cost per question?
> I don't want to use an online omnibus and/or any with a panel.
>
> Please e-mail me directly, and I can compile a list for anyone who is interested.
>
> Thanks much,
>
> Melissa
>
> Melissa Marcello
> Pursuant, Inc.
> 2141 P Street NW
> Suite 105
> Washington, DC 20037
> p 202.887.0070
> f 800.567.1723
> c 202.352.7462
>
>
I have a low incidence group I am trying to interview. I am wondering if anyone has used forums on the internet targeted to specific groups to ask people to call into an 800# in order to complete a survey.

Any "real world" experiences with this approach would be very welcome.

Thanks,
Scott.

Scott Farrell
VP, Gazelle Global Research Services
114 E32nd St, Suite 708
New York, NY 10016
(212) 686-8808

-------------------------------------------------------------------------
Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.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

-------------------------------------------------------------------------
Independent Research Consultant, Telecommunications

Research firm seeks retired or freelance telecom professional in the Los Angeles or San Diego area for long term contract work conducting in person in-depth interviews with telecommunications decision makers. The interviewer is responsible for recruiting, interviewing, and writing summary reports. Local travel is required.

Ideal candidate must have a telecommunications background, possess strong written and verbal communications skills, be equipped with a computer with Office 2000 or higher and have high speed internet. Previous interviewing experience required. Send cover letter, resume and writing sample to interviewer@thetaylorgroup.com.

Michael P. Flanagan, CAE=20
Association Manager=20
Applied Measurement Professionals =20
8310 Nieman Road=20
Lenexa, KS 66214-1579 =20
(913) 495-4470=20
FAX: (913) 599-5340 =20
Hi,

I'm looking for some methodological advice on online data collection of children under age 13. I did find a good website for a refresher on the legal and ethical issues (http://www.epic.org/privacy/kids/) but I am still searching for actual methods. We're thinking of some way of a game that will entertain/educate and also give us our information. Since we need to get parental approval (perhaps as a part of a survey directed at them), I'm also hoping to get input on the process getting the parental approval prior to the kid being online (or do the kids have to get approval before they hit the 'submit' button at the end?). So if you've done this kind of work, what has worked best in getting the approval and then getting the kid to play.

I will be happy to compile results and share them, too.

thanks,
Leora

Dr. Leora Lawton
TechSociety Research
"Custom Social Science and Consumer Behavior Research"
2342 Shattuck Avenue PMB 362, Berkeley, CA  94704
(510) 548-6174; fax (510) 548-6175; cell (510) 928-7572
www.techsociety.com
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On Wednesday, January 25, the NY Times carried an article reporting on a survey conducted for the American Association of University Women under the headline "One if Four College Students Cite Unwanted Sexual Contact in Survey."


In the article one reads: "The online survey was conducted by Harris Interactive, which polled 2,036 students at two- and four-year colleges. It had a margin of error of plus or minus two percentage points."

The actual news release from Harris Interactive can be obtained at http://www.harrisinteractive.com/news/newsletters/clientnews/2006_AAUWEF.pdf

As is their custom, HI provides a methodology statement which includes the following: "In theory, with probability samples of this size, one could say with 95 percent certainty that the overall results have a sampling error of +/- 2 percentage points. Sampling error for the sub-samples of (......) is higher and varies. This online sample is not a probability sample."

I've noted before that this statement is cleverly crafted to provide those citing HI online surveys with a "margin of error" they can report while allowing HI to pretend that they never claimed that "margin of error" was appropriate.

But the real problem is that news organizations insist that a "margin of error" must always be given for survey results. This forces reporters to quote false and misleading statistics if they want to provide results from any non-probability surveys, no matter how credible they may be.

AAPOR has been negligent in failing to develop proper guidelines for reporting on non-probability surveys that would remedy this situation. This should be the highest priority for the organization.

Jan Werner
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The Associated Press has the following opening:

NEWS SURVEY SPECIALIST
Location: Washington, D.C.
Responsibilities: Works with the manager of news surveys and director of polling in commissioning AP survey research in states, nationally and internationally. Assists in designing research projects and works with polling vendors. Assists reporters with polling data and analysis. Maintains polling data archives and helps manage polling intranet site. This is a one-year contract position.

Qualifications: At least three years experience in the survey research field, preferably in news polling. Experience with research project design and survey questionnaire development. Experience with Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) and statistical software packages such as SPSS or SAS. Knowledge of and interest in U.S. politics is a must. Advanced degree in survey research or related field is a plus.

To apply: Email resume and cover letter to Mike Mokrzycki, AP polling director, at mmokrzycki@ap.org.

Mike Mokrzycki
Director of Polling
The Associated Press
mmokrzycki@ap.org
978 363 1504
=20

The information contained in this communication is intended for the use of the designated recipients named above. If the reader of this communication is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this communication in error, and that any review, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify The Associated Press immediately by telephone at +1-212-621-1898 and delete this email. Thank you.
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Folks:

We have the opportunity to do a followup health insurance survey to our study in Kansas in 2001, which was a statewide RDD telephone survey. We are calling back the same households, but only in some of the most-rural counties. Given the initial high response from 2001 and less-migratory nature of folks in those particular areas, we are hoping for sufficient response. (In one of my favorite novels, ARCHANGEL by Sharon Shinn, one of the characters observes, "Farmers...live in one place forever, and their children live there, and their children's children...." We're hoping that is true for Kansas farmers as well.)

I worked on SIPP during my time at Census, and I am familiar with the longitudinal aspects of MEPS, but I wanted to check around if there were any state- or community-level projects that y'all had conducted. (Apologies to the health insurance experts I have already consulted individually, for whom this will seem to be a second request.)

At this point, I am interested specifically in questionnaire design, making the most effective use of the time series. Any pitfalls or great ideas? Any questionnaires to share?

Also, what would one call a design like this, with datapoints five years apart? I am trying to avoid the use of "longitudinal," because I don't think two data collections are quite enough to qualify, and I am trying to avoid people drawing a straight line between the two points.

Many thanks,
Colleen

PLEASE NOTE NEW CONTACT INFO
Colleen K. Porter
Research Program Manager (Pain Lab)
University of Florida College of Dentistry
Community Dentistry and Behavioral Science
1329 SW 16th St. (1329 Bldg.), Ste. 5180
PO Box 103628
Gainesville, Florida 32610-3628
(352) 273-5979, phone
(352) 273-5985, fax
cporter@dental.ufl.edu
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"This online sample is not a probability sample."

Shame on the NY Times for reporting results from a survey not based on a probability sample.

Ed Freeland

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jan Werner
Sent: Sunday, January 29, 2006 6:06 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Misleading survey reporting

On Wednesday, January 25, the NY Times carried an article reporting on a survey conducted for the American Association of University Women under the headline "One if Four College Students Cite Unwanted Sexual Contact in Survey."


In the article one reads: "The online survey was conducted by Harris Interactive, which polled 2,036 students at two- and four-year colleges.

It had a margin of error of plus or minus two percentage points."

The actual news release from Harris Interactive can be obtained at http://www.harrisinteractive.com/news/newsletters/clientnews/2006_AAUWEF.pdf

As is their custom, HI provides a methodology statement which includes the following: "In theory, with probability samples of this size, one could say with 95 percent certainty that the overall results have a sampling error of +/- 2 percentage points. Sampling error for the sub-samples of (......) is higher and varies. This online sample is not a probability sample."

I've noted before that this statement is cleverly crafted to provide those citing HI online surveys with a "margin of error" they can report while allowing HI to pretend that they never claimed that "margin of error" was appropriate.

But the real problem is that news organizations insist that a "margin of
error" must always be given for survey results. This forces reporters to quote false and misleading statistics if they want to provide results from any non-probability surveys, no matter how credible they may be.

AAPOR has been negligent in failing to develop proper guidelines for reporting on non-probability surveys that would remedy this situation. This should be the highest priority for the organization.

Jan Werner
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Date: Mon, 30 Jan 2006 15:33:54 -0500
Reply-To: Sid Groeneman <sid@GROENEMAN.COM>
Sender: AAPORNENET <AAPORNENET@ASU.EDU>
From: Sid Groeneman <sid@GROENEMAN.COM>
Subject: Partisanship and racial bias
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

This piece in today's Washington Post might be of interest: http://tinyurl.com/7jv4u

Sid Groeneman

Groeneman Research & Consulting
Bethesda, Maryland

sid@groeneman.com

Are Republicans more racially biased? This piece in today's Washington Post might be of interest: http://tinyurl.com/7jv4u

Sid Groeneman

Groeneman Research & Consulting
Bethesda, Maryland
sid@groeneman.com

If interested please send resume and cover letter to jobs@shrm.org.

=20
SUMMARY

Produces and manages quantitative and qualitative research on HR topics utilized by members and other customers in making business decisions. The incumbent's role includes designing survey instruments, data collection, analysis and the dissemination of the research. The incumbent is also responsible for managing internal relationships with other SHRM departments and external relationships with outside organizations, academics, members and non-members.

ESSENTIAL DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES include the following: (other duties may be assigned).

Designing, collecting, analyzing and disseminating HR related research that HR professionals and other customers will utilize and apply in their organizations to improve workforce dynamics and to make strategic business decisions. Responsible for managing survey research projects from start to finish as assigned by Survey Program Manager.

Works with internal staff including the Internal Survey Committee and other SHRM departments in developing (may require conducting background research on HR related topics through literature reviews) survey instruments to collect data for internal and external use. Works with staff liaisons to SHRM Expertise Panels (SHRM volunteers from the SHRM membership) to seek input from panel members on survey projects related to panel expertise.

Designs survey instruments used to collect data on HR related topics and programs (using online survey software and Microsoft FrontPage) the online surveys for fielding. He/she pulls the sample of HR professionals from the SHRM membership data and in some cases works with an outside vendor to obtain an employee sample. The incumbent is involved in all aspects of the data management including the data collection process and performing data quality control including cleaning and preparing the data for analysis. The incumbent has decision-making responsibility over issues of data integrity and accuracy.

Designs the analysis plan and conducts the analysis using SPSS (a statistical software package). Creates figures and tables by interpreting the data. The incumbent produces written reports with HR content and conclusions drawn on sound empirical research from analysis of the survey results. These reports are printed and/or posted on SHRMOnline for use by organizations and HR departments. The incumbent works with other departments throughout SHRM to ensure that the research is disseminated through both print and online mediums. Responsible for review of materials posted on SHRMOnline and managing project related online postings. Works closely with Public Affairs to disseminate survey results to media and other appropriate external groups which may include acting as a SHRM spokesperson for media.

Works with outside organizations and/or academics, as necessary, serving =
as a liaison for SHRM partnerships on joint survey projects ensuring =
that partner organizations are appraised of each step of process.

Responds to member and non-member inquiries regarding SHRM research.

Assists in developing, documenting, and improving processes associated =
with various survey and research projects. May work on developing =
special projects which require development from the beginning and =
evaluation on a theoretical and operational basis for improvements and =
enhancements.

May work on special projects that require development and retention of =
survey panels (volunteers who agree to participate in the survey or =
series of surveys). Tasks associated with these types of projects may =
include maintaining communications with panel members (including =
personal contact via monthly phone calls), handling the removal of =
participants, recruiting of new participants and disseminating any =
incentive benefits.=20

Survey data may be compiled by the incumbent, if necessary, for =
presentation to SHRM departments, SHRM senior management and/or the =
Board. On occasion may act as a representative for SHRM at conferences =
held by SHRM and other organizations.

Stays abreast of current HR and employment trends including legal and =
economic trends such as new legislation, economic indicators and =
employment statistics. Able to interpret and explain trends.

Other duties may be assigned.

SUPERVISORY RESPONSIBILITIES=20

None. There may be occasional supervision of temporary personnel.

QUALIFICATIONS To perform this job successfully, an individual must be =
able to perform each essential duty satisfactorily. The requirements =
listed below are representative of the knowledge, skill, and/or ability =
required. Reasonable accommodations may be made to enable individuals =
with disabilities to perform the essential functions.

EDUCATION and/or EXPERIENCE=20

Requires a strong academic background. A minimum of a bachelor's degree =
is required. A minimum of 5-7 years overall experience with at least 4-5 =
years in a setting that conducts quantitative survey research is =
required. Knowledge of the HR profession as well as current economic =
indicators is preferred but not required. Incumbents should have solid =
experience with survey research methodology, instrument design, data =
collection and conducting data analysis using statistical analysis =
software. Experience with SPSS and familiarity with online survey tools =
is required.

Requires knowledge of Word, Excel, Power Point, statistical packages =
(such as SPSS) and other software applications. Knowledge of Microsoft =
FrontPage, Javascript and HTML also preferred. Experience with relational database applications including designing tables, queries, forms and reports are strongly preferred. Knowledge of SQL/Access/SQL Server is preferred. Programming experience (such as Visual Basic Applications) is preferred.

Must possess exemplary organizational skills, ability to balance multiple projects with changing priorities, working independently and in a team environment with attention to detail, strict adherence to deadlines and minimal supervision.

Strong written and oral communication skills required, including excellent writing, grammar, editing and customer service skills.

Must possess strong interpersonal skills and the ability to work with all levels of internal staff as well as outside professionals such as vendors, sponsors, partners and academics.

Requires analytical and problem solving skills. Ability to prioritize, plan and carry out responsibilities independently with minimal supervision. Requires considerable judgment and ability to perform duties in a confidential manner.

Excellent research and project management skills required, including comfort with numbers and statistics.

An understanding of HR functions, organizational/business processes and/or other relevant organizational/business systems is desirable.

PHYSICAL DEMANDS: The physical demands described here are representatives of those that must be met by an employee to successfully perform the essential functions of this job. Reasonable accommodations may be made to enable individuals with disabilities to perform the essential functions.

WORK ENVIRONMENT: The work environment characteristics described here are representative of those an employee encounters while performing the essential functions of this job. Reasonable accommodations may be made to enable individuals with disabilities to perform the essential functions.
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Date: Tue, 31 Jan 2006 10:01:54 -0500
Reply-To: Jennifer Agiesta <jenniferagiesta@BRSPOLL.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jennifer Agiesta <jenniferagiesta@BRSPOLL.COM>
Subject: Updates on Polling in Louisiana?
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
Not sure how much has changed since the last post on Louisiana surveys back in December, but if anyone's done any phone surveys in Louisiana since then and can share information on their experience with response rates/coverage, I'd really appreciate it. Thanks!

Jennifer Agiesta
Research Analyst/Field Manager
Belden Russonello & Stewart
1320 19th St. NW, Ste. 700
Washington, DC 20036
202-822-6090 (B)
202-822-6094 (F)
www.brspoll.com

Any updates on experiences with mail surveys would be appreciated as well.
Not sure how much has changed since the last post on Louisiana surveys back in December, but if anyone's done any phone surveys in Louisiana since then and can share information on their experience with response rates/coverage, I'd really appreciate it. Thanks!

Jennifer Agiesta
Research Analyst/Field Manager
Belden Russonello & Stewart
1320 19th St. NW, Ste. 700
Washington, DC 20036
202-822-6090 (B)
202-822-6094 (F)
www.brspoll.com
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Reply-To:     Jim Bason <jbason@ARCHES.UGA.EDU>
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Subject:      Question on Elderly
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
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Greetings,

A colleague of mine is interested in any literature on missing data/non-response among the elderly in mail and/or group administered surveys. If anyone has information on such literature I would be most appreciative to get that off list.

Sincerely,

Jim Bason

PLEASE NOTE NEW ADDRESS BELOW

James J. Bason, Ph.D.
Director and Associate Research Scientist
Survey Research Center
Office of Research Services
jbason@uga.edu
303A Stegeman Coliseum
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30606
706-542-9082
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I can't tell if this comment is meant to be serious, but whether it is or is not, it is completely beside the point.

There can be no question that the press should report on any serious survey, whether or not it is based on a probability sample. The problem that needs to be addressed is HOW surveys are identified and reported.

Unfortunately as long as the press considers "margin of error" to be the
mandatory seal of approval whenever survey results are mentioned, that
number will remain little more than an indicator of sample size, useless
as a measure of statistical significance without much more information.

The proportion of surveys using non-probability samples is likely to
increase greatly in the future (and for that matter, should an RDD with
85% coverage of its target population and a 40% response rate even be
considered a probability sample?). This means that we need to be working
on something more appropriate than "margin of error" as an indicator of
general survey reliability for reporting in the media.

Jan Werner

Edward P. Freeland wrote:
> "This online sample is not a probability sample."
> Shame on the NY Times for reporting results from a survey not based on a
> probability sample.
>
> Ed Freeland
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jan Werner
> Sent: Sunday, January 29, 2006 6:06 PM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: Misleading survey reporting
>
> On Wednesday, January 25, the NY Times carried an article reporting on a
> survey conducted for the American Association of University Women under
> the headline "One if Four College Students Cite Unwanted Sexual Contact
> in Survey."
>
>
> In the article one reads: "The online survey was conducted by Harris
> Interactive, which polled 2,036 students at two- and four-year colleges.
>
> It had a margin of error of plus or minus two percentage points."
>
> The actual news release from Harris Interactive can be obtained at
> .pdf
>
> As is their custom, HI provides a methodology statement which includes
> the following: "In theory, with probability samples of this size, one
> could say with 95 percent certainty that the overall results have a
> sampling error of +/- 2 percentage points. Sampling error for the
> sub-samples of (......) is higher and varies. This online sample is not
> a probability sample."
>
> I've noted before that this statement is cleverly crafted to provide
> those citing HI online surveys with a "margin of error" they can report
> while allowing HI to pretend that they never claimed that "margin of
> error” was appropriate.
> But the real problem is that news organizations insist that a "margin of
> error" must always be given for survey results. This forces reporters to
> quote false and misleading statistics if they want to provide results
> from any non-probability surveys, no matter how credible they may be.
> AAPOR has been negligent in failing to develop proper guidelines for
> reporting on non-probability surveys that would remedy this situation.
> This should be the highest priority for the organization.
>
> Jan Werner
>
> Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.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
>
> Conference info and call for papers: http://www.aapor.org/
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>
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> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>
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---

A colleague of mine has asked for some articles or books on nonresponse bias. He's going to be sending a customer satisfaction survey to the managers of divisions of an organization, and is concerned about skewness due to nonresponse. This also may be a repeated survey, and he is wondering about that aspect as well.

Does anyone have suggestions for classic (or otherwise authoritative) articles or books on these issues? All suggestions much appreciated.

---

Craig
Bit of a long shot, but does anyone have a citation for Peter van Westendorp's original work in developing his price sensitivity index =96 in English?

Thanks.

--
Mike Donatello
703.582.5680
HYPERLINK "mailto:MDonatello@cox.net"MDonatello@cox.net
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Quirks magazine recently published a directory of online research vendors with information on their panels. I did a quick tabulation of their sizes and found that in aggregate it went into the hundreds of millions. The following recruitment e-mail was sent to students at a midwestern university. It would appear there are problems with the composition of panels and the comprehension of panel members about their roles. $650 dollars per week is more than $33,000 per year! Not bad for a job that is "easy and rewarding." A Who Is on the sender of this message points to "Ivan Petrov" of Sofia (Bulgaria). This may be merely a scam to collect enrollment fees from gullible candidates, or it could indicate problems with the composition of panels claiming more participants than is plausible and/or representing them as recruited under less purposeful objectives.

Subject: Job for students

Dear Student,

I would like to offer you an exciting and well-paid job opportunity available to students from University of Chicago. Every year we recruit reliable and self-motivated young people to participate in research projects for prestigious local and international companies.

You can earn from $650 to $850 per week by saying what you think. You will participate in online surveys, focus groups, and product/service evaluations.

This job is easy and rewarding. All you need is a computer, Internet connection, and good English skills. You will be free to decide from the comfort of your home when to work, how much to work, and which assignments to take. If you like the job, you can keep it as long as you want!

To become part of the research team, please write back and I will be happy to send you more information.

Looking forward to hearing from you!

Sincerely,

Sarah Grant

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
J.P. MURPHY & COMPANY
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