

From: LISTS.ASU.EDU LISTSERV Server (16.0) [LISTSERV@asu.edu]  
Sent: Saturday, May 28, 2011 6:10 PM  
To: Shapard Wolf  
Subject: File: "AAPORNET LOG0602"

---

Date: Wed, 1 Feb 2006 07:42:48 -0500  
Reply-To: John Mitchell <john@BUZZBACK.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: John Mitchell <john@BUZZBACK.COM>  
Subject: Re: Recruiting for Online Panels  
Comments: To: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

This is a well known scam.

=20

John B. Mitchell  
Business Development  
Buzzback  
cell: 347 581 3863  
john@buzzback.com

---

From: AAPORNET on behalf of James P. Murphy  
Sent: Tue 1/31/2006 11:12 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Recruiting for Online Panels

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  
Post Office Box 80484  
Valley Forge, PA 19484-0484  
(610) 408-8800  
www.jpMurphy.com  
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

-----  
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

-----  
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: Wed, 1 Feb 2006 10:42:58 -0500  
Reply-To: "Lavrakas, Paul" <Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Lavrakas, Paul" <Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>  
Subject: Re: Updates on Polling in Louisiana?  
Comments: To: Jennifer Agiesta <jenniferagiستا@BRSPOLL.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

The director of our Call Centers, Bob Smith, tells me that we not doing any RDD phoning into the New Orleans metro area due to continued low coverage/contacts, but apart from that we are continuing our large national RDD surveys in all other areas impacted by 2005 hurricanes, including the rest of LA, and are not having any noticeable difficulties with lower than expected contact rates or lower than expected cooperation. PJL =20

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jennifer Agiesta  
Sent: Tuesday, January 31, 2006 10:02 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Updates on Polling in Louisiana?

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!

=20

Jennifer Agiesta

Research Analyst/Field Manager

=20

Belden Russonello & Stewart

1320 19th St. NW, Ste. 700

Washington, DC 20036

202-822-6090 (B)

202-822-6094 (F)

www.brspoll.com

=20

=20

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

---

Date: Wed, 1 Feb 2006 09:29:46 -0700  
Reply-To: Megan M Henly <[megan.m.henly@CENSUS.GOV](mailto:megan.m.henly@CENSUS.GOV)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Megan M Henly <[megan.m.henly@CENSUS.GOV](mailto:megan.m.henly@CENSUS.GOV)>  
Subject: literature comparing TYPES of monetary incentives

I'm looking for literature that compares different types of cash incentives (cash, checks, debit cards, gift cards, etc). I've found comparisons of gifts vs. cash, lotteries vs. cash, but none that compare different types of monetary incentives.

Any information would be appreciated. Please respond off the list.

Thanks,  
Megan Henly  
US Census Bureau  
[megan.m.henly@census.gov](mailto:megan.m.henly@census.gov)

---

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

---

Date: Wed, 1 Feb 2006 10:39:01 -0600  
Reply-To: [lynn.stalone@IHR-RESEARCH.COM](mailto:lynn.stalone@IHR-RESEARCH.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Lynn Stalone <[lynn.stalone@IHR-RESEARCH.COM](mailto:lynn.stalone@IHR-RESEARCH.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Updates on Polling in Louisiana?  
Comments: To: "Lavrakas, Paul" <[Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM](mailto:Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

We have just completed one study in New Orleans and will be fielding another within a week or so. We found residents very cooperative, although the subject matter was certainly of concern to people still living there.

Best regards,  
Lynn

Lynn Stalone  
Partner  
I/H/R Research Group  
[Lynn.Stalone@ihr-research.com](mailto:Lynn.Stalone@ihr-research.com)  
(714) 368-1885 direct  
(714) 368-1884 I/H/R Main

---

On Wed, 01 Feb 2006 10:42:58 -0500, "Lavrakas, Paul"

<Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM> wrote:

> The director of our Call Centers, Bob Smith, tells me that we not doing  
> any RDD phoning into the New Orleans metro area due to continued low  
> coverage/contacts, but apart from that we are continuing our large  
> national RDD surveys in all other areas impacted by 2005 hurricanes,  
> including the rest of LA, and are not having any noticeable difficulties  
> with lower than expected contact rates or lower than expected  
> cooperation. PJL

>

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

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

> Sent: Tuesday, January 31, 2006 10:02 AM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Updates on Polling in Louisiana?

>

> 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

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

> -----

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

Date: Wed, 1 Feb 2006 12:57:35 -0500  
Reply-To: "Info@PollingCompany" <[info@POLLINGCOMPANY.COM](mailto:info@POLLINGCOMPANY.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Info@PollingCompany" <[info@POLLINGCOMPANY.COM](mailto:info@POLLINGCOMPANY.COM)>  
Subject: Interviewing City Officials  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

We are interested in surveying various mayors, city council members, and =  
city attorneys across the US on behalf of a client. =20

1. Are there any sample houses that offer contact lists of such =  
officials?=20

2. Are there any professional interviewers who specialize in research =  
with these types of individuals?=20

Any recommendations or suggestions would be appreciated. Thank you.

=20

Shelley West  
Research Analyst  
the polling company(tm), inc./WomanTrend

202-667-6557  
[www.pollingcompany.com](http://www.pollingcompany.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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Wed, 1 Feb 2006 09:35:33 -0800  
Reply-To: "Fullmer, Pat" <[Pat.Fullmer@METROKC.GOV](mailto:Pat.Fullmer@METROKC.GOV)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Fullmer, Pat" <[Pat.Fullmer@METROKC.GOV](mailto:Pat.Fullmer@METROKC.GOV)>  
Subject: Re: literature comparing TYPES of monetary incentives  
Comments: To: Megan M Henly <[megan.m.henly@CENSUS.GOV](mailto:megan.m.henly@CENSUS.GOV)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"

please include me in your reply.

Thanks.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Megan M Henly  
Sent: Wednesday, February 01, 2006 8:30 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: literature comparing TYPES of monetary incentives

I'm looking for literature that compares different types of cash incentives (cash, checks, debit cards, gift cards, etc). I've found comparisons of gifts vs. cash, lotteries vs. cash, but none that compare different types of monetary incentives.

Any information would be appreciated. Please respond off the list.

Thanks,  
Megan Henly  
US Census Bureau  
megan.m.henly@census.gov

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

---

Date: Wed, 1 Feb 2006 13:08:25 -0500  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Subject: Not a push poll  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Mayors attack water company's 'push polls'=20  
By MIKE MONSON  
(c) 2006 THE NEWS-GAZETTE  
Published Online January 28, 2006

CHAMPAIGN - The mayors of Champaign and Urbana came out swinging Friday against Illinois American Water Co., charging that telephone surveys the company conducted this week were "push polls" designed to turn residents against the possibility of the cities purchasing the local water system.=20

SNIP

Neil Newhouse, a partner in Public Opinion Strategies, said the surveys asked 49 questions. Many were about the quality of local water service. Some were about the cities' interest in purchasing the system.=20

Customers also were asked if they approve of the job local officials, like Schweighart and Prussing, are doing, he said.

"A push poll is when you, under the guise of a poll, communicate negative information, usually in less than 30 seconds," Newhouse said. "This was a 49-question survey."

SNIP

<http://www.news-gazette.com/localnews/story.cfm?Number=3D19784>

or

<http://tinyurl.com/a58fl>

--=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/>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

-----  
Date: Wed, 1 Feb 2006 13:20:51 -0500

Reply-To: Heather Contrino <[hcontrino@NUSTATS.COM](mailto:hcontrino@NUSTATS.COM)>

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

From: Heather Contrino <[hcontrino@NUSTATS.COM](mailto:hcontrino@NUSTATS.COM)>

Organization: NuStats

Subject: Job Posting

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

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Posting on behalf of my colleague at the Chicago Transit Authority:

The Chicago Transit Authority is currently recruiting qualified candidates for the Manager of Market Research position. CTA's Manager of Market Research is a member of the Planning Department and oversees a



staff of four. This group coordinates all market research efforts for the authority. Their work includes short-turnaround survey research geared towards specific transit service changes (route-level surveys), larger scale consultant-led surveys (such as system-wide customer satisfaction or corridor level market analysis), and assisting with planning and policy analysis efforts more generally.

Market research professionals who are interested in this public transit industry opportunity may please contact me at [jsriver@transitchicago.com](mailto:jsriver@transitchicago.com), and I can follow up with more details by phone and email.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Sriver

\*\*\*\*\*

Jeffrey Sriver

General Manager, Strategic Planning

Chicago Transit Authority

567 W. Lake Street

P.O. Box 7602

Chicago, IL 60680-7602

tel 312-681-4220

fax 312-681-4297

[jsriver@transitchicago.com](mailto:jsriver@transitchicago.com)

Heather Contrino

Director

NuStats

2034 Eisenhower Avenue, Suite 100

Alexandria, VA 22314

703-739-2727 ext. 10

[hcontrino@nustats.com](mailto:hcontrino@nustats.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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Wed, 1 Feb 2006 11:08:17 -0800  
Reply-To: "Ken Pick - GMI (Seattle)" <[kpick@GMI-MR.COM](mailto:kpick@GMI-MR.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Ken Pick - GMI (Seattle)" <[kpick@GMI-MR.COM](mailto:kpick@GMI-MR.COM)>  
Organization: Global Market Insite  
Subject: Re: Interviewing City Officials  
Comments: To: "Info@PollingCompany" <[info@POLLINGCOMPANY.COM](mailto:info@POLLINGCOMPANY.COM)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[33F9270EF21F4A47B0CCAEB4C87ED107016E7CF9@POLLING2003.pollingcompany.local](mailto:33F9270EF21F4A47B0CCAEB4C87ED107016E7CF9@POLLING2003.pollingcompany.local)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Hi Shelly,  
I work with CEO's for Cities (their membership includes many mayors, city officials, etc.) for our city brands index research - perhaps I could put you in touch with them?  
Ken

--  
Kenneth M. Pick <[kpick@gmi-mr.com](mailto:kpick@gmi-mr.com)>  
Director, GMI Poll (GMI, Inc.)  
Direct: +1 206-315-9315 (int. 00-1-206-315-9315)  
Cell: +1 206-992-7541 (int. 00-1-206-992-7541)  
Fax: +1 206-315-9301 (int. 00-1-206-315-9301)

Integrated Solutions for Market Intelligence

Stormy outlook for some Consumer Electronics Brands. Find out which ones on January 5, 2006 at [www.brandbarometer.com](http://www.brandbarometer.com)!

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

From: AAPORNET [[mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)] On Behalf Of [Info@PollingCompany](mailto:Info@PollingCompany)  
Sent: Wednesday, February 01, 2006 9:58 AM  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Subject: Interviewing City Officials

We are interested in surveying various mayors, city council members, and city attorneys across the US on behalf of a client.

1. Are there any sample houses that offer contact lists of such officials?
2. Are there any professional interviewers who specialize in research with these types of individuals?

Any recommendations or suggestions would be appreciated. Thank you.

Shelley West  
Research Analyst  
the polling company(tm), inc./WomanTrend

202-667-6557  
www.pollingcompany.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](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

---

Date: Wed, 1 Feb 2006 12:47:47 -0800  
Reply-To: Betsy Strick <[bstrick@PSY.UCSD.EDU](mailto:bstrick@PSY.UCSD.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Betsy Strick <[bstrick@PSY.UCSD.EDU](mailto:bstrick@PSY.UCSD.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: literature comparing TYPES of monetary incentives  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[LISTSERV%200602010929466880.38B6@LISTS.ASU.EDU](mailto:LISTSERV%200602010929466880.38B6@LISTS.ASU.EDU)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Please include me in your replies, too.

At 08:29 AM 2/1/2006, Megan M Henly wrote:

>I'm looking for literature that compares different types of cash incentives  
>(cash, checks, debit cards, gift cards, etc). I've found comparisons of  
>gifts vs. cash, lotteries vs. cash, but none that compare different types  
>of monetary incentives.

>  
>Any information would be appreciated. Please respond off the list.

>  
>Thanks,  
>Megan Henly  
>US Census Bureau  
>[megan.m.henly@census.gov](mailto:megan.m.henly@census.gov)

---

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

Date: Wed, 1 Feb 2006 20:44:01 -0500  
Reply-To: Rich Clark <[clark@CUIOG.UGA.EDU](mailto:clark@CUIOG.UGA.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Rich Clark <[clark@CUIOG.UGA.EDU](mailto:clark@CUIOG.UGA.EDU)>  
Subject: Job posting  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

\*Research Professional II\*

\*Survey Research and Data Services Unit\*

\*Carl Vinson Institute of Government\*

\*University\*\* of Georgia\*\*\*

The Carl Vinson Institute of Government invites applications for a Research Coordinator in the Survey Research and Data Services Unit of the Policy Research and Analysis Division. Review of applications will begin immediately and continue until a qualified applicant is hired. This position seeks applicants with a Masters degree, survey research experience and academic training in the Social Sciences.

The successful candidate will be familiar with questionnaire design, basic sampling methods, and data analysis. Familiarity with SPSS is essential. The selected candidate will work in the Survey Research Unit, assisting faculty and working with external clients on survey research projects. Successful applicants will also demonstrate the ability to write clearly and concisely.

To apply, go to the University of Georgia Human Resources web site (<http://www.busfin.uga.edu/employment/>) - see job #200602006. For more information about the Carl Vinson Institute of Government, visit our website (<http://www.cviog.uga.edu> <<http://www.cviog.uga.edu/>>).

The University of Georgia is an Equal

Opportunity/Affirmative Action Institution.

(\*<http://tinyurl.com/8bewq>\*)

--

---

Richard L. Clark, Ph.D.  
Director of Peach State Poll  
Manager of Survey Research Unit  
Carl Vinson Institute of Government  
University of Georgia  
201 N. Milledge Avenue  
Athens, GA 30602  
(706) 542-2736

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

Date: Thu, 2 Feb 2006 10:09:15 -0600  
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Subject: Job Opportunity  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Comments: cc: [lmarion@cmgrp.com](mailto:lmarion@cmgrp.com)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

KRC RESEARCH, a unit of the Interpublic Group of Companies (NYSE: IPG) is seeking to hire a Project Director in its Boston or Washington, DC office. =20

=20

KRC conducts quantitative and qualitative opinion research for a wide range of corporate and non-profit clients, with particular expertise in communications research to support public relations, public affairs, and social marketing campaigns.

=20

The successful candidate will have at least five to seven years of work experience in the field of opinion research, including experience with sampling, questionnaires, moderators' guides, coding and data processing, graphing data, and drafting reports. Candidate will also have experience managing client and team projects. Strong writing and analytic skills are required. Knowledge of SPSS and skill with

PowerPoint are a plus. Candidates must have a minimum of a bachelor's degree. Advanced degrees, focus group facilitation experience and/or specific training in survey research and statistics are preferred.=20

=20

The position is located in Boston or Washington DC.

=20

Please send resume and cover letter to:

=20

Recruitment Director

KRC Research

Fax 202-585-2078

E-mail: [jobs@krcresearch.com](mailto:jobs@krcresearch.com)

=20

No phone calls, please.

=20

=20

=20

-----  
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.

=====  
Date: Thu, 2 Feb 2006 12:45:14 -0500  
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>  
Subject: Fwd: CEPR Study Finds Labor Dept. Overstates Share of Working Americans

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

MIME-version: 1.0

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

[of interest to AAPORites?]

A new study by Center for Economic and Policy Research economists John Schmitt and Dean Baker found that the Current Population Survey, the source of the government's most important statistics on the labor market, may be overstating the share of working Americans by 1.4

percentage points (roughly 3 million people).

The study found that the CPS overstates employment rates for blacks by about 2 percentage points, with the gap for younger black men as high as 8 percentage points. The CPS also appears to be overstating employment rates of younger Hispanic women by about the same margin, and younger Hispanic men by 3 to 6 percentage points.

In the coming weeks CEPR will be holding discussions on the implications of this overstatement in terms of measuring health coverage, unemployment and poverty rates. Please contact Liz Chimienti at (202) 293-5380 x110 or [chimienti@cepr.net](mailto:chimienti@cepr.net) if you would like more information.

## STUDY FINDS CPS OVERSTATES SHARE OF WORKING AMERICANS BY 1.4 PERCENTAGE POINTS

Washington, DC - The most important source of data on the U.S. labor market may be systematically overstating employment, according to a new report by the Center for Economic and Policy Research. The report, "Missing Inaction: Evidence of Undercounting of Non-Workers in the Current Population Survey (CPS)," found that the CPS appears to be overstating the share of American adults who are working by about 1.4 percentage points.

The report by economists John Schmitt and Dean Baker noted that a large and growing portion of the population does not respond to the CPS, and that the non-responders appear less likely to be employed than people who take the survey. This overstatement is significant because the CPS is the source for the government's most important statistics on the labor market, including the unemployment rate, poverty rate and health-insurance coverage.

"Current labor market estimates appear to be overstating the share of working Americans by 1.4 percentage points. This corresponds to roughly 3 million fewer people working - almost as big a drop in employment as in a typical recession," said John Schmitt, CEPR economist and lead author of the report.

The study assessed employment rates among non-responders by comparing employment rates in the CPS with employment rates in the 2000 Census. In 2000, 8 percent of the population did not respond to the CPS. In contrast, only 2 percent did not respond to the 2000 Census. After adjusting for the errors in reported employment in the Census data (and excluding the prison population), the study found that employment rates were 1.4 percent lower overall in the Census than in the CPS.

The study also found that the CPS overstates employment rates for blacks by about 2 percentage points, with the gap for younger black men as high as 8 percentage points. The CPS also appears to be overstating employment rates of younger Hispanic women by about the same margin, and younger Hispanic men by 3 to 6 percentage points.

Since the CPS is also the source of official statistics on poverty rates and health-insurance coverage, the report warns that these widely reported numbers could also be overly optimistic. Non-working adults are more likely to be in poverty and less likely to be covered by health insurance. Therefore, if non-working adults are disproportionately excluded from the CPS, then the survey is understating the true poverty rate and overstating the share of the population covered by health insurance.

The Current Population Survey is a monthly survey of households conducted by the Bureau of Census for the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

To read the report, see:

<[http://cepr.net/publications/undercounting\\_cps\\_2006\\_01.pdf](http://cepr.net/publications/undercounting_cps_2006_01.pdf)>

-----  
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.

=====  
Date: Thu, 2 Feb 2006 14:34:23 -0500

Reply-To: [pd@kerr-downs.com](mailto:pd@kerr-downs.com)

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

From: Phillip Downs <[pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM](mailto:pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM)>

Subject: Internet surveys

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

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Earlier this week, there was a thread about stating sampling errors for internet surveys. Presuming everyone agrees that sampling errors cannot and should not be associated with internet surveys, what measure of "validity" should or can be associated with internet surveys. Second, many would argue that RDD probability samples are superior to internet samples. Being able to reference a sampling error is presumably part of this claim along with other issues. Given the incidence of cell only households, given the low cooperation rates we get to telephone surveys, given the screening mechanisms people use to avoid our calls, where is the evidence that suggests that RDD telephone surveys provide better data than internet surveys? Does anyone have empirical (as opposed to theoretical) evidence? Does anyone have evidence that shows the predictive ability of these two methods side-by-side. The market research industry is trending heavily toward internet surveys. Will government and political surveying be far behind. I'm interested to see any comparative figures for predictive capabilities or validity, otherwise established, for internet surveys vs. RDD telephone surveys given all of the compromises we make these days with the latter.

Thanks, Philli

Phillip E. Downs, PhD

Partner, Kerr & Downs Research



Professor of Marketing, FSU  
2992 Habersham Drive  
Tallahassee, FL 32309  
Phone: 850.906.3111  
Fax: 850.906.3112  
www.kerr-downs.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.  
=====

Date: Thu, 2 Feb 2006 16:42:50 -0500  
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>  
Subject: Explanation of Palestinian Exit Poll error  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Here is an explanation of the exit poll error for=20  
the Palestinian election last week. Sorry that=20  
the tables did not come through in readable format.  
warren mitofsky

>[]

>

>The Polling Issue: Is it a Problem of the Poll Centers

>

>or the Change of Attitudes ?

>A Preliminary Study

>

>Prepared by: Dr. Nabil Kukali

>

> In fact, what draw my attention and=20  
> urged me to conduct this survey is my watching=20  
> a TV discussion on Al-Jazeera Channel Thursday,=20  
> 26/1/2006, about the preliminary results of the=20  
> PLC-election the day before. Upon the question=20  
> of Al-Jazeera correspondent to the Director of=20  
> the Research Center at Al-Najah University,=20  
> Nablus, about the public opinion polls, the=20  
> spontaneous reaction of the audience on that=20  
> question was ironical and expressing merely=20  
> skepticism and incredulity towards the results=20  
> of the announced public opinion polls. It=20  
> seemed to me that some of the attendants of the=20  
> TV discussion were just lurking for the poll=20  
> centers and wishing their failure. This=20  
> doesn't however mean that there is no alert=20  
> public appreciating the work of the poll=20  
> centers, and educated leaderships, who trust=20

> the results of these polls and appraise the=20  
> efforts and pains these polling centers take=20  
> upon themselves for the building of a=20  
> Palestinian democratic society. For this=20  
> reason, and in my capacity as a pollster, I=20  
> find myself obliged to give my opinion frankly and honestly.

>  
> The process of investigating the=20  
> Palestinian public opinion in order to know its=20  
> notions and directions about the elections=20  
> gives the people the chance to freely express=20  
> their wishes and the opportunity to show their=20  
> support or sympathy to the candidates and=20  
> parties. It furthermore helps the politicians=20  
> to assess their positions in the Palestinian=20  
> street, understand the motivations of the=20  
> voters and the issues that satisfy or displease=20  
> them. In addition, the polling provides the=20  
> politicians with the information on how far the=20  
> voters accept their programs and obtain=20  
> information about the voters, who will likely=20  
> support them, even if they are not supporting=20  
> them at the moment. We, in the Palestinian=20  
> territories, are lucky to have many polling=20  
> centers, and we may be distinguished from other=20  
> countries in the region by the presence of=20  
> these centers, which in other countries hardly=20  
> play an important role in the formation of the=20  
> political life. We, as polling centers in the=20  
> Palestinian territories, have played and still=20  
> play a significant role in the public life,=20  
> without any intervention in our internal=20  
> affairs, neither from the side of the=20  
> Palestinian Authority, nor from the side of the=20  
> opposition, and that since the date of our=20  
> foundation; an evidence that democracy in all=20  
> its forms is not a mere talking, but also a=20  
> practice, and that what really emerged from the=20  
> legislative elections some days ago.

>  
> In this context, I would like here=20  
> first to point out that most of the results the=20  
> polling and research centers obtained prior to=20  
> the legislative elections held on Wednesday,=20  
> January 25th, 2006, were very close to each=20  
> other. Fateh's rate was fluctuating between=20  
> (39.6 %) and (42 %), which is still within the=20  
> margin of error. For Hamas it was between (29=20  
> %) and (35%), which lies also on the tolerated=20  
> edge of the margin of error. In other words,=20  
> there were no grave discrepancies between the local poll centers.

>  
> Now, in my capacity as founder of the=20  
> Palestinian Center for Public Opinion (PCPO) in=20

> Beit Sahour and the person responsible for it,=20  
> I want to talk about the last poll ( poll no.=20  
> 149 ) PCPO has conducted in the period from=20  
> January 18th to 21st, 2006 and published on=20  
> January 23rd, 2006, five days before the=20  
> legislative elections. The poll is covered by a=20  
> random sample of (2,389) adults over 18 years=20  
> old, representing the various demographic=20  
> strata in the West Bank, including=20  
> <?xml:namespace prefix =3D st1 ns =3D=20  
> "urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:smarttags"=20  
> />East Jerusalem, and Gaza Strip. All the=20  
> interviews were carried out face-to-face inside=20  
> the respondents' homes, which were randomly=20  
> chosen according to PCPO's long experienced=20  
> scientific methodology. The margin of error was=20  
> (=B12.0 %) at a level of confidence of (95 %).=20  
> That means that the error in the sample is plus=20  
> or minus 2 point percent. A level of confidence=20  
> of (95 %) means that (2.5%) of the cases are=20  
> very much higher than the average, and (2.5%)=20  
> are very much lower than the average; the rest,=20  
> (95 %), is the percentage of the results, which=20  
> lie within the error range of the sample=20  
> choice. The aforementioned (5%) rate, which=20  
> lies very far from the average, represents the=20  
> only probability of the poll results being outside the margin of error.

>  
>Reverting to poll no. (149), the target of which=20  
>was to investigate the public opinion about the=20  
>election of the proportional lists only, which=20  
>are also called the "national lists, and not the=20  
>electorate districts (election of individuals).

>  
>Compared with the real election outcome, we find=20  
>out that most of the lists, with the exception=20  
>of Hamas lists, obtained similar results and lie=20  
>within the margin of error and the level of confidence.

>  
>The results were in detail as follows:

>  
>Table (1)

>  
>PCPO-poll no. 149

>  
>Real results

>  
>Name of the list

>  
>%

>  
>Number of seats

>  
>%

>  
>Number of seats  
>  
>1. The Alternative List (DFLP, People's Party, "FIDA") ( Al Badeel)  
>  
>7.2  
>  
>4  
>  
>3.0  
>  
>2  
>  
>2. National Initiative List (Independent Palestine)  
>  
>7.7  
>  
>5  
>  
>3.0  
>  
>2  
>  
>3. List of Martyr Abu Ali Mustafa (PFLP)  
>  
>  
>  
>4.9  
>  
>3  
>  
>4.5  
>  
>3  
>  
>4. List of Martyr Abu El-Abbas  
>  
> (Palestinian Liberation Front)  
>  
>0.8  
>  
>-----  
>  
>-----  
>  
>-----  
>  
>5. List of Freedom and Social Justice  
>  
> (Popular Struggle Front)  
>  
>0.8  
>  
>-----

>  
>-----  
>  
>-----  
>  
>6. List of Change and Reform ( Hamas)

>  
>  
>  
>  
>28.8  
>  
>19  
>  
>43.9  
>  
>29  
>

>7. List of National Coalition for Justice and Democracy (Independent)

>  
>0.8  
>  
>---  
>  
>-----  
>  
>-----  
>

>8. List of the Third Way (Independent), headed=20  
>by Salam Fayyad and Hanan Ashrawi.

>  
>4.7  
>  
>3  
>  
>3.0  
>  
>2  
>

>9. List of Freedom and Independence  
>  
> (ArabPalestinian Front)

>  
>0.7  
>  
>-----  
>  
>-----  
>  
>-----  
>

>10. List of Palestinian Justice (Independent)

>  
>  
>

>0.8

>

>----

>

>----

>

>----

>

>11. List of the Palestinian National Liberation Movement (FATEH)

>

>39.6

>

>26

>

>42.4

>

>28

>

>12. Didn't decide yet.

>

>

>

>3.3

>

>2

>

>----

>

>----

>

> Upon the analysis of the real outcome=20

> and those of poll no. (149), one can easily=20

> establish a discrepancy between the poll=20

> results and Hamas overwhelming victory in the=20

> elections held on Wednesday, Jan. 25th, 2006.=20

> That may be attributable to the following reasons:

>

>01.) Voters did not tell the pollsters, neither=20

>in the pre-election polls nor in the exit polls,=20

>their true and honest intentions on whom they=20

>really wanted to vote for. The reason is that=20

>the independent voters, who were up to the last=20

>moment uncertain, decided eventually for Hamas.=20

>Add thereto those voters, who were cross with=20

>the other parties and factions, especially with=20

>Fateh, were scared to admit that because they=20

>feared for their social or economical position.=20

>I would like in this context to quote the=20

>journalist Khairiyyeh Radwan Yahia from the=20

>website "Status of the Homeland" (Dunia=20

>al-Watan) that : "there were rumours spread among=20

>my compatriots pretending that whoever elects=20

>Hamas will not receive his salary, or will no=20

>longer be in such a post or in such a position.=20

>We shouldn't forget, that there are people cross=20  
>with their traditional parties or factions,=20  
>which were always reflecting their real notions,=20  
>wishes and aspirations. These people, being now=20  
>disappointed, elect another party which is=20  
>really not of their affinity, but they don't say=20  
>that openly. All these things and many others=20  
>effect the credibility of the respondent and=20  
>mislead the field researcher to incorrect results."

>  
>In this context I would also like to quote Sarah=20  
>El-Deeb, an AP writer, who wrote in a news=20  
>article published on 26/1/2006 under the heading=20  
>"Palestinian Premier, Cabinet resigns": "=85..=20  
>Some voters also said they were afraid to admit=20  
>to pollsters that they supported=20  
>Hamas". Another reason may be attributable to=20  
>the customs and traditions in the Palestinian=20  
>society, particularly the courtesy between the=20  
>voter and the candidates and the wish to please=20  
>everybody. We, as a polling center, deal with=20  
>concrete data and figures and are not in the=20  
>position to predict the internal feelings of the=20  
>people. Our outcome is based on the response of=20  
>the public to definite questions, but the public=20  
>chose not to show their real intentions.

>  
>02.) The change of the voters' opinion at the=20  
>last moment can be reverted to many=20  
>factors. First and foremost, a big rate of=20  
>about (77 %) of the voters are, in fact,=20  
>independents or sympathizers of political=20  
>organizations, and are not traditionally=20  
>affiliated to a definite party. They have=20  
>therefore no problem in changing their mind in=20  
>the last minute if extraordinary factors were=20  
>provided, such as the conviction by a member of=20  
>the family or the clan to vote for a definite=20  
>candidate. Add thereto, (8%) of the Palestinian=20  
>society are illiterate and may therefore be=20  
>easily influenced by the opinion of other family=20  
>members, especially at the moment of balloting.

>  
>Women may also be very much influenced by the=20  
>opinion of the family man on the Election Day, a=20  
>condition which is definitely excluded when=20  
>conducting the interview face-to-face by the=20  
>pollster, for the family man cannot interfere in=20  
>the filling up of the questionnaire form. Ms.=20  
>Badia Rabi' says at the Website "Canaan": "The=20  
>woman participated intensively in the=20  
>legislative elections and was motivated to do so=20  
>by her own role or by the conviction of the=20  
>husband, or upon exerting his pressure on=20

>her=85.etc. The result was an overwhelming victory=20  
>for Hamas, one beyond all expectations, to the=20  
>extent that some people grasped the theory of=20  
>conspiracy to explain that phenomenon; for=20  
>example: that Hamas demanded from its followers=20  
>and activists not to admit in the pre-election=20  
>polls that they shall vote for Hamas as to=20  
>mislead Fateh to the belief that Fateh is in the foreground of the race".

>  
>03.) A considerable rate of the voters=20  
>made up their mind to vote against Fateh by=20  
>casting their votes to the favour of Hamas and=20  
>not to other smaller parties or party=20  
>coalitions, for they believe that the latter=20  
>will be unable to effect a substantial change in=20  
>the electoral representation. That's what=20  
>actually happened to the List of Alternative,=20  
>the List of Independent Palestine and List of=20  
>the Third Way. Most of the polls pointed out=20  
>that the List of Independent Palestine will come=20  
>in the third position after Fateh and Hamas. Due=20  
>however to the feeling of the uncertain=20  
>independent voter that these lists will not cope=20  
>with Fateh, he changed his attitude and elected Hamas list.

>  
>04.) Voters supporting different=20  
>streams did not abide by the lists of their=20  
>candidates and voted randomly. For example, the=20  
>List of Independent Palestine obtained (2,009)=20  
>votes in Bethlehem governorate, while its top=20  
>candidate scored a much higher figure, namely=20  
>(3,556) votes, and the second candidate only=20  
>(907) votes. The same applies to the List of=20  
>Alternative, which received (3,200) votes in=20  
>Bethlehem governorate, where its top independent=20  
>candidate obtained (4,219) votes and the next to=20  
>him (2,145) votes. The question emerging from=20  
>the context is how to explain that, and how can=20  
>it be applied to the poll results.

>  
>05.) In regard to the independent=20  
>lists like Independent Palestine and the Third=20  
>Way, these are relatively new lists formed by=20  
>personalities of different political=20  
>inclinations and affinities, who lack a firm=20  
>strategy that may attract the Palestinian voter.=20  
>This, by its part, wearied the voter and turned him to Hamas.

>  
>06.) With respect to the List of=20  
>Alternative (Al-Badeel), we can perceive that it=20  
>was able to convince more than (7%) of the=20  
>Palestinians of its credibility. However the=20  
>lack of stability before the elections and the=20  
>skepticism of the voter towards its ability to=20



>continue, had contributed to the reluctance of=20  
>the voters to ballot for it in the last minute and to vote instead for=20  
 Hamas.

>  
>07.) As for the lists of Fateh and the martyr=20  
>Abu Ali Mustafa, their results came consistent=20  
>with that of poll no. (149), and that due to the=20  
>inability of each of them to influence the=20  
>independent voters to ballot for them. Both=20  
>lists obtained just the support of their true=20  
>followers. In addition, Fateh's internal=20  
>divisions and infight weakened the party and=20  
>were of great benefit to Hamas. For example,=20  
>Fateh obtained in Bethlehem governorate (21,285)=20  
>votes, which are equal to (44%) of the cast=20  
>votes, whilst Hamas scored (14,967) votes, i.e.=20  
>(31.9%) of the yield. This means that Fateh had=20  
>a surplus of (6,318) votes more than Hamas,=20  
>which means a plus of (12.1%) for Fateh. The=20  
>top Moslem candidates on Fateh list obtained=20  
>(14,490) and (13,946) votes respectively, which=20  
>makes an average of (14,218) votes. Hamas top=20  
>candidates obtained (17,274) and (15,923) votes=20  
>respectively, i.e. an average of (16,598) votes.=20  
>By comparing now the average of votes Fateh=20  
>candidates obtained with the total of the votes=20  
>cast for Fateh on the propositional=20  
>representation list (national list), we=20  
>establish a deficit of (7,058) votes less than=20  
>on the list. The question is: where did these=20  
>votes go to? Did they go to the independents or=20  
>to Hamas? If we subtract the number of Hamas=20  
>votes on the national list from the number of=20  
>votes Hamas top candidate obtained, we get the=20  
>difference of (2,307) votes (17,274=96 14,967).=20  
> From where came these votes ? And how can one=20  
>explain that the secretary of Fateh in Bethlehem=20  
>governorate, the candidate for the 'Christian=20  
>seat,' obtained (8,667) votes and the other=20  
>Christian candidate (8,368) votes out of=20  
>(21,285) votes?! If Fateh traditional followers=20  
>didn't abide by their own list, how will they=20  
>then vote in the polls?!!! And why should we=20  
>burden the polls with things beyond their=20  
>capacities, whilst the votes themselves don't=20  
>stick to their lists and candidates?

>  
>08.) It seems that there is an ambiguity in the=20  
>public understanding of the election system in=20  
>Palestine. (66) Parliament seats are allocated=20  
>to the elections in the electoral districts=20  
>(election of individuals on the district list )=20  
>and (66) seats for the proportional=20  
>representation system, which means election of=20

>one list at the national level. The two systems=20  
>make up the total number of Parliament seats, which is (132).

>  
>On examining the results of both systems, we=20  
>found out that there is a big discrepancy in=20  
>voting for the various lists. For example, Fateh=20  
>list obtained (42.4%) of the seats in the=20  
>proportional representation system against=20  
>(28.5%) in the electoral district=20  
>election. Hamas, on the other side, attained=20  
>(43.9%) in the proportional representation and=20  
>(68.2%) in the electoral=20  
>district. Consequently, Fateh obtained (34.1%)=20  
>of the total number of seats, while Hamas scored=20  
>(56.1%) thereof. ( Vide table no. 2 ).

>  
> We conclude from all the afore-mentioned,=20  
> particularly from the election outcome, that=20  
> the voter is lacking a clear insight into the=20  
> Palestinian parties and their political and=20  
> economic agendas. The balloting for the=20  
> candidates is carried out randomly as to please=20  
> all of them. For example, some people thinking=20  
> that they are in principle neutral and don't=20  
> want to side with any party, believed that the=20  
> can please Hamas and the independent candidates=20  
> by voting for them in the electoral districts,=20  
> and at the same time can please Fateh by voting=20  
> for it on the national list. Furthermore, the=20  
> personal image of the candidates in the=20  
> electoral districts seemed to play an important=20  
> role, regardless of their political=20  
> program. The candidates of Hamas, for example,=20  
> were able to score (68.2%) of the votes against (25.8%) for Fateh.

>  
> The Palestinian people gave Hamas far more=20  
> support than Fateh, because they believed that=20  
> Hamas candidates are more competent for their=20  
> representation and for carrying out the=20  
> required domestic reforms. Furthermore, many=20  
> former Fateh followers ran the election as=20  
> independent candidates, dispersing thereby the=20  
> votes, which were originally thought to come to=20  
> Fateh, in all possible directions. On the other=20  
> hand, Hamas nominated in each district a=20  
> reasonable number of candidates, which stood in=20  
> an adequate proportion to the number of the available Parliament seats.

>  
>Dr. Mohammed Dajjani commented the election=20  
>results at the website "The Palestinian Economy"=20  
>saying:" Actually the polls were right in the=20  
>percentages they gave of Fateh winning with two=20  
>thirds, and Hamas getting only one third. In=20  
>reality that is exactly what happened. If you=20

>take the votes given to Fateh, including those=20  
>Fateh renegades who ran as independent=20  
>candidates, you will find that Fateh got two=20  
>thirds of the votes. So it was actually election=20  
>mismanagement. Also, if you look at the votes in=20  
>Jerusalem, five candidates withdrew yet because=20  
>of inefficiency. Their names appeared on the=20  
>ballot and each got a thousand votes. If their=20  
>names were not on the ballot, at least two Fateh=20  
>candidates would have won. If the other=20  
>so-called Fateh independent candidates did not=20  
>run, more Fateh candidates would have won,=20  
>though some of them should not have been=20  
>candidates in the first place, since they are not Jerusalem residents".

>  
>In the light of these factors and facts, how can=20  
>the results of the poll samples then coincide=20  
>with the election outcome? Is the actual=20  
>problem in the public opinion polls, or is it a=20  
>problem of adherence to one's parties and=20  
>political movements? I think, there is, indeed,=20  
>a pressing need to answer this question.

>  
>  
>  
>Table (2)

>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>Name of the list

>  
>Number of seats proportional representation

>  
>  
>  
>  
>%

>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>Number of seats electoral district election

>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>%

>  
>Total of seats

>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>

>%

>

>1

>

>List of Change and Reform ( Hamas)

>

>29

>

>43.9%

>

>45

>

>68.2%

>

>74

>

>56.1%

>

>2

>

>List of the Palestinian National Liberation Movement (FATEH)

>

>28

>

>42.4%

>

>17

>

>25.8%

>

>45

>

>34.1%

>

>3

>

>List of Martyr Abu Ali Mustafa (PFLP)

>

>3

>

>4.6%

>

>0

>

>0%

>

>3

>

>2.3%

>

>4

>

>List of the Third Way Independent headed by Salam Fayyad and Hanan Ashrawi.

>

>2  
>  
>3.0%  
>  
>0  
>  
>0%  
>  
>2  
>  
>1.5%  
>  
>5  
>  
>The Alternative List (DFLP, People's Party, "FIDA")  
>  
>( Al Badeel)  
>  
>2  
>  
>3.0%  
>  
>0  
>  
>0%  
>  
>2  
>  
>1.5%  
>  
>6  
>  
>National Initiative List (Independent Palestine)  
>  
>2  
>  
>3.0%  
>  
>0  
>  
>0%  
>  
>2  
>  
>1.5%  
>  
>7  
>  
>Independence  
>  
>  
>  
>0  
>

>0%

>

>4

>

>6.0%

>

>4

>

>3.0%

>

>09.) If we cast a view to the other lists, such=20

>as the list of Martyr Abu El-Abbas (Palestinian=20

>Liberation Front), list of Freedom and Social=20

>Justice (Popular Struggle Front), list of=20

>National Coalition for Justice and Democracy=20

>(Independent), list of Freedom and Independence=20

>(Arab Palestinian Front) and the list of=20

>Palestinian Justice (Independent), we will see=20

>that the actual election outcome is to a great extent compatible

>

>with the pre-election poll results, namely their=20

>failure to obtain the required passing rate due=20

>to the ignorance of the public of some of them=20

>and the absence of a broad public or party basis for them.

>

>10.) The big number of the independent=20

>candidates in the electoral districts (election=20

>of individuals) has somehow confused the voters.=20

>Consequently, the election process of their=20

>candidates became very difficult, the matter=20

>which led to the dispersion of the votes between=20

>the candidates. For example, the highest top=20

>candidate in Bethlehem governorate scored=20

>(17,274) votes, while the lowest obtained (230)=20

>votes only. In such cases is the predictive=20

>capacity of the polling and research centers very limited.

>

>11.) The polling literature reveals the fact=20

>that the voter in his nature is uncertain and=20

>casts his vote usually to the favor of the=20

>defiant candidate. Whereas now the post-holding=20

>candidate is normally better known to the public=20

>than his challenger, the uncertain voter would=20

>rather cast his vote to the favor of the "new"=20

>candidate than to the known "old" one as to=20

>satisfy his wish for change. The independent=20

>uncertain voter is therefore in many elections=20

>an uncontrollable card, and that's what really=20

>happened to Fateh and Hamas, for the uncertain=20

>voters, who came up to (4%) in the poll, gave in=20

>the election most of their votes to Hamas and not to Fateh.

>

>12.) Another reason for the discrepancies in the=20

>poll results may be attributed to the fact that=20

>the Palestinians were neither happy with any of=20  
>the candidates and lists, nor with the choice=20  
>imposed upon them, nor with the general=20  
>situation in the country. Their displeasure is=20  
>reflected in the instability of the poll=20  
>results, especially in the elections of the electoral districts.  
>  
>Most of the pollsters failed to take this point into due consideration.  
>  
>13.) About (10%) of the respondents of the total size of the random sample  
>  
>(10% x 2,667 =3D 267 persons) told the=20  
>interviewers that they will refrain from voting=20  
>and will therefore abandon the polling centers.=20  
>We, as pollsters, considered them outside the=20  
>framework of the random sample and disregarded=20  
>them on the announcement of the results.=20  
>Presumably, these people changed their mind and=20  
>decided to participate in the elections and vote in the last minute for=  
  > Hamas.  
>  
>14.) The public opinion polls are demanding now=20  
>an increasingly significant role in the=20  
>media. Their influence on probing the public=20  
>and its attitudes is also growing. Nowadays,=20  
>Palestinians are able to easily compare their=20  
>own opinions and notions with that of the=20  
>majority of people around them, and their trust=20  
>in the polls has remarkably increased. (60%) of=20  
>the Palestinians trust the polls, which does not=20  
>mean that these polls are infallible, for polls=20  
>investigate the opinion of a representative=20  
>sample and are not plebiscites. One meets a good=20  
>number of correct and precise polls, but also=20  
>some inexact and faulty ones. There are also=20  
>polls that have mistaken locally and globally.=20  
>For example, Mr. Warren Mitofsky from Mitofsky=20  
>International, New York, wrote us a letter on=20  
>the same issue saying:" It seems more likely=20  
>that there is a response rate difference between=20  
>Hamas and Fateh voters. Fateh voters were=20  
>cooperating more with the interviewers than the=20  
>Hamas voters." Mr. W. Mitowsky adds;" It was=20  
>the same problem we had in 2004 in the U.S. exit=20  
>polls. It happens when interviewers do not=20  
>follow a random selection of voters exiting the=20  
>polling places. When these choose a voter to=20  
>interview using their judgment, they pick people=20  
>who are more likely to talk to them, people like=20  
>themselves". Although our PCPO did not conduct=20  
>an exit poll, I find that the statement of Mr.=20  
>Mitofsky is an important point to take into due=20  
>consideration by my colleagues of the other poll centers.  
>

> I would like in this context to point out that=20  
> PCPO has conducted a Fateh-commissioned poll in=20  
> Bethlehem district on the eve of the=20  
> legislative elections. That poll revealed that=20  
> the list of Change and Reform ( Hamas ) will win=20  
> two seats and Fateh will win also the other two=20  
> seats for the Christian quota. The rates of the=20  
> said PCPO-poll were very close to the real=20  
> election outcome and gave a hint that there=20  
> will be a shoulder-to-shoulder race between one=20  
> of Hamas candidates and a Fateh candidate. And=20  
> this is what really happened ! In the=20  
> elections of Beit Ummar municipal council=20  
> ( governorate of Hebron ) held in summer 2005, we=20  
> have been entrusted to conduct a=20  
> Hamas-commissioned poll, the results of which=20  
> were compatible with the elections outcome two weeks later.

>  
>15.) The predictive limitations of the poll due=20  
>to size and selection of the random sample. I=20  
>believe that the public opinion polls are based=20  
>on scientific principles and are conducted=20  
>according to scientific steps. Error which may=20  
>be made are probability errors. In case an error=20  
>is committed, so is that a bad luck of the=20  
>center or the researcher, for conducting polls=20  
>is a matter of ethics, principles,=20  
>responsibility and confidence borne by the=20  
>pollsters and the respondents as well.=20  
>Investigating the public opinion in the=20  
>Palestinian territories is therefore a=20  
>responsibility and a national commitment, and=20  
>cannot be dealt with under the aspect of=20  
>individual or group interests. We are the=20  
>children of one country, one issue and share the=20  
>same fate. The Palestinian parties and factions=20  
>may differ in opinion, but eventually meet in=20  
>the same fate. The same can be applied to the=20  
>researchers, interviewers, supervisors and=20  
>managers of poll centers. Their role is=20  
>important and vital in conveying the Palestinian=20  
>public opinion honestly, truthfully, ethically,=20  
>methodologically and with transparency. From=20  
>this basis, the question I would like to address=20  
>to the public is: Is the polling issue a=20  
>problem of the poll centers, or the change of attitudes?

>  
>  
>Beit Sahour, 02 / 02 / 2006

>  
>This analytical study is published on 29/1/2006 in AL-QUDS daily newspaper.

>  
>Contact Person: Dr. Nabil Kukali

>



>  
>Tel: 00970 2 277 4846, Telfax: 00970 2 277 2034  
>  
>  
>  
>Mobile: 00972 547 216 643 / 00970 599 726 878  
>  
>P.O. Box 15, Beit Sahour - Palestine  
>  
>  
>Email: <mailto:kukali@p-ol.com>kukali@p-ol.com  
>  
>  
>  
>Website: <http://www.pcpo.ps/>www.pcpo.ps  
>

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

212 980-3031  
212 980-3107 Fax

www.mitofskyinternational.com  
mitofsky@mindspring.com =20=

-----  
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.

=====  
Date: Thu, 2 Feb 2006 16:53:03 -0600  
Reply-To: "Charles H. Franklin" <franklin@POLISCI.WISC.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Charles H. Franklin" <franklin@POLISCI.WISC.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Explanation of Palestinian Exit Poll error  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Comments: cc: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>  
In-Reply-To: <7.0.1.0.2.20060202163140.0472ee20@mindspring.com>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; format=flowed; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

The web address of the original article is

<http://www.pcpo.ps/articles.htm>

Thanks to Warren for forwarding it.

Charles

Warren Mitofsky wrote:

> Here is an explanation of the exit poll error for the Palestinian

> election last week. Sorry that the tables did not come through in  
> readable format.  
> warren mitofsky  
>

--

Charles H. Franklin  
Professor, Political Science  
University of Wisconsin, Madison  
franklin@polisci.wisc.edu  
chfrankl@wisc.edu  
608-263-2022 (voice)  
608-265-2663 (fax)  
<http://politicalarithmetik.blogspot.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.

=====  
Date: Thu, 2 Feb 2006 16:55:19 -0600  
Reply-To: "Doyle, Ken" <kendoyle@UMN.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Doyle, Ken" <kendoyle@UMN.EDU>  
Subject: Re: literature comparing TYPES of monetary incentives  
Comments: To: "Fullmer, Pat" <Pat.Fullmer@METROKC.GOV>  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <0A783574FBD0D311B3B000805FE672932E9DFCCD@kcmail1.metrokc.gov>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Me too, please.  
KenDoyle@umn.edu

Fullmer, Pat wrote:

> please include me in your reply.

>

> Thanks.

>

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)]On Behalf Of Megan M Henly

> Sent: Wednesday, February 01, 2006 8:30 AM

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

> Subject: literature comparing TYPES of monetary incentives

>

>

> I'm looking for literature that compares different types of cash incentives

> (cash, checks, debit cards, gift cards, etc). I've found comparisons of

> gifts vs. cash, lotteries vs. cash, but none that compare different types

> of monetary incentives.  
>  
> Any information would be appreciated. Please respond off the list.  
>  
> Thanks,  
> Megan Henly  
> US Census Bureau  
> megan.m.henly@census.gov  
>  
> -----  
> 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](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>

--  
Kenneth O. Doyle  
Director, Communication Research Division  
School of Journalism and Mass Communication  
University of Minnesota -- Twin Cities  
323 Murphy Hall -- 206 Church Street  
Minneapolis MN 55455-0418  
[www.KenDoyle.umn.edu](http://www.KenDoyle.umn.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.  
=====

Date: Thu, 2 Feb 2006 14:57:09 -0800  
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <[lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM](mailto:lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leora Lawton <[lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM](mailto:lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Explanation of Palestinian Exit Poll error  
Comments: To: Warren Mitofsky <[mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM)>  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
In-Reply-To: <[7.0.1.0.2.20060202163140.0472ee20@mindspring.com](mailto:7.0.1.0.2.20060202163140.0472ee20@mindspring.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

A most readable version is on their website,  
<http://www.pcpo.ps/articles.htm>

I had been wondering about polls conducted prior to the election and why the results were surprising. (They didn't particularly surprise me, but then I hadn't seen any polls.)

I was also intrigued by Dr. Kukali's comment about the Arab norm of courtesy.

" Another reason may be attributable to the customs and traditions in the Palestinian society, particularly the courtesy between the voter and the candidates and the wish to please everybody. We, as a polling center, deal with concrete data and figures and are not in the position to predict the internal feelings of the people. Our outcome is based on the response of the public to definite questions, but the public chose not to show their real intentions."

I took a semester of Arabic once and learned that it's proper to try to figure out what your listener wants to hear, and to say it. Disagreeing would be disrespectful and reduce your listener's honor. When I was in grad school, one of my professors said that when the UN or other organizations would conduct health surveys in Arab communities, there was often a problem where the answers would not jive with what the interviewer saw. The example I remember was an interviewer asking about glaucoma, seeing one of the children with glaucoma, and the parent saying the children were all healthy, even when prompted.

At any rate, I'm curious how Dr. Kukali's organization will respond to this polling experience, with all the hypothesized contributing factors for the discrepancy between the poll and the actual results. His thoughtful essay was most appreciated.

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

---

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.

---

Date: Thu, 2 Feb 2006 18:33:28 -0500  
Reply-To: Allen Barton <[allenbarton@mindspring.com](mailto:allenbarton@mindspring.com)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Allen Barton <[allenbarton@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:allenbarton@MINDSPRING.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Internet surveys  
Comments: To: [pd@kerr-downs.com](mailto:pd@kerr-downs.com), [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

There are undoubtedly people with empirical data on the extent and nature of bias due to nonresponse to telephone interviews, and perhaps now also that due to the imperfect coverage of the U.S. population by internet service.  
The following ideas are based only on the logic of probability sampling.

Logically internet surveys sample only the population regularly connected to the internet, which as we know is only a fraction (how large?) of the population of households in the US and most other advanced industrial nations, with considerable economic and educational bias as well as unknown attitudinal and behavioral biases. A telephone survey in the United States samples the population of households with (landline) telephones, which is a much larger fraction of households. The telephone sample therefore has at least the potentiality of being a better probability sample of all US households.

=20

All modes of surveying suffer from nonresponse bias, so they do not in practice produce probability samples. But household interview samples which obtain a high rate of cooperation allow estimation of the possible range of error due to noncooperation, and this range is rather limited. There is a body of research (using various modes of sampling nonrespondents) which provides general estimates of the size and direction of nonresponse bias in the realized telephone samples on certain kinds of questions. I suppose similar research can be done for internet samples, using multiple methods of reaching nonrespondents who are internet connected and also the population which is not internet connected. But since the rate of nonresponse is high, there is no way to provide statistical measures of the confidence of numbers produced in either telephone or internet surveys which match those of high-response household surveys. For telephone interviews one can only say that past efforts to assess nonresponse bias, and bias due to not being connected to telephones, suggest a certain range and direction of bias on various kinds of questions that have been tested, or that historically this method has had a certain range of error in relation to actual election results or sales figures or census figures. Similar research on the nonrespondents and the "nonconnected" will eventually be accumulated on internet users. But the survey of internet users has two strikes against its representativeness, at least until internet use becomes as near universal as telephone service.

=20

I have seen descriptions of internet surveys in which a probability sample of households was drawn and visited, and those lacking internet service were provided with it and given training and motivation to use it as members of an ongoing "panel." This has at least the potential of coming closer to a probability sample of the general population than simply surveying those who already have internet service. Offer of a reasonable degree of free telephone service might do the same for the population of those with cell phones only. Of course the bias in volunteering for such a "panel" is a problem, already examined by Lazarsfeld and Berelson in their 1940 "People's Choice" study.

Meanwhile reporting of survey results should point out not only the range of random error due to sample size, but the rate of cooperation of those initially sampled, the extent to which the public is connected to the system used to interview them, and the possibility of additional error due to differential cooperation and differential connectedness. And where possible, the differences produced by varied question wording - which some surveys on the government wiretapping issue have tried to explore, and which was well discussed in Cantril's book on "Gauging Public Opinion" on whether the US should become involved in World War II, in the years before Pearl Harbor.

Allen Barton, former director, Bureau of Applied Social Research

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

>From: Phillip Downs <pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM>

>Sent: Feb 2, 2006 2:34 PM

>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>Subject: Internet surveys

>

>Earlier this week, there was a thread about stating sampling errors for  
>internet surveys. Presuming everyone agrees that sampling errors cannot a=  
nd

>should not be associated with internet surveys, what measure of "validity"  
>should or can be associated with internet surveys. Second, many would arg=  
ue

>that RDD probability samples are superior to internet samples. Being able  
>to reference a sampling error is presumably part of this claim along with  
>other issues. Given the incidence of cell only households, given the low  
>cooperation rates we get to telephone surveys, given the screening  
>mechanisms people use to avoid our calls, where is the evidence that  
>suggests that RDD telephone surveys provide better data than internet  
>surveys? Does anyone have empirical (as opposed to theoretical) evidence?

>Does anyone have evidence that shows the predictive ability of these two  
>methods side-by-side. The market reseach industry is trending heavily  
>toward internet surveys. Will government and political surveying be far  
>behind. I'm interested to see any comparative figures for predictive  
>capabilities or validity, otherwise established, for internet surveys vs.  
>RDD telephone surveys given all of the compromises we make these days with  
>the latter.

>Thanks, Philli

>

>Phillip E. Downs, PhD

>Partner, Kerr & Downs Research

>Professor of Marketing, FSU

>2992 Habersham Drive

>Tallahassee, FL 32309

>Phone: 850.906.3111

>Fax: 850.906.3112

>www.kerr-downs.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.

Allen H. Barton, 118 Wolf's Trail, Chapel Hill, NC 27516  
Phone/fax: 919 933 4003 allenbarton@mindspring.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.

=====

Date: Thu, 2 Feb 2006 20:03:17 -0500  
Reply-To: Mike Donatello <MDonatello@COX.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mike Donatello <MDonatello@COX.NET>  
Subject: Re: literature comparing TYPES of monetary incentives  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <43E28DD7.5020605@umn.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=windows-1250  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Please respond TO the list. Thanks.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Doyle, Ken  
Sent: Thursday, 02 February, 2006 17:55  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: literature comparing TYPES of monetary incentives

Me too, please.  
KenDoyle@umn.edu

Fullmer, Pat wrote:

> please include me in your reply.

>

> Thanks.

>

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

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

> Sent: Wednesday, February 01, 2006 8:30 AM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: literature comparing TYPES of monetary incentives

>

>

> I'm looking for literature that compares different types of cash  
incentives

> (cash, checks, debit cards, gift cards, etc). I've found comparisons of

> gifts vs. cash, lotteries vs. cash, but none that compare different types

> of monetary incentives.

>

> Any information would be appreciated. Please respond off the list.

>

> Thanks,

> Megan Henly

> US Census Bureau

> megan.m.henly@census.gov

>

> -----

> 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  
>

--  
Kenneth O. Doyle  
Director, Communication Research Division  
School of Journalism and Mass Communication  
University of Minnesota -- Twin Cities  
323 Murphy Hall -- 206 Church Street  
Minneapolis MN 55455-0418  
[www.KenDoyle.umn.edu](http://www.KenDoyle.umn.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.

--  
No virus found in this incoming message.  
Checked by AVG Free Edition.  
Version: 7.1.375 / Virus Database: 267.15.0/248 - Release Date: 2/1/2006

--  
No virus found in this incoming message.  
Checked by AVG Free Edition.  
Version: 7.1.375 / Virus Database: 267.15.0/248 - Release Date: 2/1/2006

--  
No virus found in this outgoing message.  
Checked by AVG Free Edition.  
Version: 7.1.375 / Virus Database: 267.15.0/248 - Release Date: 2/1/2006

-----  
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.

---

Date: Thu, 2 Feb 2006 21:35:23 -0500  
Reply-To: Allen Barton <[allenbarton@mindspring.com](mailto:allenbarton@mindspring.com)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Allen Barton <[allenbarton@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:allenbarton@MINDSPRING.COM)>  
Subject: Fw: Re:  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0



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

Someone asked me for the gist of my somewhat wordy statement on the problems of sampling errors on internet vs. telephone surveys (saying it gave her a headache). This is the short version:

>The gist is that (a) extremely expensive household interviews with many callbacks give you a pretty good probability sample of the actual US population (like the million-dollar surveys done by the Research Triangle Institute for the government); (b) cheap telephone interviews give you a nonprobability sample of a large fraction of the US population; (c) cheap internet interviews give you a nonprobability sample of a small fraction of the US population. Choose one of the above. But if we have to do (b) or (c) we need somebody else to have already studied the extent and kind of biases they produce, and make a cautionary statement about their validity based on that.

>  
>

>Allen H. Barton, 118 Wolf's Trail, Chapel Hill, NC 27516  
>Phone/fax: 919 933 4003 allenbarton@mindspring.com

Allen H. Barton, 118 Wolf's Trail, Chapel Hill, NC 27516  
Phone/fax: 919 933 4003 allenbarton@mindspring.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.

=====  
Date: Thu, 2 Feb 2006 18:52:17 -0800  
Reply-To: Linda Bourque <lbourque@UCLA.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Linda Bourque <lbourque@UCLA.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Fw: Re:  
Comments: To: Allen Barton <allenbarton@MINDSPRING.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <8392248.1138934124091.JavaMail.root@mswamui-billy.atl.sa.earthlink.net>

MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Allen: Excellent, excellent as usual. And the longer version did not give me a headache. A friend of Corinne's. Linda Bourque

At 06:35 PM 2/2/06, Allen Barton wrote:

>Someone asked me for the gist of my somewhat wordy statement on the  
>problems of sampling errors on internet vs. telephone surveys (saying it  
>gave her a headache). This is the short version:

>

>>The gist is that (a) extremely expensive household interviews with many  
> callbacks give you a pretty good probability sample of the actual US  
> population (like the million-dollar surveys done by the Research Triangle  
> Institute for the government); (b) cheap telephone interviews give you a

> nonprobability sample of a large fraction of the US population; (c) cheap  
> internet interviews give you a nonprobability sample of a small fraction  
> of the US population. Choose one of the above. But if we have to do (b)  
> or (c) we need somebody else to have already studied the extent and kind  
> of biases they produce, and make a cautionary statement about their  
> validity based on that.

>>  
>>

>>Allen H. Barton, 118 Wolf's Trail, Chapel Hill, NC 27516  
>>Phone/fax: 919 933 4003 allenbarton@mindspring.com

>  
>  
>Allen H. Barton, 118 Wolf's Trail, Chapel Hill, NC 27516  
>Phone/fax: 919 933 4003 allenbarton@mindspring.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.

-----  
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.

=====  
Date: Thu, 2 Feb 2006 21:34:03 -0600  
Reply-To: "Norval D. Glenn" <ndglenn@MAIL.LA.UTEXAS.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Norval D. Glenn" <ndglenn@MAIL.LA.UTEXAS.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Fw: Re:  
Comments: To: Linda Bourque <lbourque@ucla.edu>  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <6.0.2.0.2.20060202185118.03bb0290@mail.ucla.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Allen Barton's excellent exposition of how to deal with nonreponse bias reminds me of how much the oldtimers in this business knew and the extent to which recent efforts are simply rediscovering (reinventing) the wheel.

Norval D. Glenn  
Stiles Professor in American Studies  
Department of Sociology  
University of Texas at Austin

On Thu, 2 Feb 2006, Linda Bourque wrote:

> Allen: Excellent, excellent as usual. And the longer version did not give  
> me a headache. A friend of Corinne's. Linda Bourque  
>  
>  
> At 06:35 PM 2/2/06, Allen Barton wrote:  
>>Someone asked me for the gist of my somewhat wordy statement on the

>>problems of sampling errors on internet vs. telephone surveys (saying it  
>>gave her a headache). This is the short version:  
>>  
>>>The gist is that (a) extremely expensive household interviews with many  
>> callbacks give you a pretty good probability sample of the actual US  
>> population (like the million-dollar surveys done by the Research Triangle  
>> Institute for the government); (b) cheap telephone interviews give you a  
>> nonprobability sample of a large fraction of the US population; (c) cheap  
>> internet interviews give you a nonprobability sample of a small fraction  
>> of the US population. Choose one of the above. But if we have to do (b)  
>> or (c) we need somebody else to have already studied the extent and kind  
>> of biases they produce, and make a cautionary statement about their  
>> validity based on that.

>>>  
>>>  
>>>Allen H. Barton, 118 Wolf's Trail, Chapel Hill, NC 27516  
>>>Phone/fax: 919 933 4003 allenbarton@mindspring.com

>>  
>>>Allen H. Barton, 118 Wolf's Trail, Chapel Hill, NC 27516  
>>>Phone/fax: 919 933 4003 allenbarton@mindspring.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.

>  
>-----  
> 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.

-----  
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.

---

Date: Thu, 2 Feb 2006 21:20:41 -0800  
Reply-To: Doug Rivers <doug@POLIMETRIX.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Doug Rivers <doug@POLIMETRIX.COM>  
Subject: Re: Internet surveys  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

>>>See comments inserted below...

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

From: AAPORNET on behalf of Allen Barton  
Sent: Thu 2/2/2006 3:33 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: Internet surveys

=20

There are undoubtedly people with empirical data on the extent and nature of bias due to nonresponse to telephone interviews, and perhaps now also that due to the imperfect coverage of the U.S. population by internet service. The following ideas are based only on the logic of probability sampling.

Logically internet surveys sample only the population regularly connected to the internet, which as we know is only a fraction (how large?) of the population of households in the US and most other advanced industrial nations, with considerable economic and educational bias as well as unknown attitudinal and behavioral biases. A telephone survey in the United States samples the population of households with (landline) telephones, which is a much larger fraction of households. The telephone sample therefore has at least the potentiality of being a better probability sample of all US households.

>>> According to the latest (2003) CPS Supplement on computer ownership, 58.7% of adults in the US have Internet access, either at home, work, school or some other location. The latest Pew study reports 68% of the adult population uses the Internet.

All modes of surveying suffer from nonresponse bias, so they do not in practice produce probability samples. But household interview samples which obtain a high rate of cooperation allow estimation of the possible range of error due to noncooperation, and this range is rather limited. There is a body of research (using various modes of sampling nonrespondents) which provides general estimates of the size and direction of nonresponse bias in the realized telephone samples on certain kinds of questions. I suppose similar research can be done for internet samples, using multiple methods of reaching nonrespondents who are internet connected and also the population which is not internet connected. But since the rate of nonresponse is high, there is no way to provide statistical measures of the confidence of numbers produced in either telephone or internet surveys which match those of high-response household surveys. For telephone interviews one can only say that past efforts to assess nonresponse bias, and bias due to not being connected to telephones, suggest a certain range and direction of bias on various kinds of questions that have been tested, or that historically this method has had a certain range of error in relation to actual election results or sales figures or census figures. Similar research on the nonrespondents and the "nonconnected" will eventually be accumulated on internet users. But the survey of internet users has two strikes against its representativeness, at least until internet use becomes as near universal as telephone service.=20

>>> Mosteller and Tukey worked out bounds and confidence intervals for non-response error in the 1940's. Suppose we want to estimate the proportion of units in a population possessing some attribute. Let  $p$

denote the proportion with the attribute in the entire population and let  $p_r$  and  $p_n$  be the proportion having the attribute among those who would and would not respond to a survey. Let  $r$  be the probability of responding, so

$$p = r p_r + (1 - r) p_n$$

The survey gives no information about  $p_n$  so, as a matter of logic,  $p_n$  could in principle take any value between 0 and 1. This gives rise to the bounds

$$(r p_r, r p_r + 1 - r)$$

for the population proportion. (This idea has been extended quite a bit by Chuck Manski in recent years.) These bounds are useful when the response rate is very high -- as in the 92-93% achieved by the CPS. No one comes close to these rates by phone--most media polls are running in the neighborhood of 30% (on a good day).

I have seen descriptions of internet surveys in which a probability sample of households was drawn and visited, and those lacking internet service were provided with it and given training and motivation to use it as members of an ongoing "panel." This has at least the potential of coming closer to a probability sample of the general population than simply surveying those who already have internet service.

>>> I think you are referring to Knowledge Networks, thank you.

Offer of a reasonable degree of free telephone service might do the same for the population of those with cell phones only. Of course the bias in volunteering for such a "panel" is a problem, already examined by Lazarsfeld and Berelson in their 1940 "People's Choice" study.

Meanwhile reporting of survey results should point out not only the range of random error due to sample size, but the rate of cooperation of those initially sampled, the extent to which the public is connected to the system used to interview them, and the possibility of additional error due to differential cooperation and differential connectedness. And where possible, the differences produced by varied question wording - which some surveys on the government wiretapping issue have tried to explore, and which was well discussed in Cantril's book on "Gauging Public Opinion" on whether the US should become involved in World War II, in the years before Pearl Harbor.

>>> This is, of course, what the AAPOR reporting guidelines call for, but the numbers are so abysmal for most phone work these days that very

few organizations comply. What is remarkable is that, for the most part, = even fairly low response rate phone surveys perform reasonably well. = (The same is true of exit polls.) However, there is nothing in sampling = theory that keeps a 30% response rate study within two (or even six) = standard errors of the truth. (And, without weighting, the results would = be much worse.)

What is much more controversial is the use of opt-in Internet "access = panels." (These bear little relation to panel studies of the = Berelson-Lazarsfeld, PSID, SIPP, etc. variety.) Although you can = calculate a within-panel response rate for each study, this is not = comparable to response rates calculated for phone studies. However, such = panels are routinely used in market research and seem to produce usable = estimates for many purposes. Most of these employ some form of quota = sampling, which doesn't have any real theory to support it (though see = the last chapter of Kish for a valiant attempt to say \*something\* about = it).=20

Doug Rivers

-----  
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.

=====  
Date: Fri, 3 Feb 2006 13:06:25 +0100  
Reply-To: Edith de Leeuw <edithl@XS4ALL.NL>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Edith de Leeuw <edithl@XS4ALL.NL>  
Subject: Voting by machine or paper ballot?  
Comments: To: WAPOR@UNL.EDU, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Comments: cc: bms-rc33@services.cnrs.fr  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Dear colleagues,

Does someone know about studies on the influence on voting machines vs paper ballots on election results?  
Both as mode change and regarding potential change of lay-out of ballot?

In Holland we change from paper and pencil ballot to a 'voting computer' with touch screen.

Also the way the candidates are presented will be different when the voting computer is used.

In our system the paper form gives lists of all political parties next to each other. Under the name of the party the names of all the candidates for that party are printed. So you see directly all the candidates and their party affiliation.

The computer form will be different. First the parties are listed on the screen, and one has to choose the party. When that choice is made the

candidates for the chosen party ONLY are listed, and one has to choose from that restricted list.

The computer form is like an 'unfolding' question, while the paper form is like a direct question offering all alternatives directly.

We wonder what the influence might be, especially in elections for municipalities, where people may vote more for persons than for parties.

Any ideas and comments are very welcome.  
I will keep you informed.

Warm regards from Amsterdam in pre-election time.

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

---

Plant Something and Keep it Alive

From the happiness manifesto

[http://www.bbc.co.uk/lifestyle/tv\\_and\\_radio/making\\_slough\\_happy/manifesto.shtml](http://www.bbc.co.uk/lifestyle/tv_and_radio/making_slough_happy/manifesto.shtml)

1

---

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

---

Date: Fri, 3 Feb 2006 10:42:40 -0500  
Reply-To: [JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM](mailto:JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "J. Ann Selzer" <[JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM](mailto:JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Internet surveys  
Comments: To: [pd@kerr-downs.com](mailto:pd@kerr-downs.com), [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I'm one of the people who actually has empirical data on the comparability of phone v. mail v. internet panel v. mail panel v. clip out survey from a newspaper. My company was commissioned by the Newspaper Association of America

to investigate the quality of data and how it varies by method of data collection. I will be happy to forward the AAPOR version of the paper, but the gist is this:

Telephone surveys, even with what appears to be a low response rate, far outperform internet panels. That is true even when I told the internet panel providing company (a leading name in the business) exactly what I was doing--collecting data five different ways and comparing results. In fact, because

their data was so seriously flawed, I asked them to refield--and I had to invent a method for doing this in a way that would do them the most good. Maybe I was assigned to a poor project manager. But, next to clip out surveys from a newspaper (median age 62), the internet panel was the worst. The method of comparison was the absolute value of percentage deviation from Census data. The best was RDD phone. And, when data were weighted by age and sex, traditional mail surveys were next best.

The title of the paper (it occurs to me AAPOR may have access to it for members on its website, though the paper is a few years old) is "How Can We Trust Our Data When Response Rates Are so Low?" or something like that. I'm currently traveling and do not have immediate access to my files.

In short, I conclude that randomness is a marvelous thing. And, those who try to manhandle the sampling process to approximate what a random sample will do fail miserably. JAS

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

visit our website: [www.SelzerCo.com](http://www.SelzerCo.com)

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

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

=====  
Date: Fri, 3 Feb 2006 12:36:15 -0500  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: ABC Poll: Rudeness in America, 2006  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Too late for today's Vox

Poll: Rudeness in America, 2006

Feb. 3, 2006 - In the ranks of rudeness, cell phones reign.=20

While vast majorities of Americans experience a range of rude behaviors at least occasionally in their daily lives, the one transgression that



occurs most often is accompanied by a ring tone: People talking on cell phones, in public places, in a loud or annoying manner.=20

Eighty-seven percent of Americans in an ABC News "20/20" survey say they encounter that kind of gabbing at least sometimes, and a majority - 57 percent - hear it often. That takes the cake for frequency; by contrast, just under four in 10 often experience generally rude or disrespectful behavior, cursing, near-cursing or people interrupting conversations to use e-mail or cell phones.

SNIP

<http://abcnews.go.com/2020/US/story?id=3D1574155>

or

<http://tinyurl.com/9tejx>

--=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/>

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

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

-----  
Date: Fri, 3 Feb 2006 18:40:05 +0000

Reply-To: "Caplan, James R CIV DMDC" <[James.Caplan@OSD.PENTAGON.MIL](mailto:James.Caplan@OSD.PENTAGON.MIL)>

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

From: "Caplan, James R CIV DMDC" <[James.Caplan@OSD.PENTAGON.MIL](mailto:James.Caplan@OSD.PENTAGON.MIL)>

Subject: Four Senior Level Vacancies

Comments: To: "AAPOR-info@goAMP.com" <[AAPOR-info@goAMP.com](mailto:AAPOR-info@goAMP.com)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain

To all:

The Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) anticipates filling multiple supervisory and senior non-supervisory positions in the Survey and Program Evaluation Division located in Arlington, Virginia. The positions will be advertised on [www.USAJOBS.gov](http://www.USAJOBS.gov) beginning 31 January and closing 13 February 2006. Positions are in the GS-101 (Social Science Analyst) and GS-1530 (Survey Statistician) series. If you have questions, please e-mail [Timothy.Elig@osd.pentagon.mil](mailto:Timothy.Elig@osd.pentagon.mil) or call (703)696.5858. DMDC is a component of the United States Department of Defense.

The mission of DMDC is to: (1) provide a facility within DoD for the collection and analysis of personnel data, and (2) furnish reports using this information, as well as advice and assistance on information requirements to the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), the Military Departments, other DoD components, and non-DoD users. The Human Resources Strategic Assessment Program (HRSAP), located at DMDC, uses

probability-based sample surveys to support the personnel information needs of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness [USD(P&R)]. These surveys assess the attitudes and opinions of the entire Department of Defense (DoD) community-active-duty, Reserve, civilian employees, and military families-on a wide range of personnel issues. The Web-based survey program, known as the Status of Forces Surveys (SOFS), provides data several times a year on active-duty and Reserve component members, and DoD civilian employees. Surveys on these populations have been conducted periodically in the Department since the 1970s. Web-administration supplemented by paper-and-pencil surveys are used to obtain data on sensitive topics (e.g., sexual or racial harassment) and from populations who might have limited Internet access (e.g., spouses of military members). These surveys are essential for providing insight into the quality of life in the military and for assessing the effectiveness of the Human Resources Strategic Plan.

Employees in the Personnel Survey Branch lead and work on teams responsible for survey sampling, weighting, operations, and analysis. Duties require not only knowledge and experience in survey sampling, weighting, and analysis, but also the development of both technical reports that summarize research methods, analyses performed and results, as well as reports for senior officials who use the data for policy formulation purposes. The incumbent must have broad knowledge of current personnel policy and database issues that might be addressed via surveys. Incumbents must have highly technical, state-of-the-art knowledge of theory and procedures for survey sampling, weighting, and analysis using SUDAAN and SAS. Positions are GS-1530-14 (Survey Statistician), DMDC-06-105659 & DMDC-06-105465; Vacancy Identification Numbers RA105659 and RA105465.

Employees in the Program Evaluation Branch lead and work on teams responsible for survey development and analysis. This includes, but is not limited to: meeting with OSD program evaluation clients and determining methods of investigation; planning, designing, and conducting surveys to determine behavior experiences, attitudes, and opinions on specified topics; preparing reports and briefings. These may include short-term studies, (e.g., summarizing data related to military separation incentives, or a specific program's personnel policies and practices), to longer-term longitudinal investigations involving, for example, periodic surveys of Reserve component members' attitudes regarding deployments and retention decisions, and of gender and race relations in the Armed Forces and in the Service Academies. Positions are GS-101-14 (Social Science Analyst), DMDC-06-104464 & DMDC-06-104491; Vacancy Identification Numbers RA104464 and RA104491.

Regards,  
Jim Caplan  
DMDC, Arlington.

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

Date: Fri, 3 Feb 2006 14:25:44 -0500

Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>  
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing  
Subject: Re: Internet surveys  
Comments: To: JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <281.5173f7f.3114d3f0@aol.com>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

When I first read it some years ago, I suggested that the methodology and logic of this particular study lead one to the conclusion that the best results would in fact be obtained from an appropriate quota sample rather than a random sample. I haven't changed my mind.

While probability samples are certainly preferable, European pollsters mostly use quota samples because they feel that the empirical results do not justify the additional expense of probability sampling. I guess they must be doing something right, since most of the big American research companies have been swallowed up by European research conglomerates.

Those interested in some experimental results that convinced at least some of the viability of conducting surveys online can download from my website two papers presented at the AAPOR Conferences in 1995 and 1997 (<http://www.jwdp.com/prodigy.html>).

Note that I am not advocating online surveys as a valid substitute for probability samples, but as Leslie Kish noted some 15 years ago, the brief era in which telephone samples could realistically be considered probability samples was already over then, and it isn't coming back.

Jan Werner

---

J. Ann Selzer wrote:

> I'm one of the people who actually has empirical data on the comparability  
> of phone v. mail v. internet panel v. mail panel v. clip out survey from a  
> newspaper. My company was commissioned by the Newspaper Association of  
America  
> to investigate the quality of data and how it varies by method of data  
> collection. I will be happy to forward the AAPOR version of the paper, but  
the  
> gist is this:  
>  
> Telephone surveys, even with what appears to be a low response rate, far  
> outperform internet panels. That is true even when I told the internet  
panel  
> providing company (a leading name in the business) exactly what I was  
> doing--collecting data five different ways and comparing results. In fact,  
because  
> their data was so seriously flawed, I asked them to refield--and I had to  
> invent a method for doing this in a way that would do them the most good.

Maybe I

> was assigned to a poor project manager. But, next to clip out surveys from  
> a newspaper (median age 62), the internet panel was the worst. The method  
> of  
> comparison was the absolute value of percentage deviation from Census data.  
> The best was RDD phone. And, when data were weighted by age and sex,  
> traditional mail surveys were next best.

>  
> The title of the paper (it occurs to me AAPOR may have access to it for  
> members on its website, though the paper is a few years old) is "How Can We  
> Trust  
> Our Data When Response Rates Are so Low?" or something like that. I'm  
> currently traveling and do not have immediate access to my files.

>  
> In short, I conclude that randomness is a marvelous thing. And, those who  
> try to manhandle the sampling process to approximate what a random sample  
> will  
> do fail miserably. JAS

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

>  
> visit our website: [www.SelzerCo.com](http://www.SelzerCo.com)  
>  
> E-mail address for purposes of this list: [JAnnSelzer@aol.com](mailto:JAnnSelzer@aol.com); otherwise,  
> contact [JASelzer@SelzerCo.com](mailto:JASelzer@SelzerCo.com).

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

>  
>

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

=====  
Date: Fri, 3 Feb 2006 14:57:41 -0600  
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Subject: Gerald R. Ford Grants and Scholar Award  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

If anyone is interested in the Gerald R. Ford Foundation Research Travel  
Grants Program and/or the Gerald R. Ford Scholar Award in Honor of  
Robert M. Teeter, please visit the following website: =20

=20

<http://www.fordlibrarymuseum.gov/library/newsnotes.asp>

=20

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

Date: Fri, 3 Feb 2006 18:17:02 -0500  
Reply-To: "DeBell, Matthew" <[MDeBell@AIR.ORG](mailto:MDeBell@AIR.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "DeBell, Matthew" <[MDeBell@AIR.ORG](mailto:MDeBell@AIR.ORG)>  
Subject: Re: Internet surveys  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Allen Barton wrote,  
>Logically internet surveys sample only the population regularly  
connected  
>to the internet, which as we know is only a fraction (how large?) of  
the >population of households in the US ...

I don't have the figures at the household level, but based on the most  
recent computer and Internet use supplement to the Current Population  
Survey (October 2003), 59 percent of adults use the Internet.

That usage rate varies quite a bit by subgroup. Here are a few examples.

All adults (18 and over): 59 percent  
Living in households where only Spanish is spoken: 18  
High school dropout: 20=20  
65 and older: 25  
Disabled: 28  
Family income <\$20K: 33  
Hispanic: 35  
Black: 46  
White: 65  
Family income \$75K+: 89  
Graduate degree: 90

--  
Matthew DeBell, Ph.D.  
Federal Statistics Program  
American Institutes for Research  
Washington, DC  
202-403-6503

mdebell@air.org

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

Date: Fri, 3 Feb 2006 20:16:03 -0500  
Reply-To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jan Werner <[jwerner@JWDP.COM](mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM)>  
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing  
Subject: Re: Internet surveys  
Comments: To: "DeBell, Matthew" <[MDeBell@AIR.ORG](mailto:MDeBell@AIR.ORG)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[D9A552CD27E0974FA91ADE56D744D3E8039279BE@dc2ex1.air.org](mailto:D9A552CD27E0974FA91ADE56D744D3E8039279BE@dc2ex1.air.org)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

A national telephone survey conducted in Q4 2005, N>4000, shows 70% of the U.S. population with Internet access.

Predictably, the rate rises with income (over 85% for incomes over \$50K and close to 95% for incomes over \$100K) and education (under 40% for less than HS grad and about 90% for college post grad) and decreases with age (about 60% for 55+ and 40% for 65+). Asians are higher (80%) and other minorities less (60%). Hispanics are no different than the rest of the population if race is not considered. The South is significantly lower (60%) than other Census regions.

I cannot reveal any more about this study, but I would be interested in hearing from anyone with similarly up-to-date information as to whether these findings correspond to theirs.

Jan Werner

-----  
DeBell, Matthew wrote:

> Allen Barton wrote,  
>> Logically internet surveys sample only the population regularly  
> connected  
>> to the internet, which as we know is only a fraction (how large?) of  
> the >population of households in the US ...  
>  
> I don't have the figures at the household level, but based on the most  
> recent computer and Internet use supplement to the Current Population  
> Survey (October 2003), 59 percent of adults use the Internet.  
>  
> That usage rate varies quite a bit by subgroup. Here are a few examples.  
>  
> All adults (18 and over): 59 percent  
> Living in households where only Spanish is spoken: 18  
> High school dropout: 20  
> 65 and older: 25

> Disabled: 28  
> Family income <\$20K: 33  
> Hispanic: 35  
> Black: 46  
> White: 65  
> Family income \$75K+: 89  
> Graduate degree: 90  
>  
>  
> --  
> Matthew DeBell, Ph.D.  
> Federal Statistics Program  
> American Institutes for Research  
> Washington, DC  
> 202-403-6503  
> mdebell@air.org  
>  
> -----  
> 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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>  
>

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

Date: Fri, 3 Feb 2006 21:51:54 -0500  
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <[mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Warren Mitofsky <[mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Internet surveys  
Comments: To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com), [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[43E40053.90506@jwdp.com](mailto:43E40053.90506@jwdp.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

The percentage of the population with internet access is irrelevant.  
It is the proportion of the population represented by the panels from  
which internet surveys are conducted that matters. Is anyone  
suggesting that the panels used by most internet surveys are  
representative of the population?

warren mitofsky

At 08:16 PM 2/3/2006, Jan Werner wrote:

>A national telephone survey conducted in Q4 2005, N>4000, shows 70%  
>of the U.S. population with Internet access.  
>  
>Predictably, the rate rises with income (over 85% for incomes over  
>\$50K and close to 95% for incomes over \$100K) and education (under  
>40% for less than HS grad and about 90% for college post grad) and

>decreases with age (about 60% for 55+ and 40% for 65+). Asians are  
>higher (80%) and other minorities less (60%). Hispanics are no  
>different than the rest of the population if race is not considered.  
>The South is significantly lower (60%) than other Census regions.  
>  
>I cannot reveal any more about this study, but I would be interested  
>in hearing from anyone with similarly up-to-date information as to  
>whether these findings correspond to theirs.  
>  
>Jan Werner  
>\_\_\_\_\_  
>  
>DeBell, Matthew wrote:  
>>Allen Barton wrote,  
>>>Logically internet surveys sample only the population regularly  
>>>connected  
>>>to the internet, which as we know is only a fraction (how large?) of  
>>the >population of households in the US ...  
>>I don't have the figures at the household level, but based on the most  
>>recent computer and Internet use supplement to the Current Population  
>>Survey (October 2003), 59 percent of adults use the Internet.  
>>That usage rate varies quite a bit by subgroup. Here are a few examples.  
>>All adults (18 and over): 59 percent  
>>Living in households where only Spanish is spoken: 18  
>>High school dropout: 20 65 and older: 25  
>>Disabled: 28  
>>Family income <\$20K: 33  
>>Hispanic: 35  
>>Black: 46  
>>White: 65  
>>Family income \$75K+: 89  
>>Graduate degree: 90  
>>  
>>--  
>>Matthew DeBell, Ph.D.  
>>Federal Statistics Program  
>>American Institutes for Research  
>>Washington, DC  
>>202-403-6503  
>>mdebell@air.org  
>>-----  
>>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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>  
>-----  
>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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
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

---

Date: Fri, 3 Feb 2006 22:58:06 -0500  
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>  
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing  
Subject: Re: Internet surveys  
Comments: To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>, AAPORNET <aapornet@asu.edu>  
In-Reply-To: <7.0.0.16.2.20060203214556.00e51138@mindspring.com>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I posted those numbers only because a number of people seem to be interested and they are apparently a couple of years more recent than what is available from the CPS. It had nothing to do with panels.

In any event, as you should know, the proportion of the population represented is not important. What is important is that the panel composition provide full and heterogeneous coverage of all dimensions of the population that are being queried. You don't know that with a panel, but then, you also don't know that if you have substantial non-response in a probability sample.

The problem is not that results from an Internet panel or a probability sample with substantial non-response are necessarily wrong, it's that you can't know the likelihood that they are wrong unless you have some external information to go by, and that is often not available.

I don't think that Internet panels can be representative of the general population on all issues, but it is certainly possible to select samples from them that are reasonably representative of some segments of the population. It just depends on what you want to find out about.

Jan

---

Warren Mitofsky wrote:

> The percentage of the population with internet access is irrelevant. It  
> is the proportion of the population represented by the panels from which  
> internet surveys are conducted that matters. Is anyone suggesting that  
> the panels used by most internet surveys are representative of the  
> population?

>

> warren mitofsky

>

> At 08:16 PM 2/3/2006, Jan Werner wrote:

>> A national telephone survey conducted in Q4 2005, N>4000, shows 70% of  
>> the U.S. population with Internet access.

>>

>> Predictably, the rate rises with income (over 85% for incomes over

>> \$50K and close to 95% for incomes over \$100K) and education (under 40%

>> for less than HS grad and about 90% for college post grad) and  
>> decreases with age (about 60% for 55+ and 40% for 65+). Asians are  
>> higher (80%) and other minorities less (60%). Hispanics are no  
>> different than the rest of the population if race is not considered.  
>> The South is significantly lower (60%) than other Census regions.

>> I cannot reveal any more about this study, but I would be interested  
>> in hearing from anyone with similarly up-to-date information as to  
>> whether these findings correspond to theirs.

>> Jan Werner

>> \_\_\_\_\_  
>>

>> DeBell, Matthew wrote:

>>> Allen Barton wrote,

>>>> Logically internet surveys sample only the population regularly  
>>>> connected

>>>> to the internet, which as we know is only a fraction (how large?) of  
>>>> the >population of households in the US ...

>>>> I don't have the figures at the household level, but based on the most  
>>>> recent computer and Internet use supplement to the Current Population  
>>>> Survey (October 2003), 59 percent of adults use the Internet.

>>>> That usage rate varies quite a bit by subgroup. Here are a few examples.

>>>> All adults (18 and over): 59 percent

>>>> Living in households where only Spanish is spoken: 18

>>>> High school dropout: 20 65 and older: 25

>>>> Disabled: 28

>>>> Family income <\$20K: 33

>>>> Hispanic: 35

>>>> Black: 46

>>>> White: 65

>>>> Family income \$75K+: 89

>>>> Graduate degree: 90

>>>>

>>>> --

>>>> Matthew DeBell, Ph.D.

>>>> Federal Statistics Program

>>>> American Institutes for Research

>>>> Washington, DC

>>>> 202-403-6503

>>>> mdbell@air.org

>>>> -----

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

>>>>

>>>> -----

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

>>>>

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

---

Date: Sat, 4 Feb 2006 12:28:46 -0500

Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <[mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM)>

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

Comments: RFC822 error: <W> MESSAGE-ID field duplicated. Last occurrence was retained.

From: Warren Mitofsky <[mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM)>

Subject: Re: Internet surveys

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

MIME-version: 1.0

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

You are right. You don't know that a sample represents a population when there is substantial non-response. However, I would submit you have a better chance of the non-responders/responders being random than you do of one of those panels used by many internet survey companies. The size of the non-response is not the issue. The issue is whether they are a significantly biased group.

warren

At 10:58 PM 2/3/2006, you wrote:

>I posted those numbers only because a number of people seem to be  
>interested and they are apparently a couple of years more recent  
>than what is available from the CPS. It had nothing to do with panels.

>  
>In any event, as you should know, the proportion of the population  
>represented is not important. What is important is that the panel  
>composition provide full and heterogeneous coverage of all  
>dimensions of the population that are being queried. You don't know  
>that with a panel, but then, you also don't know that if you have  
>substantial non-response in a probability sample.

>  
>The problem is not that results from an Internet panel or a  
>probability sample with substantial non-response are necessarily  
>wrong, it's that you can't know the likelihood that they are wrong  
>unless you have some external information to go by, and that is  
>often not available.

>  
>I don't think that Internet panels can be representative of the  
>general population on all issues, but it is certainly possible to  
>select samples from them that are reasonably representative of some  
>segments of the population. It just depends on what you want to find out  
about.

>  
>Jan

>\_\_\_\_\_

>  
>Warren Mitofsky wrote:

>>The percentage of the population with internet access is  
>>irrelevant. It is the proportion of the population represented by  
>>the panels from which internet surveys are conducted that matters.

>>Is anyone suggesting that the panels used by most internet surveys  
>>are representative of the population?

>>warren mitofsky

>>At 08:16 PM 2/3/2006, Jan Werner wrote:

>>>A national telephone survey conducted in Q4 2005, N>4000, shows  
>>>70% of the U.S. population with Internet access.

>>>>Predictably, the rate rises with income (over 85% for incomes over  
>>>>\$50K and close to 95% for incomes over \$100K) and education (under  
>>>>40% for less than HS grad and about 90% for college post grad) and  
>>>>decreases with age (about 60% for 55+ and 40% for 65+). Asians are  
>>>>higher (80%) and other minorities less (60%). Hispanics are no  
>>>>different than the rest of the population if race is not  
>>>>considered. The South is significantly lower (60%) than other Census  
regions.

>>>>I cannot reveal any more about this study, but I would be  
>>>>interested in hearing from anyone with similarly up-to-date  
>>>>information as to whether these findings correspond to theirs.

>>>>Jan Werner

>>>>\_\_\_\_\_

>>>>DeBell, Matthew wrote:

>>>>>Allen Barton wrote,

>>>>>>Logically internet surveys sample only the population regularly  
>>>>>>connected

>>>>>>>to the internet, which as we know is only a fraction (how large?) of  
>>>>>>>the >population of households in the US ...

>>>>>>>I don't have the figures at the household level, but based on the most  
>>>>>>>recent computer and Internet use supplement to the Current Population  
>>>>>>>Survey (October 2003), 59 percent of adults use the Internet.

>>>>>>>That usage rate varies quite a bit by subgroup. Here are a few examples.

>>>>>>>All adults (18 and over): 59 percent

>>>>>>>Living in households where only Spanish is spoken: 18

>>>>>>>High school dropout: 20 65 and older: 25

>>>>>>>Disabled: 28

>>>>>>>Family income <\$20K: 33

>>>>>>>Hispanic: 35

>>>>>>>Black: 46

>>>>>>>White: 65

>>>>>>>Family income \$75K+: 89

>>>>>>>Graduate degree: 90

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>--

>>>>>>>Matthew DeBell, Ph.D.

>>>>>>>Federal Statistics Program

>>>>>>>American Institutes for Research

>>>>>>>Washington, DC

>>>>>>>202-403-6503

>>>>>>>mdebell@air.org

>>>>>>>-----

>>>>>>>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  
>>>  
>>>-----  
>>>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

-----  
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: Sat, 4 Feb 2006 10:39:48 -0800  
Reply-To: Doug Rivers <doug@POLIMETRIX.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Doug Rivers <doug@POLIMETRIX.COM>  
Subject: FW: Internet surveys  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

There are really 2 issues, coverage and non-random selection. When we = started Knowledge Networks in 1998, about 25% of the population were = Internet users, versus (maybe) 70% today, so the coverage problem is = slowly going away. Further, with cellphones and number portability, RDD = phone coverage is deteriorating (from 96-97% a decade ago, to around 90% = or so now).

While I wouldn't say that coverage is no longer a problem for Internet = surveys (try estimating the proportion of persons with Internet access = using an Internet survey!), I think the fundamental problem is = non-random selection. I'd agree with Warren that non-random selection is = much less of an issue for a low response RDD phone sample or a Knowledge = Networks-style panel than for a pure opt-in Internet panel, but it's = still an issue and the various methods used to deal with it are woefully = out of date and inadequate.

Most Internet panel vendors use quota sampling, because that is what = their customers are used to for mail and mall intercept studies. Most = RDD samples are rim-weighted (aka "raking"). Harris Interactive = estimates a propensity score using unspecified survey items from its = phone and web surveys and, apparently, some other adjustments for = demographic differences. The truth is we don't understand much about any = of these methods and we evaluate them based primarily upon hunches and = intuition and knee-jerk reactions ("It's not random so it's bad"). I = think we'd all benefit from more serious scientific work, both empirical = and theoretical, because, for better or worse, this is where we're = headed for large amounts of survey work.

Doug Rivers

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

From: AAPORNET on behalf of Warren Mitofsky

Sent: Sat 2/4/2006 9:28 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: Internet surveys

=20

You are right. You don't know that a sample represents a population=20 when there is substantial non-response. However, I would submit you=20 have a better chance of the non-responders/responders being random=20 than you do of one of those panels used by many internet survey=20 companies. The size of the non-response is not the issue. The issue=20 is whether they are a significantly biased group.

warren

At 10:58 PM 2/3/2006, you wrote:

>I posted those numbers only because a number of people seem to be=20  
>interested and they are apparently a couple of years more recent=20  
>than what is available from the CPS. It had nothing to do with panels.

>  
>In any event, as you should know, the proportion of the population=20  
>represented is not important. What is important is that the panel=20  
>composition provide full and heterogeneous coverage of all=20  
>dimensions of the population that are being queried. You don't know=20  
>that with a panel, but then, you also don't know that if you have=20  
>substantial non-response in a probability sample.

>  
>The problem is not that results from an Internet panel or a=20  
>probability sample with substantial non-response are necessarily=20  
>wrong, it's that you can't know the likelihood that they are wrong=20  
>unless you have some external information to go by, and that is=20  
>often not available.

>  
>I don't think that Internet panels can be representative of the=20  
>general population on all issues, but it is certainly possible to=20  
>select samples from them that are reasonably representative of some=20  
>segments of the population. It just depends on what you want to find =  
>out about.

>Jan

> \_\_\_\_\_

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

=====  
Date: Sat, 4 Feb 2006 15:50:20 -0500

Reply-To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)

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

From: Jan Werner <[jwerner@JWDP.COM](mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM)>

Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing

Subject: Re: FW: Internet surveys

Comments: To: Doug Rivers <doug@POLIMETRIX.COM>

Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu

In-Reply-To:

<016D23FB66B59D45A107C4741789271A3A85AB@washington.polimetrix.com>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

There is a real question here as to how to define coverage (this is implied in your aside about estimating the proportion of persons with Internet access using an Internet survey). Should coverage include all working phone numbers, or only those phone numbers that will actually answer a call. Obviously the latter cannot be known, but the widespread use of such technologies as Caller ID and anonymous call rejection make it likely to be much smaller.

And coverage of what? Households? Individuals? While coverage of households might reach 90%, I doubt that it was ever that high for individuals unless ones excludes the homeless, those living in institutions or group facilities and the like from the population frame.

Interestingly, some of those who are not reachable by RDD now have Internet access through public facilities like libraries and email access through free services like Hotmail and Yahoo!, although that does not mean that they are likely to be included in Internet survey panels.

In any event, technology is rapidly obsoleting any idea of obtaining something that can reasonably be considered a probability sample from telephone numbers alone. As The Economist magazine noted last September:

It is now no longer a question of whether VOIP will wipe out traditional telephony, but a question of how quickly it will do so. People in the industry are already talking about the day, perhaps only five years away, when telephony will be a free service offered as part of a bundle of services as an incentive to buy other things such as broadband access or pay-TV services.

Once that happens, the idea of a telephone number being a unique label through which one can reach an individual or household will essentially disappear. Even today, there is no guarantee that a number with your local area code does not connect to someone in Europe or Asia, and the possibilities that VOIP provides for easy filtering, forwarding and merging of accounts will make telephony a lot more like email today.

You are quite right that we need to much more research into how to conduct surveys with some indication of reliability once RDD is little more than a fond memory. HarrisInteractive claims to have done this with propensity scoring, but the secrecy with which they surround the details of their methodology makes their results suspect.

In the meantime, we seem to be stuck in a situation where an ignorant and lazy press will only publish survey results accompanied by a "margin

of error," even if this number has no factual basis, and rejects out of hand anything that doesn't match some editor's pre-conceived notions of what a "scientific" survey is supposed to be, rather than attempt to explain how to understand and qualify the results.

Jan Werner

---

Doug Rivers wrote:

> There are really 2 issues, coverage and non-random selection. When we  
> started Knowledge Networks in 1998, about 25% of the population were  
> Internet users, versus (maybe) 70% today, so the coverage problem is  
> slowly going away. Further, with cellphones and number portability,  
> RDD phone coverage is deteriorating (from 96-97% a decade ago, to  
> around 90% or so now).

>  
> While I wouldn't say that coverage is no longer a problem for  
> Internet surveys (try estimating the proportion of persons with  
> Internet access using an Internet survey!), I think the fundamental  
> problem is non-random selection. I'd agree with Warren that  
> non-random selection is much less of an issue for a low response RDD  
> phone sample or a Knowledge Networks-style panel than for a pure  
> opt-in Internet panel, but it's still an issue and the various  
> methods used to deal with it are woefully out of date and inadequate.

>  
>  
> Most Internet panel vendors use quota sampling, because that is what  
> their customers are used to for mail and mall intercept studies. Most  
> RDD samples are rim-weighted (aka "raking"). Harris Interactive  
> estimates a propensity score using unspecified survey items from its  
> phone and web surveys and, apparently, some other adjustments for  
> demographic differences. The truth is we don't understand much about  
> any of these methods and we evaluate them based primarily upon  
> hunches and intuition and knee-jerk reactions ("It's not random so  
> it's bad"). I think we'd all benefit from more serious scientific  
> work, both empirical and theoretical, because, for better or worse,  
> this is where we're headed for large amounts of survey work.

>  
> Doug Rivers

>  
>  
> -----Original Message----- From: AAPORNET on behalf of Warren  
> Mitofsky Sent: Sat 2/4/2006 9:28 AM To: AAPORNET@asu.edu Subject: Re:  
> Internet surveys

>  
> You are right. You don't know that a sample represents a population  
> when there is substantial non-response. However, I would submit you  
> have a better chance of the non-responders/responders being random  
> than you do of one of those panels used by many internet survey  
> companies. The size of the non-response is not the issue. The issue  
> is whether they are a significantly biased group.

>  
> warren

>



> At 10:58 PM 2/3/2006, you wrote:  
>> I posted those numbers only because a number of people seem to be  
>> interested and they are apparently a couple of years more recent  
>> than what is available from the CPS. It had nothing to do with  
>> panels.  
>>  
>> In any event, as you should know, the proportion of the population  
>> represented is not important. What is important is that the panel  
>> composition provide full and heterogeneous coverage of all  
>> dimensions of the population that are being queried. You don't know  
>> that with a panel, but then, you also don't know that if you have  
>> substantial non-response in a probability sample.  
>>  
>> The problem is not that results from an Internet panel or a  
>> probability sample with substantial non-response are necessarily  
>> wrong, it's that you can't know the likelihood that they are wrong  
>> unless you have some external information to go by, and that is  
>> often not available.  
>>  
>> I don't think that Internet panels can be representative of the  
>> general population on all issues, but it is certainly possible to  
>> select samples from them that are reasonably representative of some  
>> segments of the population. It just depends on what you want to  
>> find out about.

>> Jan \_\_\_\_\_

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

---

Date: Sat, 4 Feb 2006 19:18:22 -0800  
Reply-To: [lawton@techsociety.com](mailto:lawton@techsociety.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leora Lawton <[lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM](mailto:lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM)>  
Subject: Re: FW: Internet surveys  
Comments: To: [jwerner@JWDP.COM](mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM)  
Comments: cc: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[43E5138C.5090500@jwdp.com](mailto:43E5138C.5090500@jwdp.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8bit

Hi,

I want to comment on HarrisInteractive's proprietary method of making their survey populations representative. I don't work there nor have I ever, but I believe they are trying very hard to deal with the fact that RDD is increasingly problematic and email is a heckuva lot cheaper. If they can do that then it's a very valuable product to them as a business. The reason they don't share that methodology is akin to coca-cola not sharing their recipe. I have developed various proprietary algorithms (e.g., a brand segmentation) and I wouldn't share them either.

That said, I don't know how close to the mark they are but how much worse did they do than other polls in predicting the 2004 presidential election?

[http://www.harrisinteractive.com/harris\\_poll/index.asp?PID=515](http://www.harrisinteractive.com/harris_poll/index.asp?PID=515)

Their ability to be accurate is, I imagine, proof of their methodology's quality, no?

leora

> You are quite right that we need to much more research into how to  
> conduct surveys with some indication of reliability once RDD is little  
> more than a fond memory. HarrisInteractive claims to have done this with  
> propensity scoring, but the secrecy with which they surround the details  
> of their methodology makes their results suspect.

>  
> In the meantime, we seem to be stuck in a situation where an ignorant  
> and lazy press will only publish survey results accompanied by a "margin  
> of error," even if this number has no factual basis, and rejects out of  
> hand anything that doesn't match some editor's pre-conceived notions of  
> what a "scientific" survey is supposed to be, rather than attempt to  
> explain how to understand and qualify the results.

>  
> Jan Werner

> \_\_\_\_\_  
>

> Doug Rivers wrote:

>> There are really 2 issues, coverage and non-random selection. When we  
>> started Knowledge Networks in 1998, about 25% of the population were  
>> Internet users, versus (maybe) 70% today, so the coverage problem is  
>> slowly going away. Further, with cellphones and number portability,  
>> RDD phone coverage is deteriorating (from 96-97% a decade ago, to  
>> around 90% or so now).

>>  
>> While I wouldn't say that coverage is no longer a problem for  
>> Internet surveys (try estimating the proportion of persons with  
>> Internet access using an Internet survey!), I think the fundamental  
>> problem is non-random selection. I'd agree with Warren that  
>> non-random selection is much less of an issue for a low response RDD  
>> phone sample or a Knowledge Networks-style panel than for a pure  
>> opt-in Internet panel, but it's still an issue and the various  
>> methods used to deal with it are woefully out of date and inadequate.

>>  
>>

>> Most Internet panel vendors use quota sampling, because that is what  
>> their customers are used to for mail and mall intercept studies. Most  
>> RDD samples are rim-weighted (aka "raking"). Harris Interactive  
>> estimates a propensity score using unspecified survey items from its  
>> phone and web surveys and, apparently, some other adjustments for  
>> demographic differences. The truth is we don't understand much about  
>> any of these methods and we evaluate them based primarily upon  
>> hunches and intuition and knee-jerk reactions ("It's not random so  
>> it's bad"). I think we'd all benefit from more serious scientific  
>> work, both empirical and theoretical, because, for better or worse,  
>> this is where we're headed for large amounts of survey work.

>>  
>> Doug Rivers

>>  
>>  
>> -----Original Message----- From: AAPORNET on behalf of Warren  
>> Mitofsky Sent: Sat 2/4/2006 9:28 AM To: AAPORNET@asu.edu Subject: Re:  
>> Internet surveys

>>  
>> You are right. You don't know that a sample represents a population  
>> when there is substantial non-response. However, I would submit you  
>> have a better chance of the non-responders/responders being random  
>> than you do of one of those panels used by many internet survey  
>> companies. The size of the non-response is not the issue. The issue  
>> is whether they are a significantly biased group.

>>  
>> warren

>>  
>> At 10:58 PM 2/3/2006, you wrote:

>>> I posted those numbers only because a number of people seem to be  
>>> interested and they are apparently a couple of years more recent  
>>> than what is available from the CPS. It had nothing to do with  
>>> panels.

>>>  
>>> In any event, as you should know, the proportion of the population  
>>> represented is not important. What is important is that the panel  
>>> composition provide full and heterogeneous coverage of all  
>>> dimensions of the population that are being queried. You don't know  
>>> that with a panel, but then, you also don't know that if you have  
>>> substantial non-response in a probability sample.

>>>  
>>> The problem is not that results from an Internet panel or a  
>>> probability sample with substantial non-response are necessarily  
>>> wrong, it's that you can't know the likelihood that they are wrong  
>>> unless you have some external information to go by, and that is  
>>> often not available.

>>>  
>>> I don't think that Internet panels can be representative of the  
>>> general population on all issues, but it is certainly possible to  
>>> select samples from them that are reasonably representative of some  
>>> segments of the population. It just depends on what you want to  
>>> find out about.

>>>  
>>> Jan \_\_\_\_\_

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

---

Date: Sat, 4 Feb 2006 23:40:48 -0500  
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <[mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Warren Mitofsky <[mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM)>  
Subject: Re: FW: Internet surveys  
Comments: To: [lawton@techsociety.com](mailto:lawton@techsociety.com), [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[1551.68.123.13.117.1139109502.squirrel@www.transbay.net](mailto:1551.68.123.13.117.1139109502.squirrel@www.transbay.net)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

The answer to your question about the performance of the Harris Interactive Internet survey in 2004 is that there were 15 other polls during the last two weeks before election day. The other 15 had smaller errors than the HI Internet survey.

The HI survey done by telephone was quite good. They were tied with six other polls for the second smallest error.

warren mitofsky

At 10:18 PM 2/4/2006, Leora Lawton wrote:

>Hi,  
>  
>I want to comment on HarrisInteractive's proprietary method of making  
>their survey populations representative. I don't work there nor have I  
>ever, but I believe they are trying very hard to deal with the fact that  
>RDD is increasingly problematic and email is a heckuva lot cheaper. If they  
>can do that then it's a very valuable product to them as a business. The  
>reason they don't share that methodology is akin to coca-cola not sharing  
>their recipe. I have developed various proprietary algorithms (e.g., a

>brand segmentation) and I wouldn't share them either.

>

>That said, I don't know how close to the mark they are but how much worse

>did they do than other polls in predicting the 2004 presidential election?

>[http://www.harrisinteractive.com/harris\\_poll/index.asp?PID=515](http://www.harrisinteractive.com/harris_poll/index.asp?PID=515)

>Their ability to be accurate is, I imagine, proof of their methodology's

>quality, no?

>

>leora

>

>

>> You are quite right that we need to much more research into how to  
>> conduct surveys with some indication of reliability once RDD is little  
>> more than a fond memory. HarrisInteractive claims to have done this with  
>> propensity scoring, but the secrecy with which they surround the details  
>> of their methodology makes their results suspect.

>>

>> In the meantime, we seem to be stuck in a situation where an ignorant  
>> and lazy press will only publish survey results accompanied by a "margin  
>> of error," even if this number has no factual basis, and rejects out of  
>> hand anything that doesn't match some editor's pre-conceived notions of  
>> what a "scientific" survey is supposed to be, rather than attempt to  
>> explain how to understand and qualify the results.

>>

>> Jan Werner

>>

>>

>> Doug Rivers wrote:

>>> There are really 2 issues, coverage and non-random selection. When we  
>>> started Knowledge Networks in 1998, about 25% of the population were  
>>> Internet users, versus (maybe) 70% today, so the coverage problem is  
>>> slowly going away. Further, with cellphones and number portability,  
>>> RDD phone coverage is deteriorating (from 96-97% a decade ago, to  
>>> around 90% or so now).

>>>

>>> While I wouldn't say that coverage is no longer a problem for  
>>> Internet surveys (try estimating the proportion of persons with  
>>> Internet access using an Internet survey!), I think the fundamental  
>>> problem is non-random selection. I'd agree with Warren that  
>>> non-random selection is much less of an issue for a low response RDD  
>>> phone sample or a Knowledge Networks-style panel than for a pure  
>>> opt-in Internet panel, but it's still an issue and the various  
>>> methods used to deal with it are woefully out of date and inadequate.

>>>

>>>

>>> Most Internet panel vendors use quota sampling, because that is what  
>>> their customers are used to for mail and mall intercept studies. Most  
>>> RDD samples are rim-weighted (aka "raking"). Harris Interactive  
>>> estimates a propensity score using unspecified survey items from its  
>>> phone and web surveys and, apparently, some other adjustments for  
>>> demographic differences. The truth is we don't understand much about  
>>> any of these methods and we evaluate them based primarily upon  
>>> hunches and intuition and knee-jerk reactions ("It's not random so  
>>> it's bad"). I think we'd all benefit from more serious scientific

>>> work, both empirical and theoretical, because, for better or worse,  
>>> this is where we're headed for large amounts of survey work.  
>>>  
>>> Doug Rivers  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> -----Original Message----- From: AAPORNET on behalf of Warren  
>>> Mitofsky Sent: Sat 2/4/2006 9:28 AM To: AAPORNET@asu.edu Subject: Re:  
>>> Internet surveys  
>>>  
>>> You are right. You don't know that a sample represents a population  
>>> when there is substantial non-response. However, I would submit you  
>>> have a better chance of the non-responders/responders being random  
>>> than you do of one of those panels used by many internet survey  
>>> companies. The size of the non-response is not the issue. The issue  
>>> is whether they are a significantly biased group.  
>>>  
>>> warren  
>>>  
>>> At 10:58 PM 2/3/2006, you wrote:  
>>>> I posted those numbers only because a number of people seem to be  
>>>> interested and they are apparently a couple of years more recent  
>>>> than what is available from the CPS. It had nothing to do with  
>>>> panels.  
>>>>  
>>>> In any event, as you should know, the proportion of the population  
>>>> represented is not important. What is important is that the panel  
>>>> composition provide full and heterogeneous coverage of all  
>>>> dimensions of the population that are being queried. You don't know  
>>>> that with a panel, but then, you also don't know that if you have  
>>>> substantial non-response in a probability sample.  
>>>>  
>>>> The problem is not that results from an Internet panel or a  
>>>> probability sample with substantial non-response are necessarily  
>>>> wrong, it's that you can't know the likelihood that they are wrong  
>>>> unless you have some external information to go by, and that is  
>>>> often not available.  
>>>>  
>>>> I don't think that Internet panels can be representative of the  
>>>> general population on all issues, but it is certainly possible to  
>>>> select samples from them that are reasonably representative of some  
>>>> segments of the population. It just depends on what you want to  
>>>> find out about.  
>>>>  
>>>> Jan \_\_\_\_\_  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> ----- 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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Sun, 5 Feb 2006 11:39:18 +0000  
Reply-To: [worc@MORI.COM](mailto:worc@MORI.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Robert Worcester <[worc@MORI.COM](mailto:worc@MORI.COM)>  
Subject: Re: FW: Internet surveys  
Comments: To: Warren Mitofsky <[mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Comments: cc: Roger Mortimore <[Roger.Mortimore@mori.com](mailto:Roger.Mortimore@mori.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Warren's half right on the 2004 outcome in saying Harris Interactive was furthest out of the 'final' polls, but to complete the picture, he is supported by the fact that the two polls that were out the furthest (Kerry by 3%!) were the two, and only two, that were done with internet panels, Harris Interactive, as he says, and the British internet pollsters YouGov for The Economist. See attached analysis.

Interesting and so far not commented on even in Britain yet that over the last month three other British pollsters, Ipsos MORI (for the Observer Sunday newspaper, a poll on sexual habits and attitudes polling 16-64 year olds), ICM (a national political poll for the Guardian the next day) and Populus (another national political poll, for the Times, on the day following the one in the Guardian).

Bob Worcester

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Warren Mitofsky  
Sent: 05 February 2006 04:41  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Subject: Re: FW: Internet surveys

The answer to your question about the performance of the Harris Interactive Internet survey in 2004 is that there were 15 other polls during the last two weeks before election day. The other 15 had smaller errors than the HI Internet survey.

The HI survey done by telephone was quite good. They were tied with six other polls for the second smallest error.

warren mitofsky

At 10:18 PM 2/4/2006, Leora Lawton wrote:

>Hi,  
>  
>I want to comment on HarrisInteractive's proprietary method of making=20  
>their survey populations representative. I don't work there nor have I

>ever, but I believe they are trying very hard to deal with the fact=20  
>that RDD is increasingly problematic and email is a heckuva lot cheaper.

>If they can do that then it's a very valuable product to them as a=20  
>business. The reason they don't share that methodology is akin to=20  
>coca-cola not sharing their recipe. I have developed various=20  
>proprietary algorithms (e.g., a brand segmentation) and I wouldn't  
share them either.

>  
>That said, I don't know how close to the mark they are but how much=20  
>worse did they do than other polls in predicting the 2004 presidential  
election?

>  
>[http://www.harrisinteractive.com/harris\\_poll/index.asp?PID=3D515](http://www.harrisinteractive.com/harris_poll/index.asp?PID=3D515)  
>Their ability to be accurate is, I imagine, proof of their=20  
>methodology's quality, no?

>  
>leora

>  
>  
>> You are quite right that we need to much more research into how to=20  
>> conduct surveys with some indication of reliability once RDD is=20  
>> little more than a fond memory. HarrisInteractive claims to have=20  
>> done this with propensity scoring, but the secrecy with which they=20  
>> surround the details of their methodology makes their results  
suspect.

>>  
>> In the meantime, we seem to be stuck in a situation where an=20  
>> ignorant and lazy press will only publish survey results accompanied

>> by a "margin of error," even if this number has no factual basis,=20  
>> and rejects out of hand anything that doesn't match some editor's=20  
>> pre-conceived notions of what a "scientific" survey is supposed to=20  
>> be, rather than attempt to explain how to understand and qualify the  
results.

>>  
>> Jan Werner

>> \_\_\_\_\_



>>  
>> Doug Rivers wrote:  
>>> There are really 2 issues, coverage and non-random selection. When=20  
>>> we started Knowledge Networks in 1998, about 25% of the population=20  
>>> were Internet users, versus (maybe) 70% today, so the coverage=20  
>>> problem is slowly going away. Further, with cellphones and number=20  
>>> portability, RDD phone coverage is deteriorating (from 96-97% a=20  
>>> decade ago, to around 90% or so now).  
>>>  
>>> While I wouldn't say that coverage is no longer a problem for=20  
>>> Internet surveys (try estimating the proportion of persons with=20  
>>> Internet access using an Internet survey!), I think the fundamental  
  
>>> problem is non-random selection. I'd agree with Warren that=20  
>>> non-random selection is much less of an issue for a low response=20  
>>> RDD phone sample or a Knowledge Networks-style panel than for a=20  
>>> pure opt-in Internet panel, but it's still an issue and the various  
  
>>> methods used to deal with it are woefully out of date and  
inadequate.  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> Most Internet panel vendors use quota sampling, because that is=20  
>>> what their customers are used to for mail and mall intercept=20  
>>> studies. Most RDD samples are rim-weighted (aka "raking"). Harris=20  
>>> Interactive estimates a propensity score using unspecified survey=20  
>>> items from its phone and web surveys and, apparently, some other=20  
>>> adjustments for demographic differences. The truth is we don't=20  
>>> understand much about any of these methods and we evaluate them=20  
>>> based primarily upon hunches and intuition and knee-jerk reactions=20  
>>> ("It's not random so it's bad"). I think we'd all benefit from more  
  
>>> serious scientific work, both empirical and theoretical, because,=20  
>>> for better or worse, this is where we're headed for large amounts  
of survey work.  
>>>  
>>> Doug Rivers  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> -----Original Message----- From: AAPORNET on behalf of Warren=20  
>>> Mitofsky Sent: Sat 2/4/2006 9:28 AM To: AAPORNET@asu.edu Subject:  
Re:  
>>> Internet surveys  
>>>  
>>> You are right. You don't know that a sample represents a population  
  
>>> when there is substantial non-response. However, I would submit you  
  
>>> have a better chance of the non-responders/responders being random=20  
>>> than you do of one of those panels used by many internet survey=20  
>>> companies. The size of the non-response is not the issue. The issue  
  
>>> is whether they are a significantly biased group.  
>>>

>>> warren  
>>>  
>>> At 10:58 PM 2/3/2006, you wrote:  
>>>> I posted those numbers only because a number of people seem to be=20  
>>>> interested and they are apparently a couple of years more recent=20  
>>>> than what is available from the CPS. It had nothing to do with=20  
>>>> panels.  
>>>>  
>>>> In any event, as you should know, the proportion of the population  
  
>>>> represented is not important. What is important is that the panel  
  
>>>> composition provide full and heterogeneous coverage of all=20  
>>>> dimensions of the population that are being queried. You don't=20  
>>>> know that with a panel, but then, you also don't know that if you  
  
>>>> have substantial non-response in a probability sample.  
>>>>  
>>>> The problem is not that results from an Internet panel or a=20  
>>>> probability sample with substantial non-response are necessarily=20  
>>>> wrong, it's that you can't know the likelihood that they are wrong  
  
>>>> unless you have some external information to go by, and that is=20  
>>>> often not available.  
>>>>  
>>>> I don't think that Internet panels can be representative of the=20  
>>>> general population on all issues, but it is certainly possible to=20  
>>>> select samples from them that are reasonably representative of=20  
>>>> some segments of the population. It just depends on what you want  
  
>>>> to find out about.  
>>>>  
>>>> Jan \_\_\_\_\_  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> ----- Conference=20  
>>>> info and call for papers: <http://www.aapor.org/> Archives:  
>>>> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> Please ask authors=20  
>>>> before quoting outside AAPORNET. Problems?-don't reply to this=20  
>>>> message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto: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:=20  
>>>> [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> -----  
>>>> Conference info and call for papers: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>



Sent: 05 February 2006 11:39  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: FW: Internet surveys

Warren's half right on the 2004 outcome in saying Harris Interactive was furthest out of the 'final' polls, but to complete the picture, he is supported by the fact that the two polls that were out the furthest (Kerry by 3%!) were the two, and only two, that were done with internet panels, Harris Interactive, as he says, and the British internet pollsters YouGov for The Economist. See attached analysis.

Interesting and so far not commented on even in Britain yet that over the last month three other British pollsters, Ipsos MORI (for the Observer Sunday newspaper, a poll on sexual habits and attitudes polling 16-64 year olds), ICM (a national political poll for the Guardian the next day) and Populus (another national political poll, for the Times, on the day following the one in the Guardian).

Bob Worcester

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Warren Mitofsky  
Sent: 05 February 2006 04:41  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: FW: Internet surveys

The answer to your question about the performance of the Harris Interactive Internet survey in 2004 is that there were 15 other polls during the last two weeks before election day. The other 15 had smaller errors than the HI Internet survey.

The HI survey done by telephone was quite good. They were tied with six other polls for the second smallest error.

warren mitofsky

At 10:18 PM 2/4/2006, Leora Lawton wrote:

>Hi,  
>  
>I want to comment on HarrisInteractive's proprietary method of making=20  
>their survey populations representative. I don't work there nor have I  
>ever, but I believe they are trying very hard to deal with the fact=20  
>that RDD is increasingly problematic and email is a heckuva lot cheaper.  
>  
>If they can do that then it's a very valuable product to them as a=20  
>business. The reason they don't share that methodology is akin to=20  
>cooca-cola not sharing their recipe. I have developed various=20  
>proprietary algorithms (e.g., a brand segmentation) and I wouldn't  
>share them either.  
>  
>That said, I don't know how close to the mark they are but how much=20  
>worse did they do than other polls in predicting the 2004 presidential

election?

>[http://www.harrisinteractive.com/harris\\_poll/index.asp?PID=3D515](http://www.harrisinteractive.com/harris_poll/index.asp?PID=3D515)

>Their ability to be accurate is, I imagine, proof of their=20

>methodology's quality, no?

>

>leora

>

>

>> You are quite right that we need to much more research into how to=20

>> conduct surveys with some indication of reliability once RDD is=20

>> little more than a fond memory. HarrisInteractive claims to have=20

>> done this with propensity scoring, but the secrecy with which they=20

>> surround the details of their methodology makes their results

suspect.

>>

>> In the meantime, we seem to be stuck in a situation where an=20

>> ignorant and lazy press will only publish survey results accompanied

>> by a "margin of error," even if this number has no factual basis,=20

>> and rejects out of hand anything that doesn't match some editor's=20

>> pre-conceived notions of what a "scientific" survey is supposed to=20

>> be, rather than attempt to explain how to understand and qualify the

results.

>>

>> Jan Werner

>>

>>

>> Doug Rivers wrote:

>>> There are really 2 issues, coverage and non-random selection. When=20

>>> we started Knowledge Networks in 1998, about 25% of the population=20

>>> were Internet users, versus (maybe) 70% today, so the coverage=20

>>> problem is slowly going away. Further, with cellphones and number=20

>>> portability, RDD phone coverage is deteriorating (from 96-97% a=20

>>> decade ago, to around 90% or so now).

>>>

>>> While I wouldn't say that coverage is no longer a problem for=20

>>> Internet surveys (try estimating the proportion of persons with=20

>>> Internet access using an Internet survey!), I think the fundamental

>>> problem is non-random selection. I'd agree with Warren that=20

>>> non-random selection is much less of an issue for a low response=20

>>> RDD phone sample or a Knowledge Networks-style panel than for a=20

>>> pure opt-in Internet panel, but it's still an issue and the various

>>> methods used to deal with it are woefully out of date and  
inadequate.

>>>

>>>

>>> Most Internet panel vendors use quota sampling, because that is=20

>>> what their customers are used to for mail and mall intercept=20

>>> studies. Most RDD samples are rim-weighted (aka "raking"). Harris=20

>>> Interactive estimates a propensity score using unspecified survey=20

>>> items from its phone and web surveys and, apparently, some other=20

>>> adjustments for demographic differences. The truth is we don't=20

>>> understand much about any of these methods and we evaluate them=20  
>>> based primarily upon hunches and intuition and knee-jerk reactions=20  
>>> ("It's not random so it's bad"). I think we'd all benefit from more  
  
>>> serious scientific work, both empirical and theoretical, because,=20  
>>> for better or worse, this is where we're headed for large amounts  
of survey work.  
>>>  
>>> Doug Rivers  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> -----Original Message----- From: AAPORNET on behalf of Warren=20  
>>> Mitofsky Sent: Sat 2/4/2006 9:28 AM To: AAPORNET@asu.edu Subject:  
Re:  
>>> Internet surveys  
>>>  
>>> You are right. You don't know that a sample represents a population  
  
>>> when there is substantial non-response. However, I would submit you  
  
>>> have a better chance of the non-responders/responders being random=20  
>>> than you do of one of those panels used by many internet survey=20  
>>> companies. The size of the non-response is not the issue. The issue  
  
>>> is whether they are a significantly biased group.  
>>>  
>>> warren  
>>>  
>>> At 10:58 PM 2/3/2006, you wrote:  
>>>> I posted those numbers only because a number of people seem to be=20  
>>>> interested and they are apparently a couple of years more recent=20  
>>>> than what is available from the CPS. It had nothing to do with=20  
>>>> panels.  
>>>>  
>>>> In any event, as you should know, the proportion of the population  
  
>>>> represented is not important. What is important is that the panel  
  
>>>> composition provide full and heterogeneous coverage of all=20  
>>>> dimensions of the population that are being queried. You don't=20  
>>>> know that with a panel, but then, you also don't know that if you  
  
>>>> have substantial non-response in a probability sample.  
>>>>  
>>>> The problem is not that results from an Internet panel or a=20  
>>>> probability sample with substantial non-response are necessarily=20  
>>>> wrong, it's that you can't know the likelihood that they are wrong  
  
>>>> unless you have some external information to go by, and that is=20  
>>>> often not available.  
>>>>  
>>>> I don't think that Internet panels can be representative of the=20  
>>>> general population on all issues, but it is certainly possible to=20  
>>>> select samples from them that are reasonably representative of=20







Sorry, my own copy came through without the spreadsheet attached, although it's only 25KB. Don't know why.

So here it is, hopefully.

Bob=20

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Robert Worcester  
Sent: 05 February 2006 11:39  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: FW: Internet surveys

Warren's half right on the 2004 outcome in saying Harris Interactive was furthest out of the 'final' polls, but to complete the picture, he is supported by the fact that the two polls that were out the furthest (Kerry by 3%!) were the two, and only two, that were done with internet panels, Harris Interactive, as he says, and the British internet pollsters YouGov for The Economist. See attached analysis.

Interesting and so far not commented on even in Britain yet that over the last month three other British pollsters, Ipsos MORI (for the Observer Sunday newspaper, a poll on sexual habits and attitudes polling 16-64 year olds), ICM (a national political poll for the Guardian the next day) and Populus (another national political poll, for the Times, on the day following the one in the Guardian).

Bob Worcester

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Warren Mitofsky  
Sent: 05 February 2006 04:41  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: FW: Internet surveys

The answer to your question about the performance of the Harris Interactive Internet survey in 2004 is that there were 15 other polls during the last two weeks before election day. The other 15 had smaller errors than the HI Internet survey.

The HI survey done by telephone was quite good. They were tied with six other polls for the second smallest error.

warren mitofsky

At 10:18 PM 2/4/2006, Leora Lawton wrote:

>Hi,  
>  
>I want to comment on HarrisInteractive's proprietary method of making=20  
>their survey populations representative. I don't work there nor have I  
  
>ever, but I believe they are trying very hard to deal with the fact=20  
>that RDD is increasingly problematic and email is a heckuva lot cheaper.

>If they can do that then it's a very valuable product to them as a=20  
>business. The reason they don't share that methodology is akin to=20  
>coca-cola not sharing their recipe. I have developed various=20  
>proprietary algorithms (e.g., a brand segmentation) and I wouldn't  
share them either.  
>  
>That said, I don't know how close to the mark they are but how much=20  
>worse did they do than other polls in predicting the 2004 presidential  
election?  
>[http://www.harrisinteractive.com/harris\\_poll/index.asp?PID=3D515](http://www.harrisinteractive.com/harris_poll/index.asp?PID=3D515)  
>Their ability to be accurate is, I imagine, proof of their=20  
>methodology's quality, no?  
>  
>leora  
>  
>  
>> You are quite right that we need to much more research into how to=20  
>> conduct surveys with some indication of reliability once RDD is=20  
>> little more than a fond memory. HarrisInteractive claims to have=20  
>> done this with propensity scoring, but the secrecy with which they=20  
>> surround the details of their methodology makes their results  
suspect.  
>>  
>> In the meantime, we seem to be stuck in a situation where an=20  
>> ignorant and lazy press will only publish survey results accompanied  
  
>> by a "margin of error," even if this number has no factual basis,=20  
>> and rejects out of hand anything that doesn't match some editor's=20  
>> pre-conceived notions of what a "scientific" survey is supposed to=20  
>> be, rather than attempt to explain how to understand and qualify the  
results.  
>>  
>> Jan Werner  
>> \_\_\_\_\_  
>>  
>> Doug Rivers wrote:  
>>> There are really 2 issues, coverage and non-random selection. When=20  
>>> we started Knowledge Networks in 1998, about 25% of the population=20  
>>> were Internet users, versus (maybe) 70% today, so the coverage=20  
>>> problem is slowly going away. Further, with cellphones and number=20  
>>> portability, RDD phone coverage is deteriorating (from 96-97% a=20  
>>> decade ago, to around 90% or so now).  
>>>  
>>> While I wouldn't say that coverage is no longer a problem for=20  
>>> Internet surveys (try estimating the proportion of persons with=20  
>>> Internet access using an Internet survey!), I think the fundamental  
  
>>> problem is non-random selection. I'd agree with Warren that=20  
>>> non-random selection is much less of an issue for a low response=20  
>>> RDD phone sample or a Knowledge Networks-style panel than for a=20  
>>> pure opt-in Internet panel, but it's still an issue and the various  
  
>>> methods used to deal with it are woefully out of date and

inadequate.

>>>  
>>>  
>>> Most Internet panel vendors use quota sampling, because that is=20  
>>> what their customers are used to for mail and mall intercept=20  
>>> studies. Most RDD samples are rim-weighted (aka "raking"). Harris=20  
>>> Interactive estimates a propensity score using unspecified survey=20  
>>> items from its phone and web surveys and, apparently, some other=20  
>>> adjustments for demographic differences. The truth is we don't=20  
>>> understand much about any of these methods and we evaluate them=20  
>>> based primarily upon hunches and intuition and knee-jerk reactions=20  
>>> ("It's not random so it's bad"). I think we'd all benefit from more  
  
>>> serious scientific work, both empirical and theoretical, because,=20  
>>> for better or worse, this is where we're headed for large amounts  
of survey work.  
>>>  
>>> Doug Rivers  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> -----Original Message----- From: AAPORNET on behalf of Warren=20  
>>> Mitofsky Sent: Sat 2/4/2006 9:28 AM To: AAPORNET@asu.edu Subject:  
Re:  
>>> Internet surveys  
>>>  
>>> You are right. You don't know that a sample represents a population  
  
>>> when there is substantial non-response. However, I would submit you  
  
>>> have a better chance of the non-responders/responders being random=20  
>>> than you do of one of those panels used by many internet survey=20  
>>> companies. The size of the non-response is not the issue. The issue  
  
>>> is whether they are a significantly biased group.  
>>>  
>>> warren  
>>>  
>>> At 10:58 PM 2/3/2006, you wrote:  
>>>> I posted those numbers only because a number of people seem to be=20  
>>>> interested and they are apparently a couple of years more recent=20  
>>>> than what is available from the CPS. It had nothing to do with=20  
>>>> panels.  
>>>>  
>>>> In any event, as you should know, the proportion of the population  
  
>>>> represented is not important. What is important is that the panel  
  
>>>> composition provide full and heterogeneous coverage of all=20  
>>>> dimensions of the population that are being queried. You don't=20  
>>>> know that with a panel, but then, you also don't know that if you  
  
>>>> have substantial non-response in a probability sample.  
>>>>  
>>>> The problem is not that results from an Internet panel or a=20





=3D=3D=3D=20

-----  
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.

---

Date: Sun, 5 Feb 2006 12:57:12 -0600  
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Subject: Re: FW: Internet surveys  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[B28ABDB60B6E3D478EB68CF0BA0E86A9280044@theta.mori.com](mailto:B28ABDB60B6E3D478EB68CF0BA0E86A9280044@theta.mori.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

However....

....in 2000, Harris Interactive (both Internet and phone) had the exact margin. See:  
<http://www.ncpp.org/1936-2000.htm>

...after rounding to whole percentages. (Actual outcome per the FEC:  
Gore 48.4%/Bush 47.9%)

NICK

Robert Worcester wrote:

> Well, our net is clearly not happy with attachments, sorry. If anyone  
>wants the complete final poll results of the 2004 US presidential  
>election in a tiny (25kb)Excel spreadsheet, send me an email and I'll  
>forward it to you, (unless our shepherd can let this innocent lamb  
>through the gate!)

>

>Bob

>

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

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

>Sent: 05 February 2006 11:45

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

>Subject: Re: FW: Internet surveys

>

>Sorry, my own copy came through without the spreadsheet attached,  
>although it's only 25KB. Don't know why.

>

>So here it is, hopefully.

>

>Bob

>

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

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

>Sent: 05 February 2006 11:39

>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>Subject: Re: FW: Internet surveys

>

>Warren's half right on the 2004 outcome in saying Harris Interactive was

>furthest out of the 'final' polls, but to complete the picture, he is

>supported by the fact that the two polls that were out the furthest

>(Kerry by 3%!) were the two, and only two, that were done with internet

>panels, Harris Interactive, as he says, and the British internet

>pollsters YouGov for The Economist. See attached analysis.

>

>Interesting and so far not commented on even in Britain yet that over

>the last month three other British pollsters, Ipsos MORI (for the

>Observer Sunday newspaper, a poll on sexual habits and attitudes polling

>16-64 year olds), ICM (a national political poll for the Guardian the

>next day) and Populus (another national political poll, for the Times,

>on the day following the one in the Guardian).

>

>Bob Worcester

>

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

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

>Sent: 05 February 2006 04:41

>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>Subject: Re: FW: Internet surveys

>

>The answer to your question about the performance of the Harris

>Interactive Internet survey in 2004 is that there were 15 other polls

>during the last two weeks before election day. The other 15 had smaller

>errors than the HI Internet survey.

>

>The HI survey done by telephone was quite good. They were tied with six

>other polls for the second smallest error.

>

>warren mitofsky

>

>

>At 10:18 PM 2/4/2006, Leora Lawton wrote:

>

>

>>Hi,

>>

>>I want to comment on HarrisInteractive's proprietary method of making

>>their survey populations representative. I don't work there nor have I

>>

>>

>

>

>

>>ever, but I believe they are trying very hard to deal with the fact

>>that RDD is increasingly problematic and email is a heckuva lot cheaper.

>>

>>

>

>  
>  
>>If they can do that then it's a very valuable product to them as a  
>>business. The reason they don't share that methodology is akin to  
>>coca-cola not sharing their recipe. I have developed various  
>>proprietary algorithms (e.g., a brand segmentation) and I wouldn't  
>>  
>>  
>share them either.  
>  
>  
>>That said, I don't know how close to the mark they are but how much  
>>worse did they do than other polls in predicting the 2004 presidential  
>>  
>>  
>election?  
>  
>  
>>[http://www.harrisinteractive.com/harris\\_poll/index.asp?PID=515](http://www.harrisinteractive.com/harris_poll/index.asp?PID=515)  
>>Their ability to be accurate is, I imagine, proof of their  
>>methodology's quality, no?  
>>  
>>leora  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>>>You are quite right that we need to much more research into how to  
>>>>conduct surveys with some indication of reliability once RDD is  
>>>>little more than a fond memory. HarrisInteractive claims to have  
>>>>done this with propensity scoring, but the secrecy with which they  
>>>>surround the details of their methodology makes their results  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>suspect.  
>  
>  
>>>>In the meantime, we seem to be stuck in a situation where an  
>>>>ignorant and lazy press will only publish survey results accompanied  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>  
>  
>  
>>>>by a "margin of error," even if this number has no factual basis,  
>>>>and rejects out of hand anything that doesn't match some editor's  
>>>>pre-conceived notions of what a "scientific" survey is supposed to  
>>>>be, rather than attempt to explain how to understand and qualify the  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>results.  
>  
>  
>>>>Jan Werner



>>>> \_\_\_\_\_  
>>>>  
>>>> Doug Rivers wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>> There are really 2 issues, coverage and non-random selection. When  
>>>>> we started Knowledge Networks in 1998, about 25% of the population  
>>>>> were Internet users, versus (maybe) 70% today, so the coverage  
>>>>> problem is slowly going away. Further, with cellphones and number  
>>>>> portability, RDD phone coverage is deteriorating (from 96-97% a  
>>>>> decade ago, to around 90% or so now).  
>>>>>  
>>>>> While I wouldn't say that coverage is no longer a problem for  
>>>>> Internet surveys (try estimating the proportion of persons with  
>>>>> Internet access using an Internet survey!), I think the fundamental  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>  
>  
>  
>>>>> problem is non-random selection. I'd agree with Warren that  
>>>>> non-random selection is much less of an issue for a low response  
>>>>> RDD phone sample or a Knowledge Networks-style panel than for a  
>>>>> pure opt-in Internet panel, but it's still an issue and the various  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>  
>  
>  
>>>>> methods used to deal with it are woefully out of date and  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
> inadequate.  
>  
>  
>>>>> Most Internet panel vendors use quota sampling, because that is  
>>>>> what their customers are used to for mail and mall intercept  
>>>>> studies. Most RDD samples are rim-weighted (aka "raking"). Harris  
>>>>> Interactive estimates a propensity score using unspecified survey  
>>>>> items from its phone and web surveys and, apparently, some other  
>>>>> adjustments for demographic differences. The truth is we don't  
>>>>> understand much about any of these methods and we evaluate them  
>>>>> based primarily upon hunches and intuition and knee-jerk reactions  
>>>>> ("It's not random so it's bad"). I think we'd all benefit from more  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>  
>  
>  
>>>>> serious scientific work, both empirical and theoretical, because,  
>>>>> for better or worse, this is where we're headed for large amounts  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
> of survey work.

>  
>  
>>>>Doug Rivers  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>-----Original Message----- From: AAPORNET on behalf of Warren  
>>>>Mitofsky Sent: Sat 2/4/2006 9:28 AM To: AAPORNET@asu.edu Subject:  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>Re:  
>  
>  
>>>>Internet surveys  
>>>>  
>>>>You are right. You don't know that a sample represents a population  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>  
>  
>  
>>>>when there is substantial non-response. However, I would submit you  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>  
>  
>  
>>>>have a better chance of the non-responders/responders being random  
>>>>than you do of one of those panels used by many internet survey  
>>>>companies. The size of the non-response is not the issue. The issue  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>  
>  
>  
>>>>is whether they are a significantly biased group.  
>>>>  
>>>>warren  
>>>>  
>>>>At 10:58 PM 2/3/2006, you wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>>I posted those numbers only because a number of people seem to be  
>>>>>interested and they are apparently a couple of years more recent  
>>>>>than what is available from the CPS. It had nothing to do with  
>>>>>panels.  
>>>>>  
>>>>>In any event, as you should know, the proportion of the population  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>  
>  
>  
>>>>>represented is not important. What is important is that the panel  
>>>>>

>>>>>  
>  
>  
>  
>>>>>composition provide full and heterogeneous coverage of all  
>>>>>dimensions of the population that are being queried. You don't  
>>>>>know that with a panel, but then, you also don't know that if you  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>  
>  
>  
>>>>>have substantial non-response in a probability sample.  
>>>>>  
>>>>>The problem is not that results from an Internet panel or a  
>>>>>probability sample with substantial non-response are necessarily  
>>>>>wrong, it's that you can't know the likelihood that they are wrong  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>  
>  
>  
>>>>>unless you have some external information to go by, and that is  
>>>>>often not available.  
>>>>>  
>>>>>I don't think that Internet panels can be representative of the  
>>>>>general population on all issues, but it is certainly possible to  
>>>>>select samples from them that are reasonably representative of  
>>>>>some segments of the population. It just depends on what you want  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>  
>  
>  
>>>>>to find out about.  
>>>>>  
>>>>>Jan \_\_\_\_\_  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>----- 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](mailto: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](mailto: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

>>  
>>  
>  
>  
>-----  
>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

>  
>  
>=====

>Disclaimer  
>This e-mail is confidential and intended solely for the use of the  
>individual to whom it is addressed. Any views or opinions presented are  
>solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of  
>MORI Limited.  
>If you are not the intended recipient, be advised that you have received  
>this e-mail in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding,  
>printing, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have  
>received this e-mail in error please either notify the MORI Servicedesk  
>by telephone on 44 (0) 20 7347 3000 or respond to this e-mail with WRONG  
>RECIPIENT in the title line.

>=====

>  
>  
>-----  
>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.

>  
>  
>=====

>Disclaimer  
>This e-mail is confidential and intended solely for the use of the  
>individual to whom it is addressed. Any views or opinions presented are  
>solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of  
>MORI Limited.  
>If you are not the intended recipient, be advised that you have received  
>this e-mail in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding,  
>printing, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have  
>received this e-mail in error please either notify the MORI Servicedesk  
>by telephone on 44 (0) 20 7347 3000 or respond to this e-mail with WRONG  
>RECIPIENT in the title line.

>=====

>  
>

>-----

>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.

>  
>

>=====

>Disclaimer

>This e-mail is confidential and intended solely for the use of the  
>individual to whom it is addressed. Any views or opinions presented are  
>solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of  
>MORI Limited.

>If you are not the intended recipient, be advised that you have  
>received this e-mail in error and that any use, dissemination,  
>forwarding, printing, or copying of this e-mail is strictly  
>prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error please either  
>notify the MORI Servicedesk by telephone on 44 (0) 20 7347 3000  
>or respond to this e-mail with WRONG RECIPIENT in the title line.

>=====

>  
>

>-----

>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.

>  
>  
>

-----  
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.

-----  
Date: Mon, 6 Feb 2006 09:05:37 -0800  
Reply-To: "Pollack, Lance" <Lance.Pollack@UCSF.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Pollack, Lance" <Lance.Pollack@UCSF.EDU>  
Subject: Re: FW: Internet surveys  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I would not draw any conclusions about the efficacy of Internet surveys using political polling data. It seems pretty obvious to me that in the United States at least, willingness to participate in a political poll, regardless of mode, correlates with voter participation. So does SES, which also correlates with Internet access. It seems that high non-response phone surveys and some Internet surveys predict elections very well. I would NOT conclude they necessarily predict anything else very well.

While use of devices to screen phone calls has decreased effective telephone coverage, there is no evidence of bias in who is using such devices. Similarly, refusal to participate more often than not occurs before content of the study is even discussed, which means that form of non-participation is very unlikely to be correlated with the subject(s) at hand. I agree we need more research on all these issues, but these seemingly dire attacks of the efficacy of RDD sampling leave me thoroughly unconvinced.

As for the Internet, I continue to ask the question, who is at the keyboard? This is particularly problematic if recruitment was also via the Internet, but even for samples recruited by other means, one still has no sense of who is actually responding to the survey. I worry because from day one of the widespread use of the Internet by the general public, there has been extensive anecdotal evidence that users liked it because it gave a sense of anonymity and the ability to be someone else. I am not about to assume that members of the public weaned on false or even multiple Internet personas make a differentiation of survey research from other forms of Internet usage.

Finally, I am also not convinced all the ethical bugs have been worked out of Internet-based survey research. Much of that 70% Internet access is through work venues. The truth is that in many private businesses there is NO privacy for e-mails of Internet use, and in some places all keystrokes are recorded. Are we encouraging respondents to breach their own privacy when we get them to respond to Internet surveys from work? The rise of cell phone use and laptop computers in public spaces also raises issues about privacy? If they are in such spaces, will that affect answers given to sensitive questions? Again, have we encouraged respondents to breach their own privacy? Does AAPOR best practices require survey givers to at least remind Internet respondents that the survey giver does not control the privacy of the respondents' answers prior to those responses reaching the survey giver's computer?

Personally I think the jump to Internet-based survey research has been too fast, and has played fast and loose with some of these ethical issues.

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 Nick Panagakis  
Sent: Sunday, February 05, 2006 10:57 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: FW: Internet surveys

However....

...in 2000, Harris Interactive (both Internet and phone) had the exact margin. See:

<http://www.ncpp.org/1936-2000.htm>

...after rounding to whole percentages. (Actual outcome per the FEC: Gore 48.4%/Bush 47.9%)

NICK

Robert Worcester wrote:

> Well, our net is clearly not happy with attachments, sorry. If anyone  
>wants the complete final poll results of the 2004 US presidential  
>election in a tiny (25kb)Excel spreadsheet, send me an email and I'll  
>forward it to you, (unless our shepherd can let this innocent lamb  
>through the gate!)

>

>Bob

>

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

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

>Sent: 05 February 2006 11:45

>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>Subject: Re: FW: Internet surveys

>

>Sorry, my own copy came through without the spreadsheet attached,  
>although it's only 25KB. Don't know why.

>

>So here it is, hopefully.

>

>Bob

>

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

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

>Sent: 05 February 2006 11:39

>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>Subject: Re: FW: Internet surveys

>

>Warren's half right on the 2004 outcome in saying Harris Interactive  
was

>furthest out of the 'final' polls, but to complete the picture, he is

>supported by the fact that the two polls that were out the furthest

>(Kerry by 3%!) were the two, and only two, that were done with internet

>panels, Harris Interactive, as he says, and the British internet

>pollsters YouGov for The Economist. See attached analysis.

>

>Interesting and so far not commented on even in Britain yet that over

>the last month three other British pollsters, Ipsos MORI (for the

>Observer Sunday newspaper, a poll on sexual habits and attitudes

polling

>16-64 year olds), ICM (a national political poll for the Guardian the

>next day) and Populus (another national political poll, for the Times,

>on the day following the one in the Guardian).

>

>Bob Worcester

>

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

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

>Sent: 05 February 2006 04:41

>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>Subject: Re: FW: Internet surveys

>

>The answer to your question about the performance of the Harris

>Interactive Internet survey in 2004 is that there were 15 other polls

>during the last two weeks before election day. The other 15 had smaller

>errors than the HI Internet survey.

>

>The HI survey done by telephone was quite good. They were tied with six

>other polls for the second smallest error.

>

>warren mitofsky

>

>

>At 10:18 PM 2/4/2006, Leora Lawton wrote:

>

>

>>Hi,

>>

>>I want to comment on HarrisInteractive's proprietary method of making

>>their survey populations representative. I don't work there nor have

I

>>

>>

>

>

>

>>ever, but I believe they are trying very hard to deal with the fact

>>that RDD is increasingly problematic and email is a heckuva lot

cheaper.

>>

>>

>

>

>

>>If they can do that then it's a very valuable product to them as a

>>business. The reason they don't share that methodology is akin to

>>coca-cola not sharing their recipe. I have developed various

>>proprietary algorithms (e.g., a brand segmentation) and I wouldn't

>>

>>

>share them either.

>

>

>>That said, I don't know how close to the mark they are but how much

>>worse did they do than other polls in predicting the 2004 presidential

>>



>>  
>election?  
>  
>  
>>[http://www.harrisinteractive.com/harris\\_poll/index.asp?PID=3D515](http://www.harrisinteractive.com/harris_poll/index.asp?PID=3D515)  
>>Their ability to be accurate is, I imagine, proof of their  
>>methodology's quality, no?  
>>  
>>leora  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>>You are quite right that we need to much more research into how to  
>>>conduct surveys with some indication of reliability once RDD is  
>>>little more than a fond memory. HarrisInteractive claims to have  
>>>done this with propensity scoring, but the secrecy with which they  
>>>surround the details of their methodology makes their results  
>>>  
>>>  
>suspect.  
>  
>  
>>>In the meantime, we seem to be stuck in a situation where an  
>>>ignorant and lazy press will only publish survey results accompanied  
>>>  
>>>  
>  
>  
>  
>>>by a "margin of error," even if this number has no factual basis,  
>>>and rejects out of hand anything that doesn't match some editor's  
>>>pre-conceived notions of what a "scientific" survey is supposed to  
>>>be, rather than attempt to explain how to understand and qualify the  
>>>  
>>>  
>results.  
>  
>  
>>>Jan Werner  
>>> \_\_\_\_\_  
>>>  
>>>Doug Rivers wrote:  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>>There are really 2 issues, coverage and non-random selection. When  
>>>>we started Knowledge Networks in 1998, about 25% of the population  
>>>>were Internet users, versus (maybe) 70% today, so the coverage  
>>>>problem is slowly going away. Further, with cellphones and number  
>>>>portability, RDD phone coverage is deteriorating (from 96-97% a  
>>>>decade ago, to around 90% or so now).  
>>>>  
>>>>While I wouldn't say that coverage is no longer a problem for  
>>>>Internet surveys (try estimating the proportion of persons with

>>>>Internet access using an Internet survey!), I think the fundamental  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>  
>  
>  
>>>>problem is non-random selection. I'd agree with Warren that  
>>>>non-random selection is much less of an issue for a low response  
>>>>RDD phone sample or a Knowledge Networks-style panel than for a  
>>>>pure opt-in Internet panel, but it's still an issue and the various  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>  
>  
>  
>>>>methods used to deal with it are woefully out of date and  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>inadequate.  
>  
>  
>>>>Most Internet panel vendors use quota sampling, because that is  
>>>>what their customers are used to for mail and mall intercept  
>>>>studies. Most RDD samples are rim-weighted (aka "raking"). Harris  
>>>>Interactive estimates a propensity score using unspecified survey  
>>>>items from its phone and web surveys and, apparently, some other  
>>>>adjustments for demographic differences. The truth is we don't  
>>>>understand much about any of these methods and we evaluate them  
>>>>based primarily upon hunches and intuition and knee-jerk reactions  
>>>>("It's not random so it's bad"). I think we'd all benefit from more  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>  
>  
>  
>>>>serious scientific work, both empirical and theoretical, because,  
>>>>for better or worse, this is where we're headed for large amounts  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>of survey work.  
>  
>  
>>>>Doug Rivers  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>-----Original Message----- From: AAPORNET on behalf of Warren  
>>>>Mitofsky Sent: Sat 2/4/2006 9:28 AM To: AAPORNET@asu.edu Subject:  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>Re:  
>  
>  
>>>>Internet surveys  
>>>>

>>>>You are right. You don't know that a sample represents a population  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>  
>  
>  
>>>>when there is substantial non-response. However, I would submit you  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>  
>  
>  
>>>>have a better chance of the non-responders/responders being random  
>>>>than you do of one of those panels used by many internet survey  
>>>>companies. The size of the non-response is not the issue. The issue  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>  
>  
>  
>>>>is whether they are a significantly biased group.  
>>>>  
>>>>warren  
>>>>  
>>>>At 10:58 PM 2/3/2006, you wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>>I posted those numbers only because a number of people seem to be  
>>>>>interested and they are apparently a couple of years more recent  
>>>>>than what is available from the CPS. It had nothing to do with  
>>>>>panels.  
>>>>>  
>>>>>In any event, as you should know, the proportion of the population  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>  
>  
>  
>>>>>represented is not important. What is important is that the panel  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>  
>  
>  
>>>>>composition provide full and heterogeneous coverage of all  
>>>>>dimensions of the population that are being queried. You don't  
>>>>>know that with a panel, but then, you also don't know that if you  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>  
>  
>  
>>>>>have substantial non-response in a probability sample.  
>>>>>

>>>>>The problem is not that results from an Internet panel or a  
>>>>>probability sample with substantial non-response are necessarily  
>>>>>wrong, it's that you can't know the likelihood that they are wrong

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

>>>>>unless you have some external information to go by, and that is  
>>>>>often not available.

>>>>>  
>>>>>I don't think that Internet panels can be representative of the  
>>>>>general population on all issues, but it is certainly possible to  
>>>>>select samples from them that are reasonably representative of  
>>>>>some segments of the population. It just depends on what you want

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

>>>>>to find out about.

>>>>>  
>>>>>Jan \_\_\_\_\_  
>>>>>  
>>>>>

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

>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>  
>  
>  
>-----





NEW YORK, NY -- (MARKET WIRE) -- 02/06/2006 -- Half of all Americans believe sexual orientation is "innate, genetic or predetermined by other factors such as environment," a new nationwide Zogby Interactive poll shows. The surprising findings are the topline results of a survey commissioned by Scientific American MIND (SciamMind.com), the magazine that probes the workings of the brain and its impact on behavior.=20

Just 11% agreed with the statement, "sexual orientation is a conscious choice," while one in three (34%) said they believed that "sexual orientation is determined by both choice and other factors." Six percent were not sure. The margin of error for the survey, which included 4,236 interviews, is +/-1.5 percentage points

SNIP

Rest at=20

[http://www.marketwire.com/mw/release\\_html\\_b1?release\\_id=3D108767](http://www.marketwire.com/mw/release_html_b1?release_id=3D108767)

or

<http://tinyurl.com/cwzav>

--=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/>

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

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

=====  
Date: Mon, 6 Feb 2006 13:42:26 -0800

Reply-To: "Nunez, Amy" <[Amy.Nunez@JUD.CA.GOV](mailto:Amy.Nunez@JUD.CA.GOV)>

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

From: "Nunez, Amy" <[Amy.Nunez@JUD.CA.GOV](mailto:Amy.Nunez@JUD.CA.GOV)>

Subject: Research Analyst Position

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

Comments: cc: "Will, Don" <[Don.Will@jud.ca.gov](mailto:Don.Will@jud.ca.gov)>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Research Analyst=20

San Francisco=20

Job Req #:=20

002429 Overview:=20

The Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts =

(AOC), located in San Francisco, is accepting applications for a =

temporary Research Analyst position assigned to the Center for Families, =

Children & the Courts (CFCC). This position is funded for two years and =

includes benefits. Department Statement:=20

This temporary position will be responsible for providing research =

support to two projects at the Center for Families, Children and the =

Courts: (1) a Blue Ribbon Commission on Foster Care, and (2) the design of the family and juvenile court components of a statewide standardized information system for the courts.=20

## CENTER FOR FAMILIES, CHILDREN & THE COURTS=20

The CFCC is an interdisciplinary center dedicated to improving the quality of justice and services to meet the diverse needs of children, youth, families, and self-represented litigants in the California courts. Through a multidisciplinary approach, CFCC seeks to (1) ensure that the well being of children, youth, and families is a high priority within the California judicial system; (2) encourage positive changes at both the trial and appellate court levels; and (3) provide leadership, outreach, and collaboration to ensure that court and community resources are available.=20

CFCC researchers work on projects including the analysis of cases outcomes in family court, the demographics and perceptions of court users, evaluation of programs such as unified family and juvenile courts and court-based self-help centers, and surveys of judicial officers, court staff and litigants. CFCC research projects that involve collection and statistical analysis of empirical data, qualitative research methods, integrative research reviews, needs assessment, program evaluation, and research consultation. Applicants are encouraged to carefully read the minimum and desirable qualifications before applying. Recent CFCC research products can be accessed at <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/cfcc/resources/publications/articles.htm>.=20

### Responsibilities:=20

Under the direction of the supervising research analyst, the Research Analyst will:=20

- Design and conduct surveys, focus groups, interviews and other information gathering methods in the courts to guide the development of both projects;=20

- Analyze and summarize complex qualitative and quantitative data using SAS or SPSS;=20

- Conduct literature reviews and secondary data analysis on aspects of dependency court and the foster care system;=20

- Write briefing papers, research updates, press releases, presentations, and other materials for the Foster Care Commission; and=20

- Synthesize the current research available on family and juvenile court information systems. Qualifications:=20

### MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS=20

This position requires equivalent to possession of a bachelor's degree, preferably with major course work in statistics, mathematics, social science, or public or business administration with a concentration in research methods. Additionally, three years of professional analytical experience in conducting research and planning projects, OR one year as a Staff Analyst with the judicial branch.=20



Additional experience may be substituted for the education on a year-for-year basis, and the possession of a directly related postgraduate degree may be substituted for one year of experience.=20

## DESIRABLE QUALIFICATIONS=20

-Experience working collaboratively in large-scale research projects;=20

-Familiarity with juvenile dependency court policies and procedures;=20

-Experience in a range of data collection methods, quantitative and qualitative program evaluation methods, survey research methodology, statistical methods for survey data analysis, and research consultation; and=20

-Expertise with either the SAS or SPSS statistical analysis software packages.=20

To request a printed application, please contact:=20

Administrative Office of the Courts=20

Human Resources Division=20

455 Golden Gate Avenue, 7th Floor=20

San Francisco, California 94102=20

(415) 865-4272 Telecommunications Device for the Deaf Supplemental Questions:=20

Please answer the following questions about your experience as a professional researcher. If you worked as part of a team, please be clear about your role and level of responsibility on the team. Your answers to all of these questions should be less than three pages (total) in length.=20

1. Describe your experience at survey research, including study design, sampling, instrument design and testing, and field work.=20

2. Describe your background in current methods of evaluation design and research.=20

3. Describe your experience in the SAS, SPSS, State, or other statistical analysis software packages.=20

4. Describe your experience at providing research results to the public, including presentations, reports, web-based information, articles and other means of reporting research.=20

5. Describe any additional skills you have that may be relevant to the work at CFCC. Pay and Benefit(s):=20  
Salary Range: \$5,325 - \$6,471 per month.=20

Some highlights of our benefits package include:=20

-Health/Dental/Vision benefits program=20

-13 paid holidays per calendar year=20

-Choice of Annual Leave or Sick/Vacation Leave=20

-1 personal holiday per year=20  
-\$105 transit pass subsidy per month=20  
-CalPERS Retirement Plan EEO:=20  
The Administrative Office of the Courts is an Equal Opportunity =  
Employer.=20

Amy Carmen Nu=F1ez,  
Supervising Research Analyst  
Center for Families, Children & the Courts  
Judicial Council of California - Administrative Office of the Courts  
455 Golden Gate Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688  
415-865-7564, Fax 415-865-7217, amy.nunez@jud.ca.gov  
www.courtinfo.ca.gov

"Serving the courts for the benefit of all Californians"

---

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

---

Date: Mon, 6 Feb 2006 13:46:38 -0800  
Reply-To: "Nunez, Amy" <Amy.Nunez@JUD.CA.GOV>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Nunez, Amy" <Amy.Nunez@JUD.CA.GOV>  
Subject: Senior Research Analyst Position  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Comments: cc: "Will, Don" <Don.Will@jud.ca.gov>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Sr. Research Analyst=20  
Job Req #: 002344=20  
The Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts =  
(AOC), located in San Francisco, is accepting applications for a Senior =  
Research position assigned to the Center for Families, Children & the =  
Courts (CFCC).=20

This senior researcher position will work on projects including the =  
analysis of cases outcomes in family court, the demographics and =  
perceptions of court users, evaluation of programs such as unified =  
family and juvenile courts and court-based self-help centers, and =  
surveys of judicial officers, court staff and litigants. CFCC research =  
projects that involve collection and statistical analysis of empirical =  
data, qualitative research methods, integrative research reviews, needs =  
assessment, program evaluation, and research consultation. Applicants =  
are encouraged to carefully read the minimum and desirable =  
qualifications before applying. Recent CFCC research products can be =  
accessed at =  
<http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/cfcc/resources/publications/articles>=

.htm. Department Statement:=20

The CFCC is an interdisciplinary center dedicated to improving the = quality of justice and services to meet the diverse needs of children, = youth, families, and self-represented litigants in the California = courts. Through a multidisciplinary approach, CFCC seeks to (1) ensure = that the well being of children, youth, and families is a high priority = within the California judicial system; (2) encourage positive changes at = both the trial and appellate court levels; and (3) provide leadership, = outreach, and collaboration to ensure that court and community resources = are available. Responsibilities:=20

-Design of research projects, including surveys, focus groups, and = program evaluations;=20

-Collaboration with CFCC attorneys and analysts, judicial officers, = custody mediators and others to incorporate their needs and viewpoint = into research designs;=20

-Field research projects through statewide surveys, interviews, court = file review, courtroom observation, focus groups, and analysis of = administrative data;=20

-Project management and lead direction in implementing research = projects, including training, and work review; organizing and assigning = work; setting priorities; following up to ensure coordination and = completion of assigned work; and providing input into selection, = evaluation, discipline, and other personnel matters;=20

-Analyzing and summarizing complex qualitative and quantitative data = using SAS or SPSS; and=20

-Presenting project results through reports and journal articles, press = releases, and newsletter articles and give oral presentations to a wide = range of audiences. SRAs also respond to questions and provide available = information and statistical data to management, staff, other = governmental agencies, and the public. Qualifications:=20

Equivalent to possession of a bachelor's degree, preferably with major = course work in statistics, mathematics, social science, or public or = business administration with a concentration in research methods, and = three years of professional analytical experience in conducting research = and planning projects, including one year of lead experience.=20

Additional directly related experience may be substituted for the = education on a year-for-year basis. Possession of a directly related = postgraduate degree may be substituted for one of the three years of = required experience.=20

OR=20

One year as a Research Analyst with the judicial branch.=20

DESIRABLE=20

-Experience working collaboratively in large-scale research projects;=20

-Experience in a range of data collection methods, quantitative and =

qualitative program evaluation methods, survey research methodology, =  
statistical methods for survey data analysis, and research consultation; =

-Expertise with either the SAS or SPSS statistical analysis software =  
packages; and=20

-Familiarity with family and juvenile court policies and procedures. How =  
To Apply:=20

To request a printed application, please visit:=20

Administrative Office of the Courts=20

Human Resources Division=20

455 Golden Gate Avenue, 7th Floor=20

San Francisco, California 94102=20

(415) 865-4272 Telecommunications Device for the Deaf Supplemental =  
Questions:=20

Please answer the following questions about your experience as a =  
professional researcher. If you worked as part of a team, please be =  
clear about your role and level of responsibility on the team. Your =  
answers to all of these questions should be less than three pages =  
(total) in length.=20

1) Describe your experience at survey research, including study design, =  
sampling, instrument design and testing, and field work.=20

2) Describe your background in current methods of evaluation design and =  
research.=20

3) Describe your experience in the SAS, SPSS, Stata, or other =  
statistical analysis software packages.=20

4) Describe your experience at providing research results to the public, =  
including presentations, reports, web-based information, articles and =  
other means of reporting research.=20

5) Describe any additional skills you have that may be relevant to the =  
work at CFCC. Pay and Benefit(s):=20  
SALARY RANGE: \$5,850 - \$7,109 per month=20

Some highlights of our benefits package include:=20

-Health/Dental/Vision benefits program=20

-13 paid holidays per calendar year=20

-Choice of Annual Leave or Sick/Vacation Leave=20

-1 personal holiday per year=20

-\$105 transit pass subsidy per month=20

-CalPERS Retirement Plan=20

-401(K) and 457 deferred compensation plans=20

-Employee Assistance Program=20

-Basic Life and AD&D Insurance=20

-FlexElect Program=20

-Long Term Care Program (employee paid/optional)=20

-Group Legal Plan (employee paid/optional) EEO:=20

The Administrative Office of the Courts Is an Equal Opportunity =

Employer.=20

Amy Carmen Nu=F1ez,  
Supervising Research Analyst  
Center for Families, Children & the Courts  
Judicial Council of California - Administrative Office of the Courts  
455 Golden Gate Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688  
415-865-7564, Fax 415-865-7217, amy.nunez@jud.ca.gov  
www.courtinfo.ca.gov

"Serving the courts for the benefit of all Californians"

---

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

---

Date: Tue, 7 Feb 2006 08:28:15 -0500  
Reply-To: Kathryn Korostoff <[kkorostoff@CMBINFO.COM](mailto:kkorostoff@CMBINFO.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Kathryn Korostoff <[kkorostoff@CMBINFO.COM](mailto:kkorostoff@CMBINFO.COM)>  
Subject: Senior Project Manager Position  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

We have several positions open in our Boston office. To inquire about this or other positions, please contact me--see contact info at bottom.

Thanks.  
Kathryn

### Market Research Senior Project Manager

General Description: Seasoned market researcher to manage high profile, challenging projects and client relationships.

Requirements: Demonstrated ability to apply market research to produce business insights and actionable results

- \* Strong theoretical and practical knowledge of research design
- \* Ability to turn business problems into researchable questions
- \* Ability to conduct and interpret results of multivariate analysis
- \* Ability to translate research results into insightful business implications
- \* Ability to form working relationships with all levels of clients and co-workers

- \* Demonstrated concise, effective communication both written and spoken
- \* Ability to handle ambiguity, high workload and extreme amounts of detail
- \* Ability to multitask and flexibility to meet very strict deadlines
- \* Demonstrated ability to anticipate client needs for ongoing and future engagements
- \* B.A. or M.A. in related field, e.g., statistics, marketing or market research, business management, or other behavioral sciences; graduate degree preferred
- \* 5-7 years primary market research experience

Responsibilities:

- \* Design research method and sample design for large scale, complex projects
- \* Develop analysis, reporting and research plans
- \* Hands-on project execution: questionnaire design, sample plan, data collection, analysis, reporting
- \* Manage project budget, work plan and project team members
- \* Verify accuracy of data and analysis results
- \* Determine findings and draw appropriate insights/conclusions
- \* Writing clear reports that address business implications
- \* Develop additional revenue from assigned clients through project and client relationship management=20
- \* Supervise and support other project team members in all phases of the research

Computer Skills:

- \* Advanced in Microsoft Word, Excel, PowerPoint, SPSS, Wincross or other tabling software required

\*\*\*\*\*  
 CHADWICK MARTIN BAILEY, INC. ACQUIRES SAGE RESEARCH=20

\*\*\*\*\*

Kathryn Korostoff

Vice President

Sage Research, the technology practice of Chadwick Martin Bailey  
 179 South Street=20  
 Boston, Massachusetts 02111-2733=20  
 Direct Dial: 508-975-2320  
 Main Tel: 617-350-8922=20  
 Fax: 617-451-5272  
 www.chadwickmartinbailey.com=20

-----  
 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, 7 Feb 2006 12:52:24 -0500  
Reply-To: "DeBell, Matthew" <MDeBell@AIR.ORG>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "DeBell, Matthew" <MDeBell@AIR.ORG>  
Subject: research associate/analyst opening in DC  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I am posting this job announcement for a partner organization that I work with.

=20

=20

MacroSys Research and Technology offers exciting careers, a competitive salary and an excellent benefits package, including health, life, and disability insurance, a retirement plan, and education assistance, for professionals at all levels. If you are a hard-working team player and like the challenges and opportunities available at a rapidly growing small company, MacroSys wants to hear from you.

=20

We currently have an opening for a Research Associate.

=20

Primary duties:

Work with a team of researchers with diverse social science backgrounds to:

- \* Develop, review, and revise survey questionnaires, survey design materials, and documentation.
- \* Review statistical reports for substantive quality and for conformity to technical standards.
- \* Conduct literature searches and write literature reviews.
- \* Respond to occasional data user requests for information or technical assistance.
- \* Write or assist in the preparation of research papers and reports.
- \* Write SAS or SPSS code to produce statistical analyses and to check data quality in large survey datasets.

=20

Desired qualifications:

\* Master's degree or equivalent experience in a social science (e.g. sociology, economics, psychology, statistics, etc.).

\* Some background in quantitative research, including training or experience with surveys, statistics, or large datasets.

\* Adept SPSS or SAS programmer preferred: recode and compute new variables, merge data files, transform data, generate crosstabs and statistical analyses.

\* Expertise or interest in one or more of the following subjects:

Early childhood development or education

K-12 education

Adult education=20

Survey research methods

Statistics

\* Comfortable with MS Office applications (primarily Word and Excel)

\* Good writing & editing skills, with attention to detail

=20

Interested candidates should send resumes with cover letters to MacroSys Research and Technology, 888 17th Street NW, Suite 312, Washington, DC 20006; fax to 202-955-6021; or email [information@macrosysrt.com](mailto:information@macrosysrt.com).

=20

=20

--=20

Matthew DeBell, Ph.D.=20

Research Analyst=20

Federal Statistics Program=20

American Institutes for Research=20

1990 K St., NW, Suite 500=20

Washington, DC 20006=20

tel. 202-403-6503=20

[mdbell@air.org](mailto:mdbell@air.org)=20

=20

-----



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

---

Date: Tue, 7 Feb 2006 16:33:32 -0500  
Reply-To: Cliff Zukin <[zukin@RCI.RUTGERS.EDU](mailto:zukin@RCI.RUTGERS.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Cliff Zukin <[zukin@RCI.RUTGERS.EDU](mailto:zukin@RCI.RUTGERS.EDU)>  
Subject: CMOR conference  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

AAPOR colleagues:  
I'm posting below CMOR's call for papers for their respondent cooperation workshop in September.

BETHESDA, MD, February 7, 2006 - The Council for Marketing and Opinion Research (CMOR) invites research professionals to submit topics for the 2006 CMOR Respondent Cooperation Workshop to be held at the Hilton Plaza del Rio Hotel, Riverwalk, in San Antonio, Texas, September 13-15, 2006.

The Workshop will focus on improving respondent cooperation across all survey methodologies, including Internet panels, focus groups, mail surveys, telephone surveys and mall intercepts. The Workshop will also concentrate on increasing respondent cooperation in several industries, including marketing research, public opinion polling, government research, health care and school studies.

CMOR is particularly interested in papers addressing difficult-to-survey groups, such as children, teenagers, young adults 18-34, minorities and the elderly.

Proposals may be submitted for either a presentation of 20-30 minutes with 10-15 minutes for questions to the general session, or a leadership role in a breakout session involving a 10-minute open, followed by a 30-minute group discussion.

To submit a proposal, a one-page outline which briefly details the area, methodology and focus of the ideas you plan to present, or the discussion

you propose to lead, needs to be sent, along with your name, contact information, email address and brief industry-related biography to: [kiplhuj@scarborough.com](mailto:kiplhuj@scarborough.com) no later than Tuesday, February 28, 2006. For further information visit the CMOR web site at [www.cmor.org](http://www.cmor.org).

The Council for Marketing and Opinion Research (CMOR) is a non-profit organization that promotes, advocates and protects the integrity of the marketing research and opinion research processes. CMOR works to improve respondent cooperation in research, as well as to promote positive legislation and prevent restrictive legislation that could impact the survey research industry. CMOR is comprised of more than 150 organizations and members, including industry trade associations, research providers, end users or client companies, academic institutions and individuals.

Cliff Zukin

Professor of Public Policy and Political Science

Edward J. Bloustein School, Rutgers University

President

American Association for Public Opinion Research

[zukin@rci.rutgers.edu](mailto:zukin@rci.rutgers.edu) 732 932 2499 x712

Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy

33 Livingston Ave., Suite 202

New Brunswick, NJ 08901

---

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

---

Date: Tue, 7 Feb 2006 16:05:32 -0600  
Reply-To: Rob Santos <[rsantos@NUSTATS.COM](mailto:rsantos@NUSTATS.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Rob Santos <[rsantos@NUSTATS.COM](mailto:rsantos@NUSTATS.COM)>  
Subject: Re: CMOR conference  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[0IUC005V36JWWMH0@mta7.srv.hcvlny.cv.net](mailto:0IUC005V36JWWMH0@mta7.srv.hcvlny.cv.net)>

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

And while you are there, be sure to visit Chris Madrid's burger joint (a "locals" hangout).... best burgers in Texas!

Rob

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Cliff Zukin  
Sent: Tuesday, February 07, 2006 3:34 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: CMOR conference

AAPOR colleagues:

I'm posting below CMOR's call for papers for their respondent cooperation workshop in September.

BETHESDA, MD, February 7, 2006 - The Council for Marketing and Opinion Research (CMOR) invites research professionals to submit topics for the 2006 CMOR Respondent Cooperation Workshop to be held at the Hilton Plaza del Rio Hotel, Riverwalk, in San Antonio, Texas, September 13-15, 2006.

The Workshop will focus on improving respondent cooperation across all survey methodologies, including Internet panels, focus groups, mail surveys, telephone surveys and mall intercepts. The Workshop will also concentrate on increasing respondent cooperation in several industries, including marketing research, public opinion polling, government research, health care and school studies.

CMOR is particularly interested in papers addressing difficult-to-survey groups, such as children, teenagers, young adults 18-34, minorities and the elderly.

Proposals may be submitted for either a presentation of 20-30 minutes with 10-15 minutes for questions to the general session, or a leadership role in a breakout session involving a 10-minute open, followed by a 30-minute group discussion.

To submit a proposal, a one-page outline which briefly details the area, methodology and focus of the ideas you plan to present, or the discussion

you propose to lead, needs to be sent, along with your name, contact information, email address and brief industry-related biography to: [kiplhuj@scarborough.com](mailto:kiplhuj@scarborough.com) no later than Tuesday, February 28, 2006. For further information visit the CMOR web site at [www.cmor.org](http://www.cmor.org).

The Council for Marketing and Opinion Research (CMOR) is a non-profit organization that promotes, advocates and protects the integrity of the marketing research and opinion research processes. CMOR works to improve respondent cooperation in research, as well as to promote positive legislation and prevent restrictive legislation that could impact the survey research industry. CMOR is comprised of more than 150 organizations and members, including industry trade associations, research providers, end users or client companies, academic institutions and individuals.

Cliff Zukin

Professor of Public Policy and Political Science

Edward J. Bloustein School, Rutgers University

President

American Association for Public Opinion Research

[zukin@rci.rutgers.edu](mailto:zukin@rci.rutgers.edu) 732 932 2499 x712

Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy

33 Livingston Ave., Suite 202

New Brunswick, NJ 08901

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

=====  
Date: Wed, 8 Feb 2006 12:25:22 -0600

Reply-To: Cindy Boland-Perez <cbboland@UALR.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Cindy Boland-Perez <cbboland@UALR.EDU>  
Subject: SR-Associate Director Position - Little Rock AR  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

University of Arkansas at Little Rock  
Associate Director/Research Associate

University of Arkansas at Little Rock, a Metropolitan University located in the state capitol seeks an enthusiastic individual to join the Institute of Government Survey Research Center (SRC). Working with the Director of the SRC, the Associate Director would assist in all aspects of survey research. The Associate Director would be partially responsible for coordination, delivery and quality control of the survey research process. Primary responsibility would be in data collection, editing, analysis, and reporting. Secondary responsibilities would include questionnaire preparation and quality control oversight. Skills should include: strong analytical and statistical skills, familiarity with survey research standard concepts, practices, and procedures, ability to handle multiple projects and tasks, demography skills a plus.

Qualifications include: Requires a Master degree and 3-4 years of experience in survey research or in a related area. The ideal candidate would possess strong leadership skills, the ability to work independently, and strong written and verbal communications skills. Starting salary in the mid 40's.

Send applications to Jan Jackson, Institute of Government, University of Arkansas at Little Rock, 2801 S. University Ave., Little Rock, AR 72204. Applicants should submit a cover letter that discusses their educational and work experience, a current resume, and the names and phone numbers of at least three references. We will begin reviewing applications immediately and will continue until the position is filled. Applications may be sent as attachment to [bjackson@ualr.edu](mailto:bjackson@ualr.edu).

The University of Arkansas at Little Rock is an equal opportunity, affirmative action employer and actively seeks the candidacy of minorities, women and persons with disabilities. Under Arkansas law, applications are subject to disclosure. Persons hired must have proof of legal authority to work in the United States.

--

---

Cindy Boland-Perez  
Director, IOG Survey Research Center  
University of Arkansas at Little Rock  
Ross Hall 614  
2801 S. University Avenue  
Little Rock AR 72204  
ph - 501.569.8559 fx - 501.569.8514

---

-----  
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.

---

Date: Wed, 8 Feb 2006 23:22:38 -0500  
Reply-To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jan Werner <[jwerner@JWDP.COM](mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM)>  
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing  
Subject: Luntz "booted" from GOP retreat  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=windows-1252; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

Nearly a decade after AAPOR formally condemned Frank Luntz, the new Republican majority leader in the House seems to have come around to our point of view, according to this item in Roll Call today:

Pollster Booted From Retreat - GOP Event Opens Thursday  
By Ben Pershing, Roll Call Staff  
February 8, 2006

The ascent last week of Rep. John Boehner (R-Ohio) to the Majority Leader post has put the agenda for the upcoming House GOP retreat somewhat in flux, but one thing is certain: Frank Luntz won't be there.

The omnipresent Republican pollster was uninvited from the retreat — scheduled for this Thursday through Saturday in Cambridge, Md. — after Boehner adamantly told his colleagues at his first leadership meeting last Friday that he didn't want Luntz there.

“Boehner said he wasn't going if Luntz was going,” said a leadership source.

---<snip>---

It is not clear why Boehner would dislike Luntz's work enough to ban him from the retreat, though they do have a long history. The two men both worked on developing the “Contract with America” for the House GOP in 1994...

Maybe Boehner really is serious about ethics after all.

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.

---

Date: Thu, 9 Feb 2006 10:36:28 -0500  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Subject: Re: Luntz "booted" from GOP retreat  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Apparently their history is not a good one

SNIP

Luntz's lengthy missive, with the subject line "Where We Stand," referenced a front-page story in Roll Call on Wednesday revealing how the pollster was uninvited to the upcoming House GOP retreat. The e-mail, sent at 10:18 a.m., began: "By now, you are all probably aware that House Republicans have a new Majority Leader and he is not a fan of myself or my work. That's just the way it is."

Saying that Boehner has "not always been an effective communicator," Luntz continued in the internal e-mail, "We have a long history that has not been pleasant. ... For ten years, even though he was Conference Chair and a Committee Chair, I have actually had the upper hand. But now that he's in charge, I guess it's payback time."

SNIP

[http://www.rollcall.com/issues/51\\_81/hoh/12116-1.html](http://www.rollcall.com/issues/51_81/hoh/12116-1.html)

--=20

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

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

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

> Sent: Wednesday, February 08, 2006 11:23 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Luntz "booted" from GOP retreat

>=20

> Nearly a decade after AAPOR formally condemned Frank Luntz,=20  
> the new Republican majority leader in the House seems to have=20  
> come around to our point of view, according to this item in=20  
> Roll Call today:  
>=20  
> Pollster Booted From Retreat - GOP Event Opens Thursday  
> By Ben Pershing, Roll Call Staff  
> February 8, 2006  
>=20  
> The ascent last week of Rep. John Boehner (R-Ohio) to the  
> Majority Leader post has put the agenda for the upcoming House GOP  
> retreat somewhat in flux, but one thing is certain: Frank Luntz  
> won't be there.  
>=20  
> The omnipresent Republican pollster was uninvited from the retreat  
> - scheduled for this Thursday through Saturday in Cambridge, Md. -  
> after Boehner adamantly told his colleagues at his first  
> leadership meeting last Friday that he didn't want Luntz there.  
>=20  
> "Boehner said he wasn't going if Luntz was going," said a  
> leadership source.  
>=20  
> ---<snip>---  
>=20  
> It is not clear why Boehner would dislike Luntz's work enough to  
> ban him from the retreat, though they do have a long history. The  
> two men both worked on developing the "Contract with America" for  
> the House GOP in 1994...  
>=20  
> Maybe Boehner really is serious about ethics after all.  
>=20  
> Jan Werner  
>=20  
> -----  
> 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.  
>=20  
>=20

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

---

Date: Thu, 9 Feb 2006 11:16:05 -0500  
Reply-To: "Lavrakas, Paul" <[Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM](mailto:Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Lavrakas, Paul" <[Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM](mailto:Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM)>  
Subject: Re: education level as an indicator of SES  
Comments: To: [SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU](mailto:SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU), [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable



In case it's of value, we did a national RDD survey of about 2,100 adults in 2005 in which we happened to ask for self-reports about educational attainment and one's "social class". Here's the crosstab, with column percentages and the educational variable has been collapsed into five categories:

| Class                             | Middle Class | Lower Class<br>Upper-Middle | Working<br>Upper |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| Not HS Grad<br>8%                 | 4%           | 1%                          | 27%<br>8%        |
| HS Grad, No College<br>27%<br>=09 | 13%          | 14%                         | 43%<br>35%       |
| Some College<br>32%               | 22%          | 20%                         | 23%<br>37%       |
| Bachelor's Degree<br>15%          | 23%          | 33%                         | 7%<br>14%        |
| Graduate Degree<br>14%            | 31%          | 45%                         | 1%<br>5%         |

=20

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

From: Survey Research Methods Section of the ASA  
 [mailto:SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU] On Behalf Of Gene Shackman  
 Sent: Thursday, February 09, 2006 10:54 AM  
 To: SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU  
 Subject: education level as an indicator of SES

This was posted on evaltalk and I'm forwarding by permission, with an additional comment from Monica

"I am guessing that I am asked to look at education as the sole indicator because of the kids' age--so that we can ask them a simple question and get an idea of their parents' SES."

She had also found this  
 Recommendations on the Use of Socioeconomic Position Indicators to Better Understand Racial Inequalities in Health  
<http://fermat.nap.edu/books/0309092310/html/184.html>

Please respond to Monica or cc her if you post a response to the list. I'll ask that she post a summary and I'll repost back to the lists.

Thanks

Gene

Gene Shackman, Ph.D.  
Evaluation and Analysis Unit  
NYS DOH - Division of Nutrition  
150 Broadway, FL6 West  
Albany NY 12204  
518 402 7304 gxs03 at health.state.ny.us

-----  
Applied Sociologist - Finding Solutions For Society  
-----

"Zhang, Monica" <MZhang@AIR.ORG>  
posted on: American Evaluation Association Discussion List  
<EVALTALK@BAMA.UA.EDU> 02/09/2006 10:10 AM

Hi,

For those of you who are familiar with education levels and SES (socio-economic status): if I have to assign a value of either "high" or "low" to the following, which of the following is/are associated with high SES (socio-economic status), and which one(s) with low SES?

In other words, if we were to use education level as the sole indicator of SES, what educational level(s) would you say is/are associated with high SES, and what levels with low SES?

I'd appreciate leads to studies that support the claim.

Thanks!

Monica

Parental education level:

- \* Did not finish H.S.
- \* Graduated H.S.
- \* Some education after H.S.
- \* Graduated college
- \* Unknown

~~~~~  
To subscribe/unsubscribe SRMSNet:

=  
<http://listserv.umd.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A0=3Dsrmsnet&D=3D0&F=3D&H=3D0&O=3DT&S=3D=&T=3D1>

SRMS website: <http://www.amstat.org/sections/srms/>  
~~~~~

-----

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

---

Date: Thu, 9 Feb 2006 09:19:58 -0800  
Reply-To: Joel Bloom <[joeldbloom@GMAIL.COM](mailto:joeldbloom@GMAIL.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Joel Bloom <[joeldbloom@GMAIL.COM](mailto:joeldbloom@GMAIL.COM)>  
Subject: Luntz, Boehner and ethics  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable  
Content-disposition: inline

You may recall that Luntz didn't just mislead the public in his 1994 "Contract With America" polling; he also misled his Republican clients. In 1995 they went out on a limb on some of his proposals based on his claim that they were supported by at least 2/3 of the public. But he had used "message-testing" versions of the policy questions rather than fairly worded versions. When unbiased polls came out, a lot of Republicans were livid at Luntz. And apparently some of them have long memories.

As for ethics from Boehner: don't count on it. This is the guy who infamously handed out checks from tobacco companies on the House floor. He has taken \$150,000 worth of junkets from lobbyists in the last 5 years alone (legally, I should add). He has already announced that he is dropping Hastert's reform proposal because it goes too far. Anyone who expects Boehner to reform House ethics is going to be disappointed.

There are plenty of ethical Republicans in the House and Senate; unfortunately they keep choosing the unethical ones as their leaders.

--  
Joel David Bloom, Ph.D.  
<http://www.uoregon.edu/~jbloom>

University of Oregon: 541-346-0891  
Northwest Survey and Data Services: 541-687-8976  
Cell Phone: 541-579-6610

On 2/9/06, Leo Simonetta <[Simonetta@artsci.com](mailto:Simonetta@artsci.com)> wrote:

>  
> Apparently their history is not a good one  
>  
> SNIP  
>  
> Luntz's lengthy missive, with the subject line "Where We Stand,"  
> referenced a front-page story in Roll Call on Wednesday revealing how  
> the pollster was uninvited to the upcoming House GOP retreat. The  
> e-mail, sent at 10:18 a.m., began: "By now, you are all probably aware

> that House Republicans have a new Majority Leader and he is not a fan of  
> myself or my work. That's just the way it is."

>  
> Saying that Boehner has "not always been an effective communicator,"  
> Luntz continued in the internal e-mail, "We have a long history that has  
> not been pleasant. ... For ten years, even though he was Conference  
> Chair and a Committee Chair, I have actually had the upper hand. But now  
> that he's in charge, I guess it's payback time."

>  
> SNIP  
>  
> [http://www.rollcall.com/issues/51\\_81/hoh/12116-1.html](http://www.rollcall.com/issues/51_81/hoh/12116-1.html)

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

>  
>  
>> -----Original Message-----  
>> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jan Werner  
>> Sent: Wednesday, February 08, 2006 11:23 PM  
>> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>> Subject: Luntz "booted" from GOP retreat

>>  
>> Nearly a decade after AAPOR formally condemned Frank Luntz,  
>> the new Republican majority leader in the House seems to have  
>> come around to our point of view, according to this item in  
>> Roll Call today:

>>  
>> Pollster Booted From Retreat - GOP Event Opens Thursday  
>> By Ben Pershing, Roll Call Staff  
>> February 8, 2006

>>  
>> The ascent last week of Rep. John Boehner (R-Ohio) to the  
>> Majority Leader post has put the agenda for the upcoming House GOP  
>> retreat somewhat in flux, but one thing is certain: Frank Luntz  
>> won't be there.

>>  
>> The omnipresent Republican pollster was uninvited from the retreat  
>> - scheduled for this Thursday through Saturday in Cambridge, Md. -  
>> after Boehner adamantly told his colleagues at his first  
>> leadership meeting last Friday that he didn't want Luntz there.

>>  
>> "Boehner said he wasn't going if Luntz was going," said a  
>> leadership source.

>>  
>> ---<snip>---

>>  
>> It is not clear why Boehner would dislike Luntz's work enough to  
>> ban him from the retreat, though they do have a long history. The

>> two men both worked on developing the "Contract with America" for  
>> the House GOP in 1994...

>> Maybe Boehner really is serious about ethics after all.

>> 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.

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

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

Date: Thu, 9 Feb 2006 14:05:39 -0800  
Reply-To: "Berry, Sandy" <[berry@RAND.ORG](mailto:berry@RAND.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Berry, Sandy" <[berry@RAND.ORG](mailto:berry@RAND.ORG)>  
Subject: Re: FW: Internet surveys  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

A couple of references that might interest this group:

Schonlau M, Zapert K, Payne SL, Sanstad K, Marcus S, Adams J, Spranca M, Kahn H-J, Turner R, and Berry S: "A comparison between a propensity weighted web survey and an identical RDD survey." *Social Science Computer Review*, 2004; 22(1): 128-138. Includes a good description of the Harris Interactive propensity weighting methodology and a head-to-head comparison of results for a survey on consumer health information.

Matthais Schonlau, Ronald Fricker, and Marc Elliott, *Conducting Research Surveys via e-mail and the Web*, MR-1480-RC  
Available at libraries (HA29 .S366 2002) and through RAND Publications at [www.rand.org](http://www.rand.org)

Nice comparison of various Internet and e-mail sampling methods.

-----  
This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and

may contain privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

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

---

Date: Thu, 9 Feb 2006 14:54:38 -0800  
Reply-To: "Berry, Sandy" <[berry@RAND.ORG](mailto:berry@RAND.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Berry, Sandy" <[berry@RAND.ORG](mailto:berry@RAND.ORG)>  
Subject: RDD and Internet comparison paper link  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

<http://ssc.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/22/1/128>

Sandra H. Berry [berry@rand.org](mailto:berry@rand.org)  
Senior Behavioral Scientist  
RAND <http://www.rand.org/>  
1776 Main Street  
Santa Monica, CA 90407-2138  
Direct line: 310 451-7051  
Fax line: 310 451-6921

-----  
This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

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

---

Date: Thu, 9 Feb 2006 18:38:03 -0500  
Reply-To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jan Werner <[jwerner@JWDP.COM](mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM)>  
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing  
Subject: Re: FW: Internet surveys  
Comments: To: "Berry, Sandy" <[berry@RAND.ORG](mailto:berry@RAND.ORG)>

Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu

In-Reply-To: <96BB56ACFC356640B901367E0CEE6F380177B0E9@smmail5.rand.org>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

These are excellent resources!

The full contents of Social Science Computer Review, 2004: 22(1) are online at: <http://ssc.sagepub.com/content/vol22/issue1/>

The RAND monograph can be ordered or downloaded (for personal use) from: [http://www.rand.org/pubs/monograph\\_reports/MR1480/](http://www.rand.org/pubs/monograph_reports/MR1480/)

Both provide full text pdf downloads (by chapter for the RAND book).

Jan Werner

---

Berry, Sandy wrote:

> A couple of references that might interest this group:

>

> Schonlau M, Zapert K, Payne SL, Sanstad K, Marcus S, Adams J, Spranca

> M, Kan H-J, Turner R, and Berry S: "A comparison between a

> propensity weighted web survey and an identical RDD survey." Social

> Science Computer Review, 2004: 22(1): 128-138. Includes a good

> description of the Harris Interactive propensity weighting

> methodology and a head-to-head comparison of results for a survey on

> consumer health information.

>

> Matthais Schonlau, Ronald Fricker, and Marc Elliott, Conducting

> Research Surveys via e-mail and the Web, MR-1480-RC Available at

> libraries (HA29 .S366 2002) and through RAND Publications at

> [www.rand.org](http://www.rand.org) Nice comparison of various Internet and e-mail sampling

> methods.

>

> -----

>

> This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s)

> and may contain privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use,

> disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the

> intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and

> destroy all copies of the original message.

>

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

>

>

---

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

---

Date: Thu, 9 Feb 2006 23:21:39 -0500

Reply-To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)

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

From: Jan Werner <[jwerner@JWDP.COM](mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM)>

Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing

Subject: Heretical thoughts

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

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I would like to thank Sandy Berry of RAND once again for directing us to the paper "A Comparison Between Responses From a Propensity-Weighted Web Survey and an Identical RDD Survey" (available online at: <http://ssc.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/22/1/128> ).

This is just one experiment, so one must be cautious about jumping to any conclusions, nonetheless, it presents some startling possibilities.

Unless the entry screens used for the web interview were exceedingly confusing, one would expect measurement error to provide a lower portion of the total error for a web survey than for a telephone interview, and one would also expect multicategory questions to have higher measurement error than questions providing only two answer choices.

But the experiment found that "...multicategory questions are more likely to lead to significant differences between web and RDD surveys," and furthermore, that the differences are reduced when multicategory questions are collapsed. This suggests that, in this experiment at least, measurement error provides a larger part of the total error than sampling error does.

In other words, there is the distinct possibility that the results of the web implementation are more likely to be accurate than those of the RDD implementation in this particular experiment.

Obviously, a lot more work needs to be done before one could justify any such conclusion on a broader basis. In particular, as the authors somewhat obliquely imply, much work needs to be done in developing non-proprietary adjustment methods for web surveys, whether using propensity scoring or other statistical means, in order to allow for the practical replication of this kind of experiment.

Certainly food for thought.

Jan Werner

---

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



---

Date: Fri, 10 Feb 2006 11:50:19 -0500  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Subject: A question on cell phones  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Can someone point me to a good site on the law on cell phones and surveys?

I thought I had one book marked but can't find it and Googling sends me down some scary advertising paths.

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

---

Date: Fri, 10 Feb 2006 11:56:06 -0500  
Reply-To: Claire Wilson <cwilson@INSIGHTPOLICYRESEARCH.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Claire Wilson <cwilson@INSIGHTPOLICYRESEARCH.COM>  
Subject: response rates for Web versus mail data collection  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

We are getting ready to conduct a brief survey (approximately 15 closed-ended questions) of 2,400 health care providers, physicians and medical suppliers. Partly due to a necessarily short field period, we are considering a Web survey with extensive CATI follow-up. We are wondering how response rates for the Web/CATI data collection might compare with response rates for a mail/CATI data collection, assuming two mailings of a letter with website address versus two questionnaire mailings. (It is not yet clear whether we will be able to obtain email addresses of sample members.) We expect most completes will be obtained via CATI, but don't know which of the other two modes would yield a greater number of completes. If anyone has any experience to share on the effectiveness (in terms of response rate) of mail versus Web as an initial mode of data collection with

the medical community, please respond directly to me, and if others are interested, I can post responses on the listserv. Thanks.

Claire Wilson, Ph.D.

Executive Director of Programs

Insight Policy Research

1655 North Fort Myer Drive

Suite 680

Arlington, VA 22209

Phone: 703.373.6647

Email: [cwilson@insightpolicyresearch.com](mailto:cwilson@insightpolicyresearch.com)

<http://www.insightpolicyresearch.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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Fri, 10 Feb 2006 14:03:40 -0600  
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Subject: February issue of Public Opinion Pros is up  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Dear AAPOR members -

The February issue of Public Opinion Pros has now been posted to the web - a bit late, as we are in the process of switching webhosting companies, and there have been many technical challenges to be dealt with. We hope you will find it worth waiting for.

Nonsubscribers can see an overview of the issue at=20

[http://www.publicopinionpros.com/from\\_editor/2006/feb/editor.asp](http://www.publicopinionpros.com/from_editor/2006/feb/editor.asp)

We are presently scheduling material for our April, May, and June issues, and, as always, are seeking submissions from AAPOR members. Commentaries of about 500-800 words as well as full-length feature articles are particularly welcome. Please contact me directly at editor@PublicOpinionPros.com with your manuscripts or proposals.=20

Thanks and best wishes -

Lisa

Lisa Ferraro Parmelee, Ph.D.  
Manager, LFP Editorial Enterprises, LLC  
Editor, Public Opinion Pros  
www.PublicOpinionPros.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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Fri, 10 Feb 2006 13:01:27 -0800  
Reply-To: Ginger Blazier <[gblazier@DIRESEARCH.COM](mailto:gblazier@DIRESEARCH.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Ginger Blazier <[gblazier@DIRESEARCH.COM](mailto:gblazier@DIRESEARCH.COM)>  
Subject: Re: A question on cell phones  
Comments: To: Leo Simonetta <[Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[3248A9B21DD5574785FE5E2C8E5216843ED676@exchange.local.artsience.com](mailto:3248A9B21DD5574785FE5E2C8E5216843ED676@exchange.local.artsience.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Hi Leo,

I spoke with some of my colleagues and they think CMOR is probably the best resource.

<http://www.cmor.org/>

Neustar has some good info as well

[http://www.tcpcacompliance.us/content/tcpa\\_links.html](http://www.tcpcacompliance.us/content/tcpa_links.html)

Main issue with cellular is autodialing...  
(TCPA rule making document).

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

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta  
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2006 8:50 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: A question on cell phones

Can someone point me to a good site on the law on cell phones and surveys?

I thought I had one book marked but can't find it and Googling sends me down some scary advertising paths.

--

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

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

=====  
Date: Fri, 10 Feb 2006 15:25:41 -0600  
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>  
Subject: Job Opportunity  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Comments: cc: ksmith@pollingcompany.com  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Position Opening: Research Analyst/Project Manager =20  
=20  
A full service market research, public affairs and political consulting

firm headquartered in Washington DC, is looking to expand their research team. =20

=20

Job Description: The individual will be involved in all stages of project development and execution, namely, drafting original proposals, research program design, sample and questionnaire construction, data analysis, and report writing for quantitative and qualitative research. The position will ensure proper methodology in all research projects and will communicate the survey design to data collection centers. He or she will be responsible for updating and taking direction from the President and CEO on the progress of all projects, and assisting on other client endeavors as needed. =20

=20

Qualifications: Applicants should have 2-5 years experience in the market research industry, including quantitative and qualitative methods, be able to manage several tasks at the same time, and willing to work in a small group environment. Candidate must be willing to work in a fast-paced office. Strong writing skills and statistical knowledge is a must. Candidate must have Bachelor's degree, higher education a plus. Salary and benefits are commensurate with experience. =20

=20

Please send cover letter, resume and references to Karen Smith via email to [ksmith@pollingcompany.com](mailto:ksmith@pollingcompany.com), postal mail to 1220 Connecticut Ave NW, Washington, DC, 20036, or facsimile to (202) 467-6551. For more information about the polling company(tm), inc., please access our website at [www.pollingcompany.com](http://www.pollingcompany.com)

=20

=20

=20

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

=====  
Date: Mon, 13 Feb 2006 00:58:09 +0000

Reply-To: [kfuse@MCHSI.COM](mailto:kfuse@MCHSI.COM)

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

From: Koji Fuse <[kfuse@MCHSI.COM](mailto:kfuse@MCHSI.COM)>

Subject: Re: A Question about Financial Planners

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

Dear AAPOR Members:

I'm looking for any information regarding people's preference for names when referring to those who provide personal and business financial-planning services. Some examples are "financial adviser," "financial coach," "financial planner," "personal wealth coach," etc. My questions, for example, are which one(s) people feel comfortable with and what impressions people have about

each name. Is there anyone who happens to know any survey or focus-group research results gathered by either the industry or academics? Or would you please point me to a right direction to find this kind of information? I greatly appreciate any help you can offer me.

Cordially,

Koji Fuse

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

Date: Mon, 13 Feb 2006 08:48:56 -0500  
Reply-To: [kdonelan@PARTNERS.ORG](mailto:kdonelan@PARTNERS.ORG)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Karen Donelan <[kdonelan@PARTNERS.ORG](mailto:kdonelan@PARTNERS.ORG)>  
Subject: A washingtonpost.com article from: [kdonelan@partners.org](mailto:kdonelan@partners.org)  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

You have been sent this message from [kdonelan@partners.org](mailto:kdonelan@partners.org) as a courtesy of= washingtonpost.com=20

=20

Employment Statistician Lester Frankel

=20

Lester Robert Frankel, 92, who as a young government statistician helped d= evelop an early technique for measuring unemployment and later was a New Yo= rk-based executive with marketing research firms, died Feb. 11 at his home = in Potomac after a stroke. He had congestive heart failure.

=20

To view the entire article, go to [http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/con= tent/article/2006/02/12/AR2006021201381.html?referrer=3Demailarticle](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/02/12/AR2006021201381.html?referrer=3Demailarticle)

=20

=20

Would you like to send this article to a friend? Go to=20

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/emailafriend?contentId=3DAR2006021= 201381&sent=3Dno&referrer=3Demailarticle>

=20

=20

Want the latest news in your inbox? Check out washingtonpost.com's e-mail n= ewsletters:

[http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn?node=3Dadmin/email&referrer=3Demail= larticle](http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn?node=3Dadmin/email&referrer=3Demailarticle)

Washingtonpost.Newsweek Interactive  
c/o E-mail Customer Care  
1515 N. Courthouse Road  
Arlington, VA 22201=20

=A9 2004 The Washington Post Company

---

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

---

Date: Mon, 13 Feb 2006 09:37:25 -0500  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Replies to A question on cell phones  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Here is a synopsis of the responses that I received.

Thanks to all that replied.

Telephone Consumer Protection Act

---

Check out CMOR's website or the original source:  
<http://www.fcc.gov/cgb/consumerfacts/tcpa.html#20>

---

I haven' searched their site, but try the us telecom assoc,  
[www.usta.org](http://www.usta.org).

---

Attached is the link to the Federal Register Implementing Rules and Regs  
for TCPA.=20  
To find the document scroll down to FCC RULES Common carrier services.

[http://www.access.gpo.gov/su\\_docs/fedreg/a030725c.html](http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fedreg/a030725c.html)

For the related FCC order (download) go the the site below and enter  
document 03-153

[http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs\\_public/SilverStream/Pages/edocs.html](http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/SilverStream/Pages/edocs.html)

The documents state no one may use automated dialing equipment to call a  
variety of telephone number types, including cell phones. It also  
describes FCC interpretation of automated dialing equipment.

---

I spoke with some of my colleagues and they think CMOR is probably the  
best resource.

<http://www.cmor.org/>

Neustar has some good info as well

[http://www.tcpanpliance.us/content/tpa\\_links.html](http://www.tcpanpliance.us/content/tpa_links.html)

Main issue with cellular is autodialing...  
(TCPA rule making document).

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

Date: Mon, 13 Feb 2006 11:04:24 -0500  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: AAPOR in the news  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

#### PUBLIC OPINION

Spy-case study criticized for bias  
Analysts said a professor's study in the 'Cuban Five' case could have  
been compromised by his sympathy for Castro.  
Miami Herald

<http://www.miami.com/mld/miamiherald/news/13857910.htm>

A retired Florida International University psychology professor's  
admiration for Fidel Castro could have compromised the findings of a  
study he conducted that helped overturn the conviction of five Cubans  
accused of spying for the communist government, legal analysts told The  
Miami Herald.

#### SNIP

The design of Moran's poll and its conclusions troubled Rutgers  
University Professor Cliff Zukin, president of the American Association  
for Public Opinion Research, the top organization in the country on



surveys and polling. Zukin, who reviewed a copy of the poll obtained by The Miami Herald, said it appears that Moran's apparent opinions in favor of Castro seeped into his poll, which Zukin said used leading questions and flawed methodology that reflect bias.

"My concerns in question-wording are that the survey seems to be leading," Zukin said in an interview Sunday. Also, he said, "the first eight questions that come before the ninth question should come after it. . . . It's really pretty biasing. All those items are very one-sided. They are all anti-Castro and framed in the same way so an agreed statement would be anti-Castro."

Zukin said that pollsters with strong opinions can conduct impartial surveys but that in Moran's case, his opinion "shows up in the work product."

SNIP

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

Date: Mon, 13 Feb 2006 20:21:10 -0500  
Reply-To: Scott Keeter <[skeeter@PEWRESEARCH.ORG](mailto:skeeter@PEWRESEARCH.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Scott Keeter <[skeeter@PEWRESEARCH.ORG](mailto:skeeter@PEWRESEARCH.ORG)>  
Subject: new Pew Research Center website and newsletter  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

=20

=20

I wanted to let you all know about the launch of [PewResearch.org](http://PewResearch.org), the newly redesigned portal site of the Pew Research Center. The site is located at: <http://pewresearch.org/> <<http://pewresearch.org/>> . We're also launching a newsletter that each week will highlight never-before-released findings and analysis from [pewresearch.org](http://pewresearch.org) along with a roundup of recent reports from the six projects that make up the Pew Research Center. If you're interested in getting that email update, just sign up on the website. Thanks.  
Scott Keeter

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

=20

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

Date: Tue, 14 Feb 2006 12:23:22 -0600  
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Subject: Job Opportunity No. 1  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Comments: cc: Brandy Collins <[brandy.collins@synovate.com](mailto:brandy.collins@synovate.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Survey Methodologist

=20

=20

=20

Synovate is one of the top ten largest research companies globally. We are the market research arm of global communications specialist Aegis Group. Synovate is continuing to grow, bringing together the expertise and talents of over 5,000 employees / researchers across 50 countries worldwide.=20

POSITION SUMMARY=20

The Survey Methodologist will advise and consult with the Public Sector and Healthcare Services Research staff members. Responsibilities will be to provide quality advice and direction on best practices related to survey issues such as sample design, sample size calculation, data weighting, questionnaire design, methodological impact of mode effects, and programming in SPSS and SAS for reporting and statistical analysis. Position will involve some client and project management. The position will report to a senior statistician in our Washington DC office.=20

RESPONSIBILITIES=20

\*Direct our major survey research programs \*Advise staff on best practices in survey research \*Advise, assist or conduct analyses in SAS and SPSS \*Provide support for writing proposals in response to RFP's from the Federal Government as well as the healthcare industry=20

REQUIREMENTS=20

\*Master's degree is a minimum but a Ph.D. is preferred in one of the social sciences or applied statistics \*Advanced knowledge of SPSS and SAS is required \*Previous work experience in the survey research industry for a minimum of 5 years on social science/public policy areas \*Experience working in one of the major social science research institutes or firms \*Excellent writing skills are a must=20

We are proud to be an EEO/AA employer M/F/D/V.=20

=20

To apply for this position, please visit the following link:

[http://www.resourcehire.com/clients/synovate/publicjobs/controller.cfm?jbaaction=3DJobProfile&Job\\_Id=3D10429&esid=3Daz](http://www.resourcehire.com/clients/synovate/publicjobs/controller.cfm?jbaaction=3DJobProfile&Job_Id=3D10429&esid=3Daz)

=20

=20

-----  
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.

=====  
Date: Tue, 14 Feb 2006 12:29:27 -0600  
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>  
Subject: Job Opportunity No. 2  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Comments: cc: Ann Jastrzebowski <annj@umich.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Associate Director

Research Associate Professor or Research Professor

Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research, a unit of  
the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan

Ann Arbor, Michigan

=20

## Position Summary

The Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) seeks to appoint an Associate Director to participate in the Consortium's leadership and to manage its collection development activities. The holder of this position will provide senior leadership in partnership with the Consortium's Director, and will take on direct management of a portfolio of internally- and externally-funded activities that acquire data and prepare them for future research. She or he will also work closely with the members of ICPSR's governing Council. This position involves the direct supervision of seven senior archivists and research scientists, with a total staff of over 40 and an annual budget of \$6 million. The holder of this position will also develop new archival collections, interact with current and prospective sponsors, and write grant proposals and applications. Extensive oral and written communication is required, along with significant travel. The individual who holds this position will carry on a research program of his or her own, in collaboration with researchers in ICPSR or other units of the Institute for Social Research.

The individual selected for this position will hold a research faculty appointment in ICPSR and the Institute for Social Research at the level of Research Associate Professor or Research Professor. The selected candidate's qualifications will determine the level. The selected individual will report to the Director of ICPSR. The position is likely to be a joint appointment with the Population Studies Center or Survey Research Center, two other units within the Institute for Social Research. A joint appointment with another unit of the University of Michigan is also possible. ICPSR offers a competitive total compensation package, with full access to University of Michigan benefits.=20

## Organizational Overview=20

The Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research, established in 1962, maintains and provides access to a vast archive of social science data for research and instruction, and offers training in quantitative methods. To ensure that data resources are available to future generations of scholars, ICPSR acquires, processes, and preserves data. In addition, ICPSR provides user support. A unit within the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan, ICPSR is a membership-based organization, with 550 member colleges and universities around the world. A Council of leading scholars and data professionals guides and oversees its activities. More information can be found about ICPSR at [www.icpsr.umich.edu](http://www.icpsr.umich.edu) <<http://websvcs.itcs.umich.edu/jobnet/www.icpsr.umich.edu>> .

ICPSR's Collection Development Unit is one of five major activities, the others being Collection Delivery, Educational Activities, Computer and Network Services, and Administration. Collection Development has responsibility for identifying data resources, arranging for their

acquisition, and processing them to ensure their future usability. Its budget is provided by ICPSR member dues and by grants and contracts from public and private sponsors. Collection Development has an organizational structure that includes a General Archive and specialized Topical Archives, with each archive directed by a senior archival manager, who reports to the Associate Director. The Associate Director has general oversight of the management and budget of these archival units, as well as responsibility for establishing overall policies.

=20

=20

### Major Areas of Responsibility

- \* Lead ICPSR's Collection Development group by providing overall management to the unit and direct supervision to its archival project managers. This includes operational and budgetary oversight, and the establishment of operational procedures for the entire group.

- \* Consult with data producers and data users about the needs of the research community, and use that information to develop new archival collections and to write proposals for external funding to support those collections.

- \* Participate fully in ICPSR's senior management team, and when necessary substitute for the Director in relations with the ICPSR Council, with other units at the University of Michigan, and the larger social science community.

- \* Conduct and publish research in the candidate's area of expertise.

=20

### Departmental Qualifications

=20

Minimum: Ph.D in relevant field of study. Seven years professional experience in the field, with a minimum of two years of experience in the management of externally-sponsored research activities.

Demonstrated scholarly productivity, along with the proven ability to work both independently and collaboratively. Demonstrated expertise in the creation, management, and statistical analysis of social science research data. Knowledge of procedures for ensuring the privacy and protection of research subjects. Experience in writing grant proposals and applications, and in serving as a principal investigator. Experience in a supervisory role providing direction to staff. Excellent communication skills, both oral and written, in the English language.=20

=20

Desired: Previous experience in teaching or training in the field of

interest. Knowledge and experience archiving data and providing secondary analysis of those data.

=20

Applicants should submit a letter of application, a CV, three letters of reference, and relevant writing samples to: Myron P. Gutmann, Director, Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research, Institute for Social Research, P.O. Box 1248, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106-1248. Screening of applications will begin shortly and continue until the position is filled. The University of Michigan is a Non-Discriminatory Affirmative Action Employer.

=20

=20

=20

-----  
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.

=====  
Date: Wed, 15 Feb 2006 13:08:50 -0500  
Reply-To: [dgillin@cmor.org](mailto:dgillin@cmor.org)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Donna Gillin <[dgillin@CMOR.ORG](mailto:dgillin@CMOR.ORG)>  
Organization: CMOR  
Subject: CMOR Respondent Cooperation Position  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

## CMOR Respondent Cooperation Position

### JOB DESCRIPTION:

The Council for Marketing and Opinion Research (CMOR), a national trade association to promote and protect the interest of the survey research profession, is seeking a staff person to manage its Respondent Cooperation program. The job will call for candidate to:

- Manage Respondent Cooperation Projects
- Manage Respondent Cooperation Committees and Task Forces
- Implement Respondent Cooperation Strategic and Business Plans
- Author articles and updates on Respondent Cooperation Activities
- Give presentations at industry events
- Travel, as needed

### REQUIREMENTS:

- Sound understanding of research process (preferably all methodologies)

- Ability to identify research resources (publications - academic and industry)
- Strong project managerial skills
- Strong interpersonal skills
- Strong oral and written communication skills
- General research analysis skills
- Ability to function and multi-task under pressure a must. Ability to work independently and as part of a team.

**ADDITIONAL SKILLS DESIRED:**

Statistical background preferred. An ideal candidate may have a graduate degree.

**JOB LOCATION:** location open to work remotely or at our headquarters in Glastonbury, CT

**SALARY:** Commensurate with experience

**PLEASE SUBMIT RESUME WITH SALARY HISTORY TO:**

Donna Gillin, Director of Operations

[dgillin@cmor.org](mailto:dgillin@cmor.org); fax: 704-341-1937

No phone calls please

**FOR MORE INFORMATION ABOUT CMOR, PLEASE VISIT THE CMOR WEBSITE**

**AT:WWW.CMOR.ORG**

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

=====  
Date: Thu, 16 Feb 2006 10:08:37 -0500

Reply-To: Yasamin Miller <[yd17@CORNELL.EDU](mailto:yd17@CORNELL.EDU)>

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

From: Yasamin Miller <[yd17@CORNELL.EDU](mailto:yd17@CORNELL.EDU)>

Subject: Recall Bias

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

MIME-version: 1.0

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

I'm looking for articles that compare survey questions that ask about details of a particular recent event versus asking impressions of things over a long period of time? For example, asking lawyers to comment on the details of their most recent trial case versus giving their impressions of all their cases ever tried? What I'd like to learn is what is the effect of recall or memory bias when subjects are asked to recall long past events versus those that are more recent.

Many thanks,  
Yasamin

Yasamin Miller, Director  
Survey Research Institute - SRI  
168 Ives Hall  
Cornell University  
Ithaca, NY 14853  
\* yd17@cornell.edu  
( 607-255-0148  
fax: 607-255-7118  
www.sri.cornell.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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Thu, 16 Feb 2006 10:52:08 -0500  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Polling firm offering \$1,000 for tape of poll  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Polling firm offering \$1,000 for tape of poll in Sweeney/Gillibrand race  
Glens Falls (NY) Post Star  
<http://www.poststar.com/story.asp?storyid=3D210822>

For once, that telephone call from a pollster could pay off in cash.

SurveyUSA, a New Jersey-based polling organization, is offering to pay \$1,000 a recording of telephone poll conducted last week in New York's 20th congressional district.

"I'll pay \$1,000 to the first person that can provide a clean tape recording from beginning to end," said Jay Leve, president and chief executive officer of SurveyUSA.

Leve said he believes another company impersonating his firm may have conducted the two-question poll, which asked about views on President Bush's policy in wiretapping and then asked if the recipient of the call supported U.S. Rep. John Sweeney's bid for re-election.

SNIP

Leve, contacted by The Post-Star said his company, which works primarily for television stations, did not conduct the poll, but he suspected it



might be a company that uses the name USA Polling.

There are reports of USA Polling conducting a similar poll in a New Jersey congressional race, he said.

Several years ago SurveyUSA was erroneously named in a lawsuit over an illegal poll that actually was conducted by a company using the name USA Survey.

Legal authorities were unable to identify whoever was using the name USA Survey, and Leve suspects the company may have resurfaced as USA Polling.

SNIP

A reputable polling firm will identify who is calling, who the poll is being conducted on behalf of and leave a telephone number the recipient can respond to, Leve said.

Anyone with information about last week's poll may contact Leve at editor@surveyusa.com.

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

=====  
Date: Thu, 16 Feb 2006 11:03:34 -0500  
Reply-To: "Murray, Patrick" <pdmurray@MONMOUTH.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Murray, Patrick" <pdmurray@MONMOUTH.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Job Opportunity  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Comments: cc: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@goamp.com>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Research Associate

Reports to Director of the Monmouth University Polling Institute.

=20

The Monmouth University Polling Institute is a full service research center that conducts survey and focus group research for federal, state,

and local agencies, as well as for non-profit organizations covering social, political, and related issues of public policy. The Polling Institute also works with faculty and other institutes at Monmouth University to provide resources for integrated research, including opportunities for students to conduct and use original research. An ongoing activity of the institute is the Monmouth University/Gannett New Jersey Poll. These periodic polls measure the public's response to current issues in New Jersey and the region. This is an excellent opportunity for a well-trained candidate to enhance career skills within an environment that is both academically sound and innovatively entrepreneurial (and only one mile from the beach).

=20

**Primary Responsibilities:** Assist in all aspects of conducting survey research. Prepare data for processing and create data analysis runs.

Draft, format, and proof all survey materials, including questionnaires and reports. Create tables, graphs, charts and PowerPoint presentations. Manage all stages of data collection and monitor external vendors. Perform background research and literature reviews, including national and state polling databases. Track local, state, and national issues and public opinion trends. Maintain electronic databases of survey results for internal use and public access.

=20

The successful candidate must have a Bachelor's Degree in Social Science (e.g. Survey Methodology, Public Policy, Economics, Sociology, Psychology, Political Science, Communications) or related field; Master's degree is strongly preferred. =20

Position requires 1 to 3 years related work experience in survey methodology and project management.=20

Must have quantitative and qualitative analytical ability. Must be flexible, have strong attention to detail and be able to multi-task while meeting tight deadlines. Experience with statistical packages is required (SPSS preferred).

GIS experience a plus. Spanish proficiency a plus. =20

Excellent interpersonal, organizational and oral and written communication skills required.

=20

**FRINGE BENEFITS INCLUDE:**

- \* Group Health, Life, Dental, Vision and Travel Accident Insurance
- \* Tuition Remission including spouse and dependent children
- \* 13 Holidays

- \* 20 Vacation days after one year of employment
- \* Choice of 3 pension plans with 8% University contribution after one year of employment
- \* Long Term Disability Insurance Plan
- \* Flexible Spending Accounts: Medical/Dental and Dependent Care

=20

Applicants should send two cover letters and resumes indicating Reference #1918 to reach us no later than 5:00 p.m. on February 28, 2006

to:

=20

Office of Human Resources

Monmouth University

West Long Branch, NJ 07764

E-mail: mujobs@monmouth.edu

=20

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY/AFFIRMATIVE ACTION EMPLOYER

=20

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

=====  
Date: Thu, 16 Feb 2006 13:48:17 -0600  
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Subject: Job Opportunity  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Position Opening:=20

Market Research Scientist in the Research and Methodology Group=20

Job Description:=20

The Research and Methodology group within Harris Interactive seeks a talented, well-organized individual with superior quantitative skills to work on wide variety of methodological issues including the weighting of data from online and mixed-mode surveys.=20

- \* Provide weighting support and consultation for researchers from all units of the company and to external clients=20
- \* Design and implement weighting plans to ensure representativeness of client data=20
- \* Design and analyze multi-mode studies in the interest of validating US and international online research=20
- \* Provide consulting support to Harris Interactive staff on other methodological issues such as questionnaire design, sampling, or how to transition a survey from one mode to another=20
- \* Develop and disseminate methodological information to Harris Interactive staff and clients=20
- \* Prepare presentations, papers and reports for conferences and publications=20
- \* Support business development by presenting capabilities to clients and prospects=20

Required Skills:=20

- \* Degree in statistics, economics, psychology, education, political science, sociology or other quantitative social sciences (Master's degree or Ph.D. preferred)=20
- \* Superior quantitative abilities, including familiarity with selection-bias modeling=20
- \* Knowledge of statistical software (SPSS/SAS/SPLUS)=20
- \* Excellent written and oral communication skills=20
- \* Strong client management skills=20

Job Location=20

Rochester, NY, US.=20

For more Information or to Apply visit:

[www.harrisinteractive.com/careers](http://www.harrisinteractive.com/careers)

<file:///\\www.harrisinteractive.com\careers> =20

135 Corporate Woods Rochester, NY 14623 United States of America

Tel 585.272.8400 800.866.7655 Fax 585.272.8680

[www.harrisinteractive.com](http://www.harrisinteractive.com) <file:///\\www.harrisinteractive.com>=20

=20

=20

=20

-----

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

---

Date: Thu, 16 Feb 2006 15:53:39 -0600  
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Subject: Job Opportunity  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Comments: cc: [brandy.collins@synovate.com](mailto:brandy.collins@synovate.com)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Report Deliverables Director

=20

Synovate is one of the top ten largest market research companies globally. We are the market research arm of global communications specialists Aegis Group. Synovate is continuing to grow, bringing together the expertise and talents of over 5,000 employees / researchers across 50 countries worldwide. Our people are key to our success and we need smart, curious and highly qualified people to help us grow.=20

This position will be responsible for directing and reviewing report deliverables for key clients in the Chicago office, occasionally developing the report itself. This position will work closely with the account and project staff as well as the client to guarantee reports meet client expectations and requirements.=20

The primary goal of the analytic and reporting group is to create accurate and insightful analyses, including marketing recommendations. Depending on the size of the client, the reporting team is aligned with a few major clients in order to be able to guide deliverables to each client's specifications.=20

RESPONSIBILITIES:=20

\*Work closely with internal marketing and project management staff, statisticians and Administrative Support to create highly focused, actionable reports for our clients.=20

\*Analyze and interpret research findings using tabulations and multivariate statistical techniques such as: perceptual maps, cluster analysis, etc.=20

REQUIREMENTS:=20

- \*Bachelor's degree in Business or Marketing=20
- \*15+ years of market research experience=20
- \*Excellent writing and editing skills=20
- \*Previous work experience analyzing data and writing research reports=20
- \*Project Management and/or Account Exec experience a plus=20
- \*Must be highly motivated, detail-oriented, accurate and able to work independently, as well as part of a team.=20
- \*High degree of professionalism and business acumen=20

We are proud to be an EEO/AA employer M/F/D/V.

=20

=20

To apply for this position, please visit the following link:

[http://www.resourcehire.com/clients/synovate/publicjobs/controller.cfm?jaction=3DJobProfile&Job\\_Id=3D10312&esid=3Daz](http://www.resourcehire.com/clients/synovate/publicjobs/controller.cfm?jaction=3DJobProfile&Job_Id=3D10312&esid=3Daz)

=20

=20

=20

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

=====  
Date: Fri, 17 Feb 2006 12:53:10 -0500  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Question is, who conducted political poll?  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

A little bit more on the poll of unknown origin -

Question is, who conducted political poll? =20

[GIO](http://timesunion.com/AspStories/story.asp?storyID=3D451752&category=3DRE=</a></p></div><div data-bbox=)

NOTHER&BCCode=3D&newsdate=3D2/17/2006

or

<http://tinyurl.com/dp53h>

=20

First published: Friday, February 17, 2006=20

=20

Call it the great 20th Congressional District Polling Caper of 2006.

=20

Operatives, reporters and the politically curious are trying to determine who was behind a telephone poll last week that contacted several district residents.

The office of U.S. Rep. John Sweeney, R-Clifton Park, and the campaign of his Democratic challenger, Kirsten Gillibrand, have both insisted they're not polling at this early date. And the head of the New Jersey-based polling organization SurveyUSA, who fears his company is being impersonated in New York, has offered \$1,000 for a full recording of the poll.

Let us explain.

Recipients said there were only two questions posed in the "robo-poll."

The first asked if the responder supported the Bush administration's domestic surveillance/wiretapping tactics. The second noted that Sweeney supports the President on this issue, and then asked whether the responder would vote to re-elect the congressman this fall.=20

Karen Feldman, a Hudson resident and Gillibrand supporter, got the call on Feb. 8. She said she recalled hearing something about "USA," and thought perhaps USA Today was conducting the poll.=20

Denise King, a Columbia County resident and chairwoman of the executive committee of the state Democratic Committee, got the call, too. So did Clifton Park GOP Chairman Mike Lisuzzo, so at least we know the poll was bipartisan.

King said she thought she heard "USA" mentioned on the call as well.

"It didn't specifically say anything negative," King recalled.=20

SNIP=20

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

---

Date: Fri, 17 Feb 2006 16:48:21 -0500  
Reply-To: MMichaels@MichaelsResearch.com  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Maureen Michaels <mmichaels@MICHAELSRESEARCH.COM>  
Organization: Michaels Opinion Research, Inc.  
Subject: Recommendations  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Hello all,

I'm seeking recommendations for high quality focus group recruiters and state-of-the-art facilities in London and Sydney, Australia. Any feedback and contact information would be greatly appreciated.

Thanks,  
Maureen

--Maureen Michaels  
Michaels Opinion Research, Inc.  
73 Spring Street  
Suite 203  
New York, NY 10012

Tel: 212-226-6251  
mmichaels@michaelsresearch.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.

---

Date: Fri, 17 Feb 2006 14:38:46 -0800  
Reply-To: Cathy Cirina <ccirina@MAIL.SDSU.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Cathy Cirina <ccirina@MAIL.SDSU.EDU>  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Comments: cc: jluedtke@projects.sdsu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Colleagues,

I would greatly appreciate recommendations for internet survey software, particularly for packages which offer accessibility to sight-impaired



respondents.

Thank you,  
Cathy Cirina

Cathy Cirina, M.A., M.P.H.  
Coordinator, Research Services  
Social Science Research Laboratory  
San Diego State University  
619.594.1363  
ccirina@mail.sdsu.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.  
=====

Date: Mon, 20 Feb 2006 15:43:43 -0500  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Subject: Berlusconi attacks 'red' pollsters  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Of possible interest . . . .

Berlusconi attacks 'red' pollsters =20  
Premier says polling agencies are biased against him=20

(ANSA) - Rome, February 17 - Premier Silvio Berlusconi said on Friday that Italian research institutes which put him behind in pre-election opinion polls were probably biased towards the centre-left opposition .

The premier, who regularly accuses the media and parts of the judiciary of being leftwing, was speaking amid polemics over a poll commissioned by his Forza Italia party and carried out by U.S. firm PSB.

The American poll gave his centre-right House of Liberties coalition a slim lead over the centre-left Union alliance with elections just seven weeks away. This result contrasted sharply with three Italian-conducted polls released on Thursday, all of which gave the opposition a lead of about 4% .

"Among the various polling agencies (here) there is a situation which is anomalous to say the least," Berlusconi said, adding that "red pollsters" were yet another segment of society which was biased against him .

There was no immediate reaction from Italy's polling agencies. But earlier this month, in the face of similar accusations, they stressed

the strictly scientific nature of their work .

[http://ansa.it/main/notizie/awnplus/english/news/2006-02-17\\_867394.html](http://ansa.it/main/notizie/awnplus/english/news/2006-02-17_867394.html)

"Because he couldn't find a polling institute in Italy ready to paint reality according to his wishes, he simply short-circuited reality and imported a parallel one directly from America," wrote the left-leaning daily La Repubblica on Friday.

SNIP

Italy's communications authority has said it will look into whether this constitutes a breach of rules governing the publication of opinion polls in the run-up to elections .

During election campaigns, the results of polls can only be released if they are accompanied by information on who carried it out, when, on whom and using what methods .

SNIP

=20

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

=====  
Date: Tue, 21 Feb 2006 10:02:00 -0500  
Reply-To: Lori Kaplan <LKaplan@NPR.ORG>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Lori Kaplan <LKaplan@NPR.ORG>  
Subject: Online Voting Solution  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

NPR & it's Board of Directors is seeking an off-the-shelf online voting solution. The system is intended to serve as a voting tool for our 270 member stations to elect our Board members with an online ballot. So far, our IT department is proposing the use of eBallot (URL below). Has anyone had any experiences with this tool (good/bad)? If you have other vendors you would recommend, I would be happy to add those to the pool as well. As always, I appreciate any insights you are able to provide.=20

<http://eballot30.votenet.com/>

Best regards,  
Lori

---

Lori Kaplan | Deputy Research Director | npr  
635 Massachusetts Ave NW | Washington DC 20001=20  
lkaplan@npr.org | p: 202.513.2811 | f: 202.513.3041=20

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

Date: Tue, 21 Feb 2006 10:36:58 -0500  
Reply-To: "Butterworth, Michael" <MXB@CBSNEWS.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Butterworth, Michael" <MXB@CBSNEWS.COM>  
Subject: Re: Online Voting Solution  
Comments: To: Lori Kaplan <LKaplan@NPR.ORG>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I assume you want something that costs under \$400, since that's about what you'll save in the photocopying, postage, and counting if you used snail mail. Or do you need really fast turnaround?=20

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)] On Behalf Of Lori Kaplan  
Sent: Tuesday, February 21, 2006 10:02 AM  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Subject: Online Voting Solution

NPR & it's Board of Directors is seeking an off-the-shelf online voting solution. The system is intended to serve as a voting tool for our 270 member stations to elect our Board members with an online ballot. So far, our IT department is proposing the use of eBallot (URL below). Has anyone had any experiences with this tool (good/bad)? If you have other vendors you would recommend, I would be happy to add those to the pool as well. As always, I appreciate any insights you are able to provide.=20

<http://eballot30.votenet.com/>

Best regards,  
Lori

---

Lori Kaplan | Deputy Research Director | npr  
635 Massachusetts Ave NW | Washington DC 20001=20  
lkaplan@npr.org | p: 202.513.2811 | f: 202.513.3041=20

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

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

Date: Tue, 21 Feb 2006 09:50:56 -0600  
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Online Voting Solution  
Comments: To: Lori Kaplan <[LKaplan@NPR.ORG](mailto:LKaplan@NPR.ORG)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Several of our Clients use Campus-Vote.com and have been pleased with  
the results and relatively inexpensive costs. You can visit their  
website at: =20

<http://www.campus-vote.com/lower-demo.html> =20

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  
[www.goAMP.com](http://www.goAMP.com) <<http://www.goAMP.com>>

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Lori Kaplan  
Sent: Tuesday, February 21, 2006 9:02 AM  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Subject: Online Voting Solution

NPR & it's Board of Directors is seeking an off-the-shelf online voting  
solution. The system is intended to serve as a voting tool for our 270  
member stations to elect our Board members with an online ballot. So  
far, our IT department is proposing the use of eBallot (URL below). Has  
anyone had any experiences with this tool (good/bad)? If you have other  
vendors you would recommend, I would be happy to add those to the pool  
as well. As always, I appreciate any insights you are able to provide.=20

<http://eballot30.votenet.com/>

Best regards,  
Lori

---

Lori Kaplan | Deputy Research Director | npr  
635 Massachusetts Ave NW | Washington DC 20001=20  
lkaplan@npr.org | p: 202.513.2811 | f: 202.513.3041=20

---

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

---

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

---

Date: Tue, 21 Feb 2006 10:24:48 -0600  
Reply-To: Mario Callegaro <[mca@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU](mailto:mca@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mario Callegaro <[mca@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU](mailto:mca@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Online voting solution  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Dear Lori,

with the disclaimer that many computer experts are daily security issues for online voting, I found the following websites:

<http://www.electionsonline.us/>  
<http://www.vote-pro.com/>  
<http://www.evot.ca/>

My real question is: is it worth to implement an online voting system for just 270 members?

Mario

Mario Callegaro  
Doctoral program in Survey Research and Methodology (SRAM)  
<http://sram.unl.edu>  
University of Nebraska, Lincoln  
200 North 11th Street, 4th floor, Lincoln NE 68508  
Personal web page: <http://sram.unl.edu/people/showprofile2.asp?pid=2006>

---

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

---

Date: Tue, 21 Feb 2006 11:53:16 -0700  
Reply-To: Mirta Galesic <[mgalesic@SURVEY.UMD.EDU](mailto:mgalesic@SURVEY.UMD.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mirta Galesic <[mgalesic@SURVEY.UMD.EDU](mailto:mgalesic@SURVEY.UMD.EDU)>  
Subject: Model Selection and Inference: Facts and Fiction - UMD  
Statistics

Seminar, February 24

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND STATISTICS SEMINAR

SPEAKER: Professor Hannes Leeb, Yale University, Statistics Department

TITLE: Model Selection and Inference: Facts and Fiction

TIME AND PLACE: Friday, February 24, 2006, 3:00pm; University of Maryland,  
College Park, Lefrak Building Room 2205

ABSTRACT: Model selection has an important impact on subsequent inference. Ignoring the model selection step leads to invalid inference. We discuss some intricate aspects of data-driven model selection that do not seem to have been widely appreciated in the literature. We debunk some myths about model selection, in particular the myth that consistent model selection has no effect on subsequent inference asymptotically. We also discuss an 'impossibility' result regarding the estimation of the finite-sample distribution of post-model-selection estimators.

Please join us for refreshments afterwards.

Jointly sponsored by the Statistics Consortium and the Statistics Program in the Mathematics Department.

Please visit <http://www.stat.umd.edu/seminar.shtml>

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

---

Date: Tue, 21 Feb 2006 11:26:41 -0800  
Reply-To: "Henning, Maxine S" <[mhenning@FHCRRC.ORG](mailto:mhenning@FHCRRC.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Henning, Maxine S" <[mhenning@FHCRRC.ORG](mailto:mhenning@FHCRRC.ORG)>  
Subject: resume from vacation hold  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

HI,

I would like to resume by emails from AAPOR and I cannot find the email

for taking it off on vacation hold. It was put on vacation hold on 8/5/05.

Maxine Henning. email is mhenning@fhcrc.org.

Thanks,

Maxine

Maxine Henning  
Data Collection Supervisor  
Youth Smoking Studies  
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center  
PO Box 19024 M2-C826  
Seattle, WA 98109  
phone: 206 667-2937  
fax: 206 667-6184  
email: mhenning@fhcrc.org

www.fhcrc.org  
A Life of Science

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

Date: Tue, 21 Feb 2006 15:09:46 -0500  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Mystery Pollster on the USA Polling automated calls  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

RoboScam: Not Your Father's Push Poll

The plot thickens. The automated calls we noted Friday received in the New York Congressional District of Republican Congressman John Sweeney (as reported by the Glen Falls, NY Post Star and the Albany Times Union) do not appear to be an isolated incident. Very similar calls have been received in Iowa and at least three other congressional districts held by Democrats that match the pattern of a classic "push poll" dirty trick. Why such calls were also made about a Republican remain unclear, but the answer may be a new high tech development in the inglorious history of political dirty tricks. Details will follow, but for now, let's call it "robo-scam."

SNIP

[http://www.mysterypollster.com/main/2006/02/roboscaml\\_not\\_yo.html](http://www.mysterypollster.com/main/2006/02/roboscaml_not_yo.html)

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

---

Date: Tue, 21 Feb 2006 14:27:30 -0800  
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <[lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM](mailto:lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leora Lawton <[lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM](mailto:lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM)>  
Subject: organizational studies data set?  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Hi there,

I've been teaching a research methods course to doctoral students in a organizational studies program. The problem is that I don't have a data set for them to use that will (a) get them very familiar with patterns in organizations for employee relationships, decision-making processes, etc.; and (b) useful for them to use as either seeds for their dissertation research or as work to be presented at conferences (or even published).

I may just have them use GSS data or the California Workforce Survey (thanks SDA! <http://sda.berkeley.edu/>) for their final project but does anyone know of a dataset (public use?) that we could obtain to use?

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](http://www.techsociety.com)

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

---

Date: Wed, 22 Feb 2006 08:43:05 -0600  
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>



From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>  
Subject: Georgia Political Science Association meeting  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

The Georgia (USA) Political Science Association will meet in Savannah on November 16, 17 and 18, 2006. We welcome attendees and presenters from all disciplines worldwide. Over 200 participants from United States and overseas attended our 2005 conference. For more information, about submitting proposals and for the agenda of past conferences, please go to our web site at [www.gpsanet.org](http://www.gpsanet.org). Email: [GPSA06@GeorgiaSouthern.edu](mailto:GPSA06@GeorgiaSouthern.edu) <[https://mail.mgc.edu/webmail/src/compose.php?send\\_to=3DGPSA06%40GeorgiaSouthern.edu](https://mail.mgc.edu/webmail/src/compose.php?send_to=3DGPSA06%40GeorgiaSouthern.edu)>=20

Professor Harold Cline  
Director of Communications  
GPSA

=20

=20

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

=====

Date: Wed, 22 Feb 2006 12:37:14 -0600  
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>  
Subject: Job Opportunity  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Comments: cc: Ann Jastrzembowski <[annj@umich.edu](mailto:annj@umich.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

-049684-RY=20

Research Associate

A unit of the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan, the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) is an international membership organization that provides web-based access to empirical social science data for research and teaching, and offers classroom training in quantitative methods to facilitate effective data use. ICPSR also provides user support and preserves data to ensure their long-term availability. Over 500

institutions from around the world are members of ICPSR.

The work environment is a combination of the best aspects of a small nonprofit or business within a university setting. ICPSR is small enough that each person can make a difference, yet large enough to offer a variety of career opportunities. We have a relaxed, collegial atmosphere that fosters communication and networking within and between departments. We are family-friendly, offering flexibility with work hours, and we have a diverse staff who enrich the workplace with their skills and experience.=20

Duties:=20

Acquire and archive research data from the social and behavioral sciences, make the data publicly available via a website on the Internet and provide support to members of the research community who use the data.

Provide expert statistical advice. Provide expertise in the areas of data manipulation, cleaning and database management. Implement quality control measures to ensure accuracy in data and documentation.

Determine complexities of acquired data and documentation and assess problems which affect costs to prepare the datasets for dissemination to research investigators in the social sciences. Work collaboratively with other ICPSR staff in the acquisition, evaluation and processing of social science data.

Participate in the acquisition of datasets in the social sciences, and evaluation of the datasets for their substantive contribution to extended secondary analysis. Respond to and initiate inquiries with social scientists to identify needed research data and provide assistance (via E-mail, telephone and written correspondence), in using archival data to a worldwide constituency of researchers.

Provide technical and administrative leadership in processing operations providing training, supervision, team leadership and mentoring to staff members. Supervise the processing of large and complex research data files.

Participate in meetings and conference calls with research sponsors to define research questions and deliverables, to present results, and to determine next steps. May prepare research papers and manuscripts for publication and presentation at conferences and workshops and write project reports, write funding proposals, articles, and other documents. Prepare reports specified as deliverables for contracts.

The salary range for this position is \$45,000 - \$55,000, depending on the qualifications and experience of the selected candidate.

DEPARTMENT QUALIFICATIONS:=20

Masters degree in Social Science and two or more years of progressively more responsible experience with social science data and data management. Demonstrated experience with social science data including

extensive experience with statistical analysis, spreadsheet, database and word processing software. Technical skills in two of three statistical packages (SAS, SPSS and STATA), especially data management with expertise spanning three to four years. Experience manipulating large data files, and documenting files and processes. Experience analyzing data and making recommendations, and performing data transformations to resolve issues. Three or more years experience providing statistical support. Knowledge of data confidentiality issues. Proven ability to provide expert ad hoc troubleshooting and problem solving. Advanced competency in multi-tasking, proven ability to consistently meet deadlines and track multiple tasks. Ability to organize and manage detailed transactions. Previous experience supervising and/or mentoring staff, and providing constructive feedback. Excellent written and oral communication skills in the English language.

Desirable: Experience manipulating large data files and cleaning, editing and documenting files. Experience analyzing data issues, making recommendations and performing data transformations to resolve issues. Knowledge of social science data archival procedures using a variety of data storage/transmission media. Four or more years experience in progressively responsible social science research and/or data management positions. Five or more years of statistical software experience in SPSS, SAS or STATA including knowledge and experience with the UNIX platform.

The University of Michigan is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer

=20

=20

=20

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

=====  
Date: Wed, 22 Feb 2006 14:36:26 -0500  
Reply-To: Richard Clark <[clark@CUIOG.UGA.EDU](mailto:clark@CUIOG.UGA.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Richard Clark <[clark@CUIOG.UGA.EDU](mailto:clark@CUIOG.UGA.EDU)>  
Subject: customer satisfaction with government services  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Can anyone point me to research conducted to assess public expectations in regard to customer satisfaction? I am less interested in measuring

satisfaction at this point than in understanding the general criteria that is used to assess good service. Thus, a study that shows how long people expect to remain on hold, or how long is a reasonable time to wait in line would be useful to me. And I'm interested if the public has different standards for state government than they do for private industry.

Thanks in advance,

Rich Clark

--

---

Richard L. Clark, Ph.D.  
Director of Peach State Poll  
Manager of Survey Research Unit  
Carl Vinson Institute of Government  
University of Georgia  
201 N. Milledge Avenue  
Athens, GA 30602  
(706) 542-2736

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

Date: Wed, 22 Feb 2006 12:14:34 -0800  
Reply-To: Ginger Blazier <[gblazier@DIRESEARCH.COM](mailto:gblazier@DIRESEARCH.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Ginger Blazier <[gblazier@DIRESEARCH.COM](mailto:gblazier@DIRESEARCH.COM)>  
Subject: SoCal MRA - February News Bulletin  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Dear SoCal MRA Members,

Attached is our monthly news bulletin for February 2006. Included in this bulletin is Upcoming Plans/Events - such as our 2nd Regional Education Session on March 3rd, the chapter's first Meet & Greet in San Diego on March 7th, and the Las Vegas Conference in April. We know how busy you all are and how inundated you all get with e-mails, so we have managed to keep it short and concise, but still very informative. We also encourage you to visit our website [www.socalmra.com](http://www.socalmra.com).

For your convenience I have also attached the upcoming Education Session flyer and the Chapter Service Award Nomination form.

Please feel free to provide any feedback and thank you for your continued support.

Ginger Blazier  
President / SoCal MRA Chapter

Ginger Blazier  
Vice President of Business Development Directions In Research  
8593 Aero Drive  
San Diego, CA 92123

gblazier@diresearch.com  
www.diresearch.com tel:  
fax:  
toll free: 619 299 5883  
619 299 5888  
800 676 5883

---

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

---

Date: Wed, 22 Feb 2006 12:52:21 -0800  
Reply-To: Ginger Blazier <gblazier@DIRESEARCH.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Ginger Blazier <gblazier@DIRESEARCH.COM>  
Subject: Apology  
Comments: To: "AAPORNET@asu.edu" <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Dear AAPOR Members,

I am so sorry - I sent out the SoCal MRA February News Bulletin out to you,  
in error. I really apologize.  
Sincerely,

Ginger Blazier

Ginger Blazier  
Vice President of Business Development Directions In Research  
8593 Aero Drive  
San Diego, CA 92123

gblazier@diresearch.com  
www.diresearch.com tel:  
fax:  
toll free: 619 299 5883  
619 299 5888  
800 676 5883

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

Date: Wed, 22 Feb 2006 13:34:23 -0800  
Reply-To: Paolo Gardinali <[paolo@SURVEY.UCSB.EDU](mailto:paolo@SURVEY.UCSB.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Paolo Gardinali <[paolo@SURVEY.UCSB.EDU](mailto:paolo@SURVEY.UCSB.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Berlusconi attacks 'red' pollsters  
Comments: To: Leo Simonetta <[Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To:  
<[3248A9B21DD5574785FE5E2C8E5216843EDC28@exchange.local.artsience.com](mailto:3248A9B21DD5574785FE5E2C8E5216843EDC28@exchange.local.artsience.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

On Mon, 20 Feb 2006, Leo Simonetta wrote:

> Of possible interest . . . .  
>  
>  
> Berlusconi attacks 'red' pollsters  
> Premier says polling agencies are biased against him  
>  
> (ANSA) - Rome, February 17 - Premier Silvio Berlusconi said on Friday  
> that Italian research institutes which put him behind in pre-election  
> opinion polls were probably biased towards the centre-left opposition .  
>  
> The premier, who regularly accuses the media and parts of the judiciary  
> of being leftwing, was speaking amid polemics over a poll commissioned  
> by his Forza Italia party and carried out by U.S. firm PSB.  
>  
> The American poll gave his centre-right House of Liberties coalition a  
> slim lead over the centre-left Union alliance with elections just seven  
> weeks away. This result contrasted sharply with three Italian-conducted  
> polls released on Thursday, all of which gave the opposition a lead of  
> about 4% .  
>  
> "Among the various polling agencies (here) there is a situation which is  
> anomalous to say the least," Berlusconi said, adding that "red  
> pollsters" were yet another segment of society which was biased against  
> him .

According to the opposition newspaper "L'Unita" the PSB poll might be guilty of the opposite bias. Here is an example of questions from the PSB polls that favor Berlusconi. These questions are asked of people who have intention to vote for the opposition:

"Il capo del governo e' riuscito ad aumentare i posti di lavoro. Malgrado questo lei sceglie di votare Prodi?"

"The premier has been able to increase the number of jobs. In spite of that, you choose to vote for [his opponent]?"

Even more leading (and based on a presumed perception of an improvement in health care about which the respondent's opinion is allegedly not considered):

"C'e' stato un visibile miglioramento della sanita' nazionale: questo non la convince a votare Berlusconi?"

"There has been a perceivable improvement in Health care: this does not convince you to vote for Berlusconi?"

Reportedly, PBS interviewers, when asked, refuse to admit who paid for the poll.

Article at  
[http://www.unita.it/index.asp?SEZIONE\\_COD=HP&TOPIC\\_TIPO=&TOPIC\\_ID=47600](http://www.unita.it/index.asp?SEZIONE_COD=HP&TOPIC_TIPO=&TOPIC_ID=47600)

Here's a cartoon commenting the situation:

<http://www.sergiostaino.it/images/edicola/06-02-06.jpg>

"American polls give him the lead"  
"It's a great yankee tradition: never disappoint your customer"

Cheers,

Paolo A. Gardinali, Ph.D.  
Associate Director  
UCSB Social Science Survey Center  
<http://www.survey.ucsb.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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Wed, 22 Feb 2006 18:37:04 -0700  
Reply-To: Barbara Burbridge <[bburbridge@TCTWEST.NET](mailto:bburbridge@TCTWEST.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Barbara Burbridge <[bburbridge@TCTWEST.NET](mailto:bburbridge@TCTWEST.NET)>  
Subject: Registered Voter Info in Maui  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I have a friend who is doing some work in Maui, and needs to know age breaks among registered voters there. Does anyone on AAPOR-net know or know someone who might have done polling there with registered voters and have that info, or if they know if it is available on a website somewhere?

Barbara Burbridge  
307-765-9434

---

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

---

Date: Thu, 23 Feb 2006 06:38:48 -0500  
Reply-To: Andrew A Beveridge <[andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU](mailto:andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Andrew A Beveridge <[andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU](mailto:andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU)>  
Subject: Spam Test  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Dear All:

I am concerned that the new spam blocker at CUNY is stopping me getting e-mail from AAPORNET. This is a test, please ignore.

Andy Beveridge

---

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.

---

Date: Thu, 23 Feb 2006 08:33:09 -0700  
Reply-To: Harry Heller <[hheller@RCASITE.COM](mailto:hheller@RCASITE.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Harry Heller <[hheller@RCASITE.COM](mailto:hheller@RCASITE.COM)>  
Subject: Now we have a problem

The New York Times reported today that Prince Charles has been very outspoken on several issues on which the Royal Family usually remains silent. The prince kept a diary which he circulated to his "friends" but as often happens, the diary has been leaked to the press.

It was reported that after Hong Kong was turned over to the Chinese, the diary (among other things) ...

...accused Prime Minister Tony Blair of making "decisions based on market



research and focus groups,"

Imagine, a future king criticizing an elected Prime Minister for seeking the the opinions of the public!!!

His great, great, great, great grand father, King George would be proud of him.

We had better keep an eye on the taxes we pay for tea from GB.

-----  
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.

---

Date: Thu, 23 Feb 2006 11:03:26 -0500  
Reply-To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Now we have a problem  
Comments: To: Harry Heller <hheller@RCASITE.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain

Cute. And I would guess that keying in "Price Charles" is a classic Freudian slip.

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 Harry Heller  
Sent: Thursday, February 23, 2006 10:33 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Now we have a problem

The New York Times reported today that Price Charles has been very outspoken on several issues on which the Royal Family usually remains silent. The prince kept a diary which he circulated to his "friends" but as often happens, the diary has been leaked to the press.

It was reported that after Hong Kong was turned over to the Chinese, the the diary (among other things) ...

...accused Prime Minister Tony Blair of making "decisions based on market research and focus groups,"

Imagine, a future king criticizing an elected Prime Minister for seeking the the opinions of the public!!!

His great, great, great, great grand father, King George would be proud of him.

We had better keep an eye on the taxes we pay for tea from GB.

-----  
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.

-----  
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.

---

Date: Thu, 23 Feb 2006 11:00:10 -0500  
Reply-To: [bcsr@RCI.RUTGERS.EDU](mailto:bcsr@RCI.RUTGERS.EDU)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Chris Bruzios <[bcsr@RCI.RUTGERS.EDU](mailto:bcsr@RCI.RUTGERS.EDU)>  
Subject: Job Posting  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8bit

The following is a copy of a job position with the Bloustein Center for Survey Research, Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy, currently posted on the Rutgers University website.

<http://uhr.rutgers.edu/jobpostings/aps/Detail.asp?id=06-000127>

#### SURVEY RESEARCH PROJECT MANAGER

Position Number 06-000127

Posting Date Jan-30-06

Department BSPPP - Survey Research Center

Campus New Brunswick Campus

Salary Grade 07

Retirement System ABP

Funding State funded

#### Job Description

Reports to the Director of the Bloustein Center for Survey Research. Manages all aspects of survey research projects and provides leadership, management, and technical assistance to project clients. Working with clients, including state agencies, non-profits and university faculty and staff, will provide a full range of survey research services. In particular, will work collaboratively with the Bloustein School faculty/staff to manage the survey components of the school's research projects across a number of policy areas including transportation, energy, workforce development, environmental protection, public health,

criminal justice, and urban planning.

## Job Requirements

A master's degree in social sciences or a related field with at least 3 years of advanced project management in survey research is required, as is proficiency in SPSS. Excellent communication and public speaking skills, the ability to work autonomously in obtaining and completing sponsored research projects, knowledge and experience in data analysis and report writing, and knowledge of New Jersey and regional policy issues is preferred.

Send Resumes To:

Brenda Francis  
Survey Research Center  
E.J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy  
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey  
303 George St, Suite 400  
New Brunswick, NJ 08901  
email: brenfran@rci.rutgers.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.

=====  
Date: Thu, 23 Feb 2006 12:36:43 -0500  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Subject: How collecting psychographics can play out  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Wal-Mart, NASCAR tossed into political phone survey  
Rolling Meadow Review (Chicago Area)

<http://www.pioneerlocal.com/cgi-bin/ppo-story/localnews/current/rm/02-23-06-841268.html>

So what does Wal-Mart have to do with local politics anyway?=20

Residents on the receiving end of a January phone survey commissioned by Democratic state Senate primary candidate James J. Morici Jr. might be wondering the same thing.=20

The survey starts out like most political surveys, asking the respondent's opinions of local politicians, including U.S. Rep. Jan Schakowsky, D-9th, Chicago Mayor Richard Daley, and Morici's competition -- Park Ridge Democrat Dan Kotowski and incumbent state Sen. Cheryl Axley, a Republican. Participants were also asked to rank the importance

of national issues and identify their political allegiances.=20

The survey concluded with two questions, "How often do you shop at Wal-Mart?" And, "Do you consider yourself to be a NASCAR fan?"=20

SNIP

Morici's media consultant, Michael Fourcher, a senior associate with The Haymarket Group, first denied that the campaign had even commissioned a survey.=20

Later, Fourcher admitted knowledge of the survey and said information gleaned would be used in-house by the campaign.=20

"When you ask if the information could be passed along to Wal-Mart or NASCAR marketers, you are making an assumption there," Fourcher said. "I can say that any polling information collected by our group is the private property of our campaign and it is not shared with other groups."=20

SNIP

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

---

Date: Thu, 23 Feb 2006 14:08:13 -0500  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Subject: An interesting article on newspaper readership  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

And social desirability.

Where's Leo Bogart when we need him? =09

By Philip Meyer

<http://niemanwatchdog.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=3Dbackground.view&backgrou=n&did=3D0076>

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

---

Date: Sat, 25 Feb 2006 11:04:11 -0800  
Reply-To: Jon Ebeling <pols331@ROCKO.LAB.CSUCHICO.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Jon Ebeling <pols331@ROCKO.LAB.CSUCHICO.EDU>  
Subject: Surveys of intimate behaviors  
Comments: To: aapornet <aapornet@asu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

We may be doing a survey by phone of behaviors of an intimate and private nature. Can anyone give me some suggestions about the collection problems associated with such activity? If there are some web site locations I might examine providing guidance, I would appreciate it.

thanks

jon ebeling, Ph.D

---

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

---

Date: Sat, 25 Feb 2006 15:03:59 -0500  
Reply-To: John Mitchell <john@BUZZBACK.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: John Mitchell <john@BUZZBACK.COM>  
Subject: Re: Surveys of intimate behaviors  
Comments: To: Jon Ebeling <pols331@ROCKO.LAB.CSUCHICO.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Just completed one. Major problem we had was that many people who = originally agreed to participate in a survey about intimate behavior = then turned around and acted offended by the questions. So i'd say get = them to agree twice to be interviewed - something along the lines of = "You have just agreed to participate in a survey where questions about = intimate and sexual behavior will be asked of you. Are you sure that you = are willing to answer such questions about yourself?" it might drop = initial participation rates but it will improve your completion I = suspect.

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

From: Jon Ebeling [mailto:pols331@ROCKO.LAB.CSUCHICO.EDU]  
Sent: Sat Feb 25 14:06:49 2006  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Surveys of intimate behaviors

We may be doing a survey by phone of behaviors of an intimate and=20 private nature. Can anyone give me some suggestions about the collection = problems associated with such activity? If there are some web site=20 locations I might examine providing guidance, I would appreciate it.

thanks

jon ebeling, Ph.D

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

---

Date: Sun, 26 Feb 2006 00:50:46 -0600  
Reply-To: "Doyle, Ken" <[kendoyle@UMN.EDU](mailto:kendoyle@UMN.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Doyle, Ken" <[kendoyle@UMN.EDU](mailto:kendoyle@UMN.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Surveys of intimate behaviors  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <[C1A814A5E1E5E8439CFF5A3279BFB6F7358770@sps.buzzback.com](mailto:C1A814A5E1E5E8439CFF5A3279BFB6F7358770@sps.buzzback.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Prove your legitimacy from the start. For years weird guys have been using official-sounding university names to get women to agree to talk, and then things go downhill.

John Mitchell wrote:

> Just completed one. Major problem we had was that many people who originally agreed to participate in a survey about intimate behavior then turned around and acted offended by the questions. So i'd say get them to agree twice to be interviewed - something along the lines of "You have just agreed to

participate in a survey where questions about intimate and sexual behavior will be asked of you. Are you sure that you are willing to answer such questions about yourself?" it might drop initial participation rates but it will improve your completion I suspect.

>

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

> From: Jon Ebeling [mailto:pols331@ROCKO.LAB.CSUCHICO.EDU]

> Sent: Sat Feb 25 14:06:49 2006

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Surveys of intimate behaviors

>

> We may be doing a survey by phone of behaviors of an intimate and  
> private nature. Can anyone give me some suggestions about the collection  
> problems associated with such activity? If there are some web site  
> locations I might examine providing guidance, I would appreciate it.

>

> thanks

>

> jon ebeling, Ph.D

>

> -----

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

>

--

Kenneth O. Doyle

Director, Communication Research Division

School of Journalism and Mass Communication

University of Minnesota -- Twin Cities

323 Murphy Hall -- 206 Church Street

Minneapolis MN 55455-0418

[www.KenDoyle.umn.edu](http://www.KenDoyle.umn.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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Sun, 26 Feb 2006 10:28:06 -0500

Reply-To: Claire Durand <[Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA](mailto:Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA)>

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

From: Claire Durand <[Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA](mailto:Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA)>

Subject: Fwd: Re: Surveys of intimate behaviors  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

>I carried such a survey for the Corporation of physicians, many years ago,=  
=20  
>among women between 45 and 54 years old. What we did was use the phone to=  
=20  
>recruit, select and get the address. We then sent the questionnaire by=20  
>mail. Very good response rate as we could phone back to encourage=  
completion.  
>  
>Best,  
>  
>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

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

-----  
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.

=====  
Date: Sun, 26 Feb 2006 12:27:01 -0500  
Reply-To: Philip Meyer <[pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU](mailto:pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Philip Meyer <[pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU](mailto:pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Surveys of intimate behaviors



Comments: To: "Doyle, Ken" <kendoyle@UMN.EDU>  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <44014FC6.4030105@umn.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII; format=flowed

My students and I have done surveys on various antisocial behaviors including date rape, illegal drug use, and academic dishonesty. We have found that a mixed mode works well. First a brief telephone interview to explain the project and ask the respondent to accept a mail questionnaire. Acceptance rate is very high, typically > 95 percent. That also satisfies the IRB requirement of informed consent. The mail part is a full Dillman, and response for that phase is very good. But this is a student population and perhaps less risk averse than a general population.

---

Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism  
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
Voice: 919 962-4085 Fax: 919 962-1549  
Cell: 919 906-3425 URL: [www.unc.edu/~pmeyer](http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer)

---

On Sun, 26 Feb 2006, Doyle, Ken wrote:

> Date: Sun, 26 Feb 2006 00:50:46 -0600  
> From: "Doyle, Ken" <kendoyle@UMN.EDU>  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: Re: Surveys of intimate behaviors  
>  
> Prove your legitimacy from the start. For years weird guys have been using  
> official-sounding university names to get women to agree to talk, and then  
> things go downhill.  
>  
>  
> John Mitchell wrote:  
>> Just completed one. Major problem we had was that many people who  
>> originally agreed to participate in a survey about intimate behavior then  
>> turned around and acted offended by the questions. So i'd say get them to  
>> agree twice to be interviewed - something along the lines of "You have just  
>> agreed to participate in a survey where questions about intimate and sexual  
>> behavior will be asked of you. Are you sure that you are willing to answer  
>> such questions about yourself?" it might drop initial participation rates  
>> but it will improve your completion I suspect.  
>> -----Original Message-----  
>> From: Jon Ebeling [mailto:pols331@ROCKO.LAB.CSUCHICO.EDU]  
>> Sent: Sat Feb 25 14:06:49 2006  
>> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>> Subject: Surveys of intimate behaviors  
>>  
>> We may be doing a survey by phone of behaviors of an intimate and private  
>> nature. Can anyone give me some suggestions about the collection problems  
>> associated with such activity? If there are some web site locations I might

>> examine providing guidance, I would appreciate it.

>>

>> thanks

>>

>> jon ebeling, Ph.D

>>

>> -----

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

>>

>

> --

> Kenneth O. Doyle

> Director, Communication Research Division

> School of Journalism and Mass Communication

> University of Minnesota -- Twin Cities

> 323 Murphy Hall -- 206 Church Street

> Minneapolis MN 55455-0418

> [www.KenDoyle.umn.edu](http://www.KenDoyle.umn.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](mailto: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.

=====  
Date: Sun, 26 Feb 2006 11:27:14 -0600

Reply-To: Francis Fullam <[quire1@EARTHLINK.NET](mailto:quire1@EARTHLINK.NET)>

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

From: Francis Fullam <[quire1@EARTHLINK.NET](mailto:quire1@EARTHLINK.NET)>

Subject: Russian Patient Satisfaction??

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

MIME-version: 1.0

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

I have not been able to find any references to surveys of patients in Russia/USSR about their "satisfaction" with their experiences. The Picker Institute of Europe knew of none.





>>=20

>>=20

>>=20

>> -----

>> 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:=20

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

>>=20

>

> --

> Kenneth O. Doyle

> Director, Communication Research Division School of Journalism and=20

> Mass Communication University of Minnesota -- Twin Cities

> 323 Murphy Hall -- 206 Church Street Minneapolis MN 55455-0418=20

> [www.KenDoyle.umn.edu](http://www.KenDoyle.umn.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:=20

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

-----  
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.

-----  
Date: Sun, 26 Feb 2006 12:48:52 -0500

Reply-To: Linda Fisher <[llfisher@COMCAST.NET](mailto:llfisher@COMCAST.NET)>

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

From: Linda Fisher <[llfisher@COMCAST.NET](mailto:llfisher@COMCAST.NET)>

Subject: Re: Surveys of intimate behaviors

Comments: To: Philip Meyer <[pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU](mailto:pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

Comments: cc: [LFisher@aarp.org](mailto:LFisher@aarp.org)

In-Reply-To: <[Pine.A41.4.63+UNC.0602261210200.39392@login7.isis.unc.edu](mailto:Pine.A41.4.63+UNC.0602261210200.39392@login7.isis.unc.edu)>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

AARP has also used mixed-mode surveys of sexuality among the 45 and =  
older

population - a phone call followed by a mail survey among a randomly  
selected sample of the NFO panel. We have implemented this survey

(Sexuality at Midlife and Beyond: 2004 Update of Attitudes and =

Behaviors) in

this way twice - in 1999 and in 2004. We believe the combination of the use of tested question items, the initial call, and trust in both the panel and AARP has not only enhanced response rates but yielded highly reliable results. Our findings are published on the AARP web site at: [http://www.aarp.org/research/family/lifestyles/2004\\_sexuality.html](http://www.aarp.org/research/family/lifestyles/2004_sexuality.html) and although neither our methods nor our questions are identical to those of other recent surveys, the findings are not inconsistent with those of other published surveys.

We have also conducted some similar surveys of harder to reach populations (singles ages 40-69 and people who divorced at age 40 or after) using Knowledge Network's RDD recruited Internet-enabled panel with great success and also findings that are consistent (for similar populations) with our other surveys. Those include:

Lifestyles, Dating, and Romance: A Study of Midlife Singles  
<http://www.aarp.org/research/family/lifestyles/aresearch-import-522.html>

The Divorce Experience: A Study of Divorce At Midlife and Beyond  
<http://www.aarp.org/research/reference/publicopinions/aresearch-import-867.html>

The reports available on the web site include detailed information on the methodologies used in these surveys.

Linda L Fisher  
Director, National Member Research  
AARP  
601 E St., N.W., Rm A3-140  
Washington, DC 20049  
202-434-6304  
[lfisher@aarp.org](mailto:lfisher@aarp.org)  
[llfisher@comcast.net](mailto:llfisher@comcast.net)

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Philip Meyer  
Sent: Sunday, February 26, 2006 12:27 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Surveys of intimate behaviors

My students and I have done surveys on various antisocial behaviors including date rape, illegal drug use, and academic dishonesty. We have found that a mixed mode works well. First a brief telephone interview to explain the project and ask the respondent to accept a mail questionnaire.



>> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>> Subject: Surveys of intimate behaviors  
>>=20  
>> We may be doing a survey by phone of behaviors of an intimate and =  
private

>> nature. Can anyone give me some suggestions about the collection =  
problems

>> associated with such activity? If there are some web site locations I  
might=20

>> examine providing guidance, I would appreciate it.

>>=20

>> thanks

>>=20

>> jon ebeling, Ph.D

>>=20

>> -----

>> 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

>>=20

>>=20

>>=20

>> -----

>> 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

>>=20

>

> --=20

> Kenneth O. Doyle

> Director, Communication Research Division

> School of Journalism and Mass Communication

> University of Minnesota -- Twin Cities

> 323 Murphy Hall -- 206 Church Street

> Minneapolis MN 55455-0418

> [www.KenDoyle.umn.edu](http://www.KenDoyle.umn.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

>

-----  
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.

-----  
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.

---

Date: Mon, 27 Feb 2006 05:48:01 -0700  
Reply-To: Annette Jackle <[aejack@ESSEX.AC.UK](mailto:aejack@ESSEX.AC.UK)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Annette Jackle <[aejack@ESSEX.AC.UK](mailto:aejack@ESSEX.AC.UK)>  
Subject: NEW JOURNAL "Survey Research Methods": Call for Papers

NEW JOURNAL "Survey Research Methods": Call for Papers

The journal 'Survey Research Methods' invites submissions of papers which discuss methodological issues related to survey research. Two types of papers are in-scope:

1. Papers discussing methodological issues in substantive research using survey data;
2. Papers that discuss methodological issues that are more or less independent of the specific field of substantive research.

Topics of particular interest include survey design, sample design, question and questionnaire design, data collection, nonresponse, data capture, data processing, coding and editing, measurement errors, imputation, weighting and survey data analysis methods.

'Survey Research Methods' is the official journal of The European Survey Research Association (ESRA) and will be published electronically with free and open access via the internet. We aim for a fast review and publication process, so that papers could be published within three months of initial submission. The first issue is scheduled for Summer 2006.

The journal is edited by Peter Lynn of the University of Essex, UK, and the co-editor is Rainer Schnell of the University of Konstanz, Germany. The editors are supported by a multi-national panel of Associate Editors, whose names can be found on the journal website, <http://esra.sqp.nl/esra/journal/>.

Articles must be in English and should be between 4,000 and 15,000 words. Further information about the journal can be found at the website, <http://esra.sqp.nl/esra/journal/>. Papers for consideration should be submitted by email, preferably as pdf or Word documents, to [SurveyResearchMethods@uni-konstanz.de](mailto:SurveyResearchMethods@uni-konstanz.de).

\*\*\*\*\*

Peter Lynn ([plynn@essex.ac.uk](mailto:plynn@essex.ac.uk))  
Professor of Survey Methodology  
Institute for Social and Economic Research (ISER)  
University of Essex, Colchester, UK CO4 3SQ  
tel: +44 (0)1206 874809; fax: +44 (0)1206 873151  
<http://www.iser.essex.ac.uk/>

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

Date: Mon, 27 Feb 2006 14:20:43 -0500  
Reply-To: Ana Maria Arumi <[amarumi@PUBLICAGENDA.ORG](mailto:amarumi@PUBLICAGENDA.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Ana Maria Arumi <[amarumi@PUBLICAGENDA.ORG](mailto:amarumi@PUBLICAGENDA.ORG)>  
Subject: Job Posting  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To:  
<[54136.165.230.133.90.1140710410.squirrel@webmail.rci.rutgers.edu](mailto:54136.165.230.133.90.1140710410.squirrel@webmail.rci.rutgers.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=UTF-8; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

## PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCHER AND PROJECT MANAGER

Public Agenda, a nonprofit, nonpartisan research organization, seeks an experienced survey research professional for its research department.

Public Agenda is a nationally recognized nonprofit, nonpartisan research organization located in New York City. It was founded in 1975 by social scientist Dan Yankelovich and Secretary of State Cyrus Vance. Public Agenda conducts original public opinion research on social policy issues â€œ it is not a market research firm.

Candidate should be experienced in quantitative research methods, including questionnaire design and data analysis as well as have significant experience with project management, client interaction and report writing.

Additionally, candidates should have:

- ï€ Strong organizational skills and an ability to handle multiple projects and anticipate scheduling needs;
- ï€ A background in education research, public policy, or the social sciences;
- ï€ SPSS skills; and
- ï€ Experience working with government contracts (preferable, but not required).

Send cover letter and resume to:

Job Search  
Public Agenda  
6 East 39th Street  
New York, NY 10016  
Fax: 212.889.3461  
E-mail: [research@publicagenda.org](mailto:research@publicagenda.org)

Only suitable candidates will be contacted. No phone calls, please.

-----

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

---

Date: Mon, 27 Feb 2006 14:41:19 -0500  
Reply-To: Nancy Belden <[nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM](mailto:nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nancy Belden <[nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM](mailto:nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM)>  
Subject: radio and public opinion  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

AAPORians:

Mark Kind, a reporter for the Kansas City Business Journal, is looking for someone of us who has some expertise in the impact of radio on public opinion - particularly as compared to other media. For a story he is doing about a bond issue to pay for covering the stadium. If you are knowledgeable in this area, please give Mark a call. 816 777 2211 or [mkind@bizjournals.com](mailto:mkind@bizjournals.com)

Thanks -- Nancy

Nancy Belden  
Partner, Belden Russonello & Stewart  
Past President, American Association for Public Opinion Research  
  
1320 19th Street NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036  
202.822.6090

---

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

---

Date: Mon, 27 Feb 2006 15:20:38 -0500  
Reply-To: Rudy Bublitz <[rudy.bublitz@LANGUAGELOGIC.NET](mailto:rudy.bublitz@LANGUAGELOGIC.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Rudy Bublitz <[rudy.bublitz@LANGUAGELOGIC.NET](mailto:rudy.bublitz@LANGUAGELOGIC.NET)>  
Subject: Re: Surveys of intimate behaviors  
Comments: To: "Lavrakas, Paul" <[Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM](mailto:Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Is it possible to use IVR surveys, or IVR portions of surveys for this type of contents. Current technology allows a "warm" hand-off to an IVR survey from the live interviewer. Of course, voice-gender would be managed appropriately as well.



> From: "Doyle, Ken" <kendoyle@UMN.EDU>

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: Surveys of intimate behaviors

>=20

> Prove your legitimacy from the start. For years weird guys have been=20

> using official-sounding university names to get women to agree to=20

> talk, and then things go downhill.

>

>

>

> John Mitchell wrote:

>> Just completed one. Major problem we had was that many people who=20

>> originally agreed to participate in a survey about intimate behavior=20

>> then turned around and acted offended by the questions. So i'd say=20

>> get them to agree twice to be interviewed - something along the lines

>> of "You have just agreed to participate in a survey where questions=20

>> about intimate and sexual behavior will be asked of you. Are you sure

>> that you are willing to answer such questions about yourself?" it=20

>> might drop initial participation rates but it will improve your  
completion I suspect.

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

>> From: Jon Ebeling [mailto:pols331@ROCKO.LAB.CSUCHICO.EDU]

>> Sent: Sat Feb 25 14:06:49 2006

>> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>> Subject: Surveys of intimate behaviors

>>=20

>> We may be doing a survey by phone of behaviors of an intimate and=20

>> private nature. Can anyone give me some suggestions about the=20

>> collection problems associated with such activity? If there are some=20

>> web site locations I might examine providing guidance, I would  
appreciate it.

>>=20

>> thanks

>>=20

>> jon ebeling, Ph.D

>>=20

>> -----

>> 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:=20

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

>>=20

>>=20

>>=20

>> -----

>> 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:=20

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

>>=20

>  
> --  
> Kenneth O. Doyle  
> Director, Communication Research Division School of Journalism and=20  
> Mass Communication University of Minnesota -- Twin Cities  
> 323 Murphy Hall -- 206 Church Street Minneapolis MN 55455-0418=20  
> www.KenDoyle.umn.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:=20  
> [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto: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.

-----  
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.

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

---

Date: Mon, 27 Feb 2006 15:29:26 -0500  
Reply-To: Rudy Bublitz <[rudy.bublitz@LANGUAGELOGIC.NET](mailto:rudy.bublitz@LANGUAGELOGIC.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Rudy Bublitz <[rudy.bublitz@LANGUAGELOGIC.NET](mailto:rudy.bublitz@LANGUAGELOGIC.NET)>  
Subject: Re: radio and public opinion  
Comments: To: Nancy Belden <[nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM](mailto:nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM)>,  
<[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu), [mkind@bizjournals.com](mailto:mkind@bizjournals.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Nancy, Mark,

Just a guess, as we here in Bengal and Reds land have witnessed bond issues to pay for 2 stadiums. Extensive multimedia-mudslinging was engaged in by both sides. =20

You might try to contact;

TUCHFARBER Alfred J., PhD =20  
A&S-Political Science=20  
Professor  
[alfred.tuchfarber@uc.edu](mailto:alfred.tuchfarber@uc.edu)

513-556-3300

Dr. Tuchfarber works with the UC Institute for Policy Research.

Rudy Bublitz

513 241 9112 ext. 12

513 307 4925 mobile

skype: rudybublitz

Advanced technology to improve your research productivity

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

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

Sent: Monday, February 27, 2006 2:41 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: radio and public opinion

AAPORians:

Mark Kind, a reporter for the Kansas City Business Journal, is looking for someone of us who has some expertise in the impact of radio on public opinion - particularly as compared to other media. For a story he is doing about a bond issue to pay for covering the stadium. If you are knowledgeable in this area, please give Mark a call. 816 777 2211 or mkind@bizjournals.com

Thanks -- Nancy

Nancy Belden

Partner, Belden Russonello & Stewart

Past President, American Association for Public Opinion Research

1320 19th Street NW, Suite 700

Washington, DC 20036

202.822.6090

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

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

=====  
Date: Mon, 27 Feb 2006 14:49:39 -0600

Reply-To: Michael Xenos <xenos@WISC.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Michael Xenos <xenos@WISC.EDU>

Subject: AAPOR Book Sale in Montreal

Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; format=flowed; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Dear AAPOR members,

I'm writing to let you know that I have taken over for Patricia Moy this year as Books & Exhibits/Meet the Author Coordinator. In part because this is a transition year, I am also writing to ask for your help.

So far, AAPOR has secured the presence of a number of publishers who will be sending public opinion and methods-related titles to display and sell in Montreal, but we still need to coordinate with others.

\*You can help ensure that we have a good showing of publishers and continue to make our traditional Saturday night book sale as useful as possible to conference attendees by contacting me and your editor and/or your publisher's exhibits group.\*

In short, we'd like to see:

- (1) any public opinion-related titles you have published recently; and
- (2) any titles that you believe would appeal to the membership.

There are no fees for sending titles, so your publishers can send as many titles as they'd like.

Your help will be greatly appreciated, see you in Montreal,

Michael A. Xenos

Assistant Professor, Department of Communication Arts  
University of Wisconsin-Madison  
6016 Vilas Hall  
821 University Avenue  
Madison, WI 53706  
(608)263-3966

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

Date: Tue, 28 Feb 2006 06:43:42 -0500  
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>  
Subject: Poll of troops in Iraq  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable



[]  
New York Times

February 28, 2006  
Op-Ed Columnist

## The Soldiers Speak. Will President Bush Listen?

By=20  
<<http://topics.nytimes.com/top/opinion/editorialsandoped/oped/columnists/nic-holasdkristof/index.html?inline=3Dnyt-per>>NICHOLAS=20  
D. KRISTOF

When President Bush held a public meeting with=20  
troops by satellite last fall, they were=20  
miraculously upbeat. And all along, unrepentant=20  
hawks (most of whom have never been to Iraq) have=20  
insisted that journalists are misreporting Iraq=20  
and that most soldiers are gung-ho about their mission.

Hogwash! A new poll to be released today shows=20  
that U.S. soldiers overwhelmingly want out of Iraq =AD and soon.

The poll is the first of U.S. troops currently=20  
serving in Iraq, according to John Zogby, the=20  
pollster. Conducted by Zogby International and=20  
LeMoyne College, it asked 944 service members,=20  
"How long should U.S. troops stay in Iraq?"

Only 23 percent backed Mr. Bush's position that=20  
they should stay as long as necessary. In=20  
contrast, 72 percent said that U.S. troops should=20  
be pulled out within one year. Of those, 29=20  
percent said they should withdraw "immediately."

That's one more bit of evidence that our grim=20  
stay-the-course policy in Iraq has failed. Even=20  
the American troops on the ground don't buy into=20  
it =AD and having administration officials=20  
pontificate from the safety of Washington about=20  
the need for ordinary soldiers to stay the course=20  
further erodes military morale.

While the White House emphasizes the threat from=20  
non-Iraqi terrorists, only 26 percent of the U.S.=20  
troops say that the insurgency would end if those=20  
foreign fighters could be kept out. A plurality=20  
believes that the insurgency is made up=20  
overwhelmingly of discontented Iraqi Sunnis.

So what would it take to win in Iraq? Maybe that=20  
was the single most depressing finding in this poll.

By a two-to-one ratio, the troops said that "to=20 control the insurgency we need to double the=20 level of ground troops and bombing missions." And=20 since there is zero chance of that happening, a=20 majority of troops seemed to be saying that they=20 believe this war to be unwinnable.

SNIP

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

Date: Tue, 28 Feb 2006 09:38:53 -0600  
Reply-To: "Sherman, Bill - RIUSA" <[B.Sherman@RESEARCH-INT.COM](mailto:B.Sherman@RESEARCH-INT.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Sherman, Bill - RIUSA" <[B.Sherman@RESEARCH-INT.COM](mailto:B.Sherman@RESEARCH-INT.COM)>  
Subject: Post-9/11: Surveying Respondents of Middle Eastern Descent  
Residi

ng in the US  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain

Is anyone aware of recent studies of behavior of Middle Easterners residing in the US? I'm leading an effort to investigate how this population sends money to friends and relatives living in the Middle East. Not surprisingly, members of this population are extremely suspicious of people asking them for information, even in Arabic or other languages used in the Middle East. We're contemplating F2F interviews, but as to where and how, we have many unanswered questions. We perceive our biggest challenge to be getting respondents to understand that the study is legitimate, their responses are anonymous, we are not from the government, and so forth. If anyone can direct me to some examples of similar studies (post-9/11, post-"War on Terror," talking to Middle Easterners who reside in neighborhoods in Detroit, Chicago, NYC and LA), it would be much appreciated. Thanks,

Bill Sherman  
Survey Project Director

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

From: AAPORNET automatic digest system [<mailto:LISTSERV@lists.asu.edu>]  
Sent: Monday, February 27, 2006 10:00 PM  
To: [AAPORNET@lists.asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@lists.asu.edu)  
Subject: AAPORNET Digest - 26 Feb 2006 to 27 Feb 2006 (#2006-47)

<title>AAPORNET Digest - 26 Feb 2006 to 27 Feb 2006 (#2006-47)</title> <body  
bgcolor="#E9E9E9" text="#000000" link="#0000FF" vlink="#0000FF">

<a name="skipnavlinks"></a>

<center>

<h2>AAPORNET Digest - 26 Feb 2006 to 27 Feb 2006 (#2006-47)</h2> </center>

<p><h3>Table of contents:</h3> <ul> <li><a href="#S1">NEW JOURNAL "Survey Research Methods": Call for Papers</a> <li><a href="#S2">Job Posting</a>

<li><a href="#S3">radio and public opinion</a> (2) <li><a href="#S4">Surveys of intimate behaviors</a> <li><a href="#S5">AAPOR Book Sale in Montreal</a>

</ul> <ol> <a name=S1><li>NEW JOURNAL "Survey Research Methods": Call for Papers</a><ul> <li><a href="cid:8699@LISTS.ASU.EDU">NEW JOURNAL "Survey Research Methods": Call for Papers</a> (02/27)<br><b>From:</b> Annette

Jackle &lt;aejack@ESSEX.AC.UK>;</ul> <a name=S2><li>Job Posting</a><ul>

<li><a href="cid:8700@LISTS.ASU.EDU">Job Posting</a> (02/27)<br><b>From:</b> Ana Maria Arumi &lt;amarumi@PUBLICAGENDA.ORG>;</ul>

<a name=S3><li>radio and public opinion</a><ul> <li><a href="cid:8701@LISTS.ASU.EDU">radio and public opinion</a>

(02/27)<br><b>From:</b> Nancy Belden &lt;nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM>; <li><a href="cid:8703@LISTS.ASU.EDU">Re: radio and public opinion</a>

(02/27)<br><b>From:</b> Rudy Bublitz &lt;rudy.bublitz@LANGUAGELOGIC.NET>;</ul>

<a name=S4><li>Surveys of intimate behaviors</a><ul> <li><a href="cid:8702@LISTS.ASU.EDU">Re: Surveys of intimate behaviors</a>

(02/27)<br><b>From:</b> Rudy Bublitz &lt;rudy.bublitz@LANGUAGELOGIC.NET>;</ul>

<a name=S5><li>AAPOR Book Sale in Montreal</a><ul> <li><a href="cid:8704@LISTS.ASU.EDU">AAPOR Book Sale in Montreal</a>

(02/27)<br><b>From:</b> Michael Xenos &lt;xenos@WISC.EDU>;</ul> </ol> <p>

<hr> <a href="http://www.lsoft.com/LISTSERV-powered.html">

</a> <font size=-1> Browse the <a href="http://lists.asu.edu/cgi-bin/wa?LIST=AAPORNET">AAPORNET online archives.</a> </font>

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

Date: Tue, 28 Feb 2006 10:49:58 -0500

Reply-To: "Joseph, Craig" <[Craig.Joseph@FTICONSULTING.COM](mailto:Craig.Joseph@FTICONSULTING.COM)>

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

From: "Joseph, Craig" <[Craig.Joseph@FTICONSULTING.COM](mailto:Craig.Joseph@FTICONSULTING.COM)>

Subject: Re: Post-9/11: Surveying Respondents of Middle Eastern Descent Residing in the US

Comments: To: "Sherman, Bill - RIUSA" <[B.Sherman@RESEARCH-INT.COM](mailto:B.Sherman@RESEARCH-INT.COM)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

=20

I am currently conducting a survey of Middle Eastern Muslims in the Chicago area. If you would like to discuss, we can shift this off the listserv.

Craig Joseph

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Sherman, Bill - RIUSA

Sent: Tuesday, February 28, 2006 9:39 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Post-9/11: Surveying Respondents of Middle Eastern Descent Residing in the US

Is anyone aware of recent studies of behavior of Middle Easterners residing in the US? I'm leading an effort to investigate how this population sends money to friends and relatives living in the Middle East. Not surprisingly, members of this population are extremely suspicious of people asking them for information, even in Arabic or other languages used in the Middle East.

We're contemplating F2F interviews, but as to where and how, we have many unanswered questions. We perceive our biggest challenge to be getting respondents to understand that the study is legitimate, their responses are anonymous, we are not from the government, and so forth. If anyone can direct me to some examples of similar studies (post-9/11, post-"War on Terror," talking to Middle Easterners who reside in neighborhoods in Detroit, Chicago, NYC and LA), it would be much appreciated. Thanks,

Bill Sherman  
Survey Project Director

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

From: AAPORNET automatic digest system [mailto:LISTSERV@lists.asu.edu]

Sent: Monday, February 27, 2006 10:00 PM

To: AAPORNET@lists.asu.edu

Subject: AAPORNET Digest - 26 Feb 2006 to 27 Feb 2006 (#2006-47)

<title>AAPORNET Digest - 26 Feb 2006 to 27 Feb 2006 (#2006-47)</title>

<body bgcolor=#E9E9E9 text=#000000 link=#0000FF vlink=#0000FF">

<a name=skipnavlinks"></a>

<center>

<h2>AAPORNET Digest - 26 Feb 2006 to 27 Feb 2006 (#2006-47)</h2>

</center> <p><h3>Table of contents:</h3> <ul> <li><a href=#S1">NEW

JOURNAL "Survey Research Methods": Call for Papers</a> <li><a href=#S2">Job Posting</a> <li><a href=#S3">radio and public

opinion</a> (2) <li><a href=#S4">Surveys of intimate behaviors</a>

<li><a href=#S5">AAPOR Book Sale in Montreal</a> </ul> <ol> <a

name=3DS1"><li>NEW JOURNAL "Survey Research Methods": Call for

Papers</a><ul> <li><a href=#cid:8699@LISTS.ASU.EDU">NEW JOURNAL =

"Survey

Research Methods": Call for Papers (02/27) From: Annette Jackle &aejack@ESSEX.AC.UK</ul> <a name=3DS2><li>Job Posting</a><ul> <li><a href=3D"cid:8700@LISTS.ASU.EDU">Job Posting</a> (02/27) From: Ana Maria Arumi &lt;amarumi@PUBLICAGENDA.ORG></ul> <a name=3DS3><li>radio and public opinion</a><ul> <li><a href=3D"cid:8701@LISTS.ASU.EDU">radio and public opinion</a> (02/27) From: Nancy Belden &lt;nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM></ul> <li><a href=3D"cid:8703@LISTS.ASU.EDU">Re: radio and public opinion</a> (02/27) From: Rudy Bublitz &lt;rudy.bublitz@LANGUAGELOGIC.NET></ul> <a name=3DS4><li>Surveys of intimate behaviors</a><ul> <li><a href=3D"cid:8702@LISTS.ASU.EDU">Re: Surveys of intimate behaviors</a> (02/27) From: Rudy Bublitz &lt;rudy.bublitz@LANGUAGELOGIC.NET></ul> <a name=3DS5><li>AAPOR Book Sale in Montreal</a><ul> <li><a href=3D"cid:8704@LISTS.ASU.EDU">AAPOR Book Sale in Montreal</a> (02/27) From: Michael Xenos &lt;xenos@WISC.EDU></ul> </ol> <p> <hr> <a href=3D"http://www.lsoft.com/LISTSERV-powered.html"> <img src=3D"http://LISTS.ASU.EDU/archives/lpowered.gif" align=3Dright alt=3D"Powered by LISTSERV(R)" border=3D0></a> <font size=3D-1> Browse = the <a href=3D"http://lists.asu.edu/cgi-bin/wa?LIST=3DAAPORNET">AAPORNET online archives.</a> </font>

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

=====  
Date: Tue, 28 Feb 2006 14:36:19 -0500  
Reply-To: Frank Rusciano <[rusciano@RIDER.EDU](mailto:rusciano@RIDER.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Frank Rusciano <[rusciano@RIDER.EDU](mailto:rusciano@RIDER.EDU)>  
Subject: Competing views  
Comments: To: AAPOR <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

Competing views--the latter from a "media watchdog" group. One suspects that the weighting process addresses their questions.

Poll: Bush Ratings At All-Time Low

NEW YORK, Feb. 27, 2006

---

(CBS/AP)

#### Fast Fact

In a bright spot for the administration, most Americans appeared to have heard enough about Vice President Dick Cheney's hunting accident.

---

(CBS) The latest CBS News poll finds President Bush's approval rating has fallen to an all-time low of 34 percent, while pessimism about the Iraq war has risen to a new high.

Americans are also overwhelmingly opposed to the Bush-backed deal giving a Dubai-owned company operational control over six major U.S. ports <<http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2006/02/26/national/main1346503.shtml>>. Seven in 10 Americans, including 58 percent of Republicans, say they're opposed to the agreement.

CBS News senior White House correspondent Jim Axelrod reports that now it turns out the Coast Guard had concerns about the ports deal, a disclosure that is no doubt troubling to a president who assured Americans there was no security risk from the deal.

The troubling results for the Bush administration come amid reminders about the devastating impact of Hurricane Katrina and negative assessments of how the government and the president have handled it for six months.

In a separate poll, two out of three Americans said they do not think President Bush has responded adequately to the needs of Katrina victims. Only 32 percent approve of the way President Bush is responding to those needs, a drop of 12 points from last September's poll, taken just two weeks after the storm made landfall.

---

Full Poll: Bush, The Ports And Iraq (.pdf)

<[http://www.cbsnews.com/htdocs/pdf/poll\\_bush\\_022706.pdf](http://www.cbsnews.com/htdocs/pdf/poll_bush_022706.pdf)>

Full Poll: Katrina Six Months Later (.pdf)

<[http://www.cbsnews.com/htdocs/pdf/poll\\_katrina\\_022706.pdf](http://www.cbsnews.com/htdocs/pdf/poll_katrina_022706.pdf)>

CBS Public Eye Discussion Of Poll 'Weighting' Issues

<<http://www.cbsnews.com/blogs/2006/02/28/publiceye/entry1352504.shtml>>

---

Mr. Bush's overall job rating has fallen to 34 percent, down from 42 percent last month. Fifty-nine percent disapprove of the job the president is doing.

For the first time in this poll, most Americans say the president does not care much about people like themselves. Fifty-one percent now think

he doesn't care, compared to 47 percent last fall.

Just 30 percent approve of how Mr. Bush is handling the Iraq war, another all-time low.

By two to one, the poll finds Americans think U.S. efforts to bring stability to Iraq are going badly - the worst assessment yet of progress in Iraq.

Even on fighting terrorism, which has long been a strong suit for Mr. Bush, his ratings dropped lower than ever. Half of Americans say they disapprove of how he's handling the war on terror, while 43 percent approve.

In a bright spot for the administration, most Americans appeared to have heard enough about Vice President Dick Cheney's hunting accident.

More than three in four said it was understandable that the accident had occurred and two-thirds said the media had spent too much time covering the story.

Still, the incident appears to have made the public's already negative view of Cheney a more so. Just 18 percent said they had a favorable view of the vice president, down from 23 percent in January.

Americans were evenly split on whether or not Cheney's explanation of why there was a delay in reporting the accident was satisfactory.

©MMVI, CBS Broadcasting Inc. All Rights Reserved.

### CBS Slants Bush Poll in Favor of Democrats

Posted by Greg Sheffield <<http://newsbusters.org/user/21>> on February 28, 2006 - 08:57.

In its classic "fair and balanced" tradition, CBS slanted in favor of Democrats its poll that found Bush has a 34 percent approval rating and a 59 percent disapproval rating, an all-time high for a CBS poll.

On the bottom of the PDF version <[http://www.cbsnews.com/htdocs/pdf/poll\\_bush\\_022706.pdf](http://www.cbsnews.com/htdocs/pdf/poll_bush_022706.pdf)> of the poll (page 18) it says how many Democrats versus Republicans were contacted.

"Total Republicans" contacted: 272 unweighted and 289 weighted.

"Total Democrats" contacted: 409 unweighted and 381 weighted.

"Total Independents" contacted: 337 unweighted and 348 weighted.

Brent Baker <<http://newsbusters.org/node/4206>> also noted how CBS failed to highlight a key portion of its poll on the Feb. 27 "CBS Evening News." 66 percent of respondents thought the media devoted "too much time" to Cheney's hunting accident.

UPDATE 12:31. The Pew Research Center for the People and the Press <<http://people-press.org/reports/questionnaires/270.pdf>> has a helpful table in this report (page 13) on what percentage of Americans consider themselves to be Republican or Democrat. It shows that in both 2004 and 2005, 30% said they were Republican compared to 33% who said they were Democrats. The new CBS poll (even after being weighted) had a population of only 28% Republicans to 37% Democrats.

UPDATE 13:21. Aside from their bias, Jason Smith notes how mid-year polls are often unreliable predictors <<http://texasrainmaker.blogspot.com/2006/02/if-election-were-held-today-democrats.html>> for future elections.

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

=====  
Date: Tue, 28 Feb 2006 15:12:59 -0500  
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Competing views  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[4404A633.5030204@rider.edu](mailto:4404A633.5030204@rider.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Frank Rusciano wrote:

>Competing views--the latter from a "media watchdog" group. One  
>suspects that the weighting process addresses their questions.

Why the imbalance in the raw numbers, though? Do more Dems answer the phone?

--

Doug Henwood  
Left Business Observer  
38 Greene St - 4th fl.  
New York NY 10013-2505 USA  
<[dhenwood@panix.com](mailto: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



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

podcast: <<http://shout.lbo-talk.org/lbo/RadioArchive/2005/dircaster.php>>

-----  
download my book Wall Street (for free!) at

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

-----  
Conference info: <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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====

Date: Tue, 28 Feb 2006 15:18:18 -0500

Reply-To: Frank Rusciano <[rusciano@RIDER.EDU](mailto:rusciano@RIDER.EDU)>

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

From: Frank Rusciano <[rusciano@RIDER.EDU](mailto:rusciano@RIDER.EDU)>

Subject: Re: Competing views

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

In-Reply-To: <[4404A633.5030204@rider.edu](mailto:4404A633.5030204@rider.edu)>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

As a sidenote: I didn't post these articles because I doubt the veracity of CBS's polling results. I just find it interesting that no sooner are the data posted than there is a (supposed) reply to the results, usually from someone who has little knowledge of methodology. I'm reminded of Frank Newport's presentation at NJAAPOR, when he said that whenever Gallup found Bush was up, Democrats would complain about the methodology, and whenever Bush was down, Republicans would complain about the methodology. We all know the punchline--the methodology was the same both times. I find these stories just another reflection of how politicized reporting data has become.

Frank Rusciano

Frank Rusciano wrote:

> Competing views--the latter from a "media watchdog" group. One

> suspects that the weighting process addresses their questions.

>

>

> Poll: Bush Ratings At All-Time Low

>

>

> NEW YORK, Feb. 27, 2006

> -----

> (CBS/AP)

>

> Fast Fact

>

> In a bright spot for the administration, most Americans appeared to

> have heard enough about Vice President Dick Cheney's hunting accident.

> -----

>  
>  
> (CBS) The latest CBS News poll finds President Bush's approval rating  
> has fallen to an all-time low of 34 percent, while pessimism about the  
> Iraq war has risen to a new high.  
>  
> Americans are also overwhelmingly opposed to the Bush-backed deal  
> giving a Dubai-owned company operational control over six major U.S.  
> ports  
> <<http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2006/02/26/national/main1346503.shtml>>.  
> Seven in 10 Americans, including 58 percent of Republicans, say  
> they're opposed to the agreement.  
>  
> CBS News senior White House correspondent Jim Axelrod reports that now  
> it turns out the Coast Guard had concerns about the ports deal, a  
> disclosure that is no doubt troubling to a president who assured  
> Americans there was no security risk from the deal.  
>  
> The troubling results for the Bush administration come amid reminders  
> about the devastating impact of Hurricane Katrina and negative  
> assessments of how the government and the president have handled it  
> for six months.  
>  
> In a separate poll, two out of three Americans said they do not think  
> President Bush has responded adequately to the needs of Katrina  
> victims. Only 32 percent approve of the way President Bush is  
> responding to those needs, a drop of 12 points from last September's  
> poll, taken just two weeks after the storm made landfall.  
>  
>  
> -----  
> Full Poll: Bush, The Ports And Iraq (.pdf)  
> <[http://www.cbsnews.com/htdocs/pdf/poll\\_bush\\_022706.pdf](http://www.cbsnews.com/htdocs/pdf/poll_bush_022706.pdf)>  
> Full Poll: Katrina Six Months Later (.pdf)  
> <[http://www.cbsnews.com/htdocs/pdf/poll\\_katrina\\_022706.pdf](http://www.cbsnews.com/htdocs/pdf/poll_katrina_022706.pdf)>  
> CBS Public Eye Discussion Of Poll 'Weighting' Issues  
> <<http://www.cbsnews.com/blogs/2006/02/28/publiceye/entry1352504.shtml>>  
>  
> -----  
>  
> Mr. Bush's overall job rating has fallen to 34 percent, down from 42  
> percent last month. Fifty-nine percent disapprove of the job the  
> president is doing.  
>  
> For the first time in this poll, most Americans say the president does  
> not care much about people like themselves. Fifty-one percent now  
> think he doesn't care, compared to 47 percent last fall.  
>  
> Just 30 percent approve of how Mr. Bush is handling the Iraq war,  
> another all-time low.  
>  
> By two to one, the poll finds Americans think U.S. efforts to bring  
> stability to Iraq are going badly - the worst assessment yet of  
> progress in Iraq.

>  
> Even on fighting terrorism, which has long been a strong suit for Mr.  
> Bush, his ratings dropped lower than ever. Half of Americans say they  
> disapprove of how he's handling the war on terror, while 43 percent  
> approve.  
>  
> In a bright spot for the administration, most Americans appeared to  
> have heard enough about Vice President Dick Cheney's hunting accident.  
>  
> More than three in four said it was understandable that the accident  
> had occurred and two-thirds said the media had spent too much time  
> covering the story.  
>  
> Still, the incident appears to have made the public's already negative  
> view of Cheney a more so. Just 18 percent said they had a favorable  
> view of the vice president, down from 23 percent in January.  
>  
> Americans were evenly split on whether or not Cheney's explanation of  
> why there was a delay in reporting the accident was satisfactory.  
>  
> ©MMVI, CBS Broadcasting Inc. All Rights Reserved.  
>  
>  
>  
> CBS Slants Bush Poll in Favor of Democrats  
>  
> Posted by Greg Sheffield <<http://newsbusters.org/user/21>> on February  
> 28, 2006 - 08:57.  
> In its classic "fair and balanced" tradition, CBS slanted in favor of  
> Democrats its poll that found Bush has a 34 percent approval rating  
> and a 59 percent disapproval rating, an all-time high for a CBS poll.  
>  
> On the bottom of the PDF version  
> <[http://www.cbsnews.com/htdocs/pdf/poll\\_bush\\_022706.pdf](http://www.cbsnews.com/htdocs/pdf/poll_bush_022706.pdf)> of the poll  
> (page 18) it says how many Democrats versus Republicans were contacted.  
>  
> "Total Republicans" contacted: 272 unweighted and 289 weighted.  
>  
> "Total Democrats" contacted: 409 unweighted and 381 weighted.  
>  
> "Total Independents" contacted: 337 unweighted and 348 weighted.  
>  
> Brent Baker <<http://newsbusters.org/node/4206>> also noted how CBS  
> failed to highlight a key portion of its poll on the Feb. 27 "CBS  
> Evening News." 66 percent of respondents thought the media devoted  
> "too much time" to Cheney's hunting accident.  
>  
> UPDATE 12:31. The Pew Research Center for the People and the Press  
> <<http://people-press.org/reports/questionnaires/270.pdf>> has a helpful  
> table in this report (page 13) on what percentage of Americans  
> consider themselves to be Republican or Democrat. It shows that in  
> both 2004 and 2005, 30% said they were Republican compared to 33% who  
> said they were Democrats. The new CBS poll (even after being weighted)  
> had a population of only 28% Republicans to 37% Democrats.

>  
> UPDATE 13:21. Aside from their bias, Jason Smith notes how mid-year  
> polls are often unreliable predictors  
> <<http://texasrainmaker.blogspot.com/2006/02/if-election-were-held-today-democrats.html>>  
> for future elections.

>  
>  
>  
> -----

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

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

Date: Tue, 28 Feb 2006 16:05:39 -0500  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Competing views  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

The guy behind newsbusters was also behind Rather Biased . . . =20

The Mystery Pollster takes a look at the weights and reweights the data  
at:  
[http://www.mysterypollster.com/main/2006/02/ports\\_cbs\\_news\\_.html](http://www.mysterypollster.com/main/2006/02/ports_cbs_news_.html)  
(about 1/2 way down)

And the Zogby Poll Warren referred to earlier is at:  
<http://www.zogby.com/news/ReadNews.dbm?ID=3D1075>

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

> -----Original Message-----  
> From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Frank Rusciano  
> Sent: Tuesday, February 28, 2006 3:18 PM  
> To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

> Subject: Re: Competing views

>=20

> As a sidenote: I didn't post these articles because I doubt=20

> the veracity of CBS's polling results. I just find it=20

> interesting that no sooner are the data posted than there is=20

> a (supposed) reply to the results, usually from someone who=20

> has little knowledge of methodology. I'm reminded of Frank=20

> Newport's presentation at NJAAPOR, when he said that whenever=20

> Gallup found Bush was up, Democrats would complain about the=20

> methodology, and whenever Bush was down, Republicans would=20

> complain about the methodology. We all know the=20

> punchline--the methodology was the same both times. I find=20

> these stories just another reflection of how politicized=20

> reporting data has become.

>=20

> Frank Rusciano

>=20

> Frank Rusciano wrote:

>=20

>> Competing views--the latter from a "media watchdog" group. One=20

>> suspects that the weighting process addresses their questions.

>>

>>

>> Poll: Bush Ratings At All-Time Low

>>

>>

>> NEW YORK, Feb. 27, 2006

>>=20

> -----

>> --

>> (CBS/AP)

>>

>> Fast Fact

>>

>> In a bright spot for the administration, most Americans appeared to=20

>> have heard enough about Vice President Dick Cheney's=20

> hunting accident.

>>=20

> -----

>> --

>> =20

>>

>> (CBS) The latest CBS News poll finds President Bush's=20

> approval rating=20

>> has fallen to an all-time low of 34 percent, while=20

> pessimism about the=20

>> Iraq war has risen to a new high.

>>

>> Americans are also overwhelmingly opposed to the Bush-backed deal=20

>> giving a Dubai-owned company operational control over six major U.S.

>> ports

>>=20

> <<http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2006/02/26/national/main134650>

> 3.shtml>.=20

>> Seven in 10 Americans, including 58 percent of Republicans, say=20  
>> they're opposed to the agreement.  
>>  
>> CBS News senior White House correspondent Jim Axelrod=20  
> reports that now=20  
>> it turns out the Coast Guard had concerns about the ports deal, a=20  
>> disclosure that is no doubt troubling to a president who assured=20  
>> Americans there was no security risk from the deal.  
>>  
>> The troubling results for the Bush administration come amid=20  
> reminders=20  
>> about the devastating impact of Hurricane Katrina and negative=20  
>> assessments of how the government and the president have handled it=20  
>> for six months.  
>>  
>> In a separate poll, two out of three Americans said they do=20  
> not think=20  
>> President Bush has responded adequately to the needs of Katrina=20  
>> victims. Only 32 percent approve of the way President Bush is=20  
>> responding to those needs, a drop of 12 points from last=20  
> September's=20  
>> poll, taken just two weeks after the storm made landfall.  
>>  
>> =20  
>>=20  
> -----  
> -----  
>> Full Poll: Bush, The Ports And Iraq (.pdf)  
>> <[http://www.cbsnews.com/htdocs/pdf/poll\\_bush\\_022706.pdf](http://www.cbsnews.com/htdocs/pdf/poll_bush_022706.pdf)>  
>> Full Poll: Katrina Six Months Later (.pdf)  
>> <[http://www.cbsnews.com/htdocs/pdf/poll\\_katrina\\_022706.pdf](http://www.cbsnews.com/htdocs/pdf/poll_katrina_022706.pdf)>  
>> CBS Public Eye Discussion Of Poll 'Weighting' Issues  
>> =20  
>>=20  
> <<http://www.cbsnews.com/blogs/2006/02/28/publiceye/entry1352504.shtml>>  
>> =20  
>>=20  
> -----  
>> --  
>>  
>> Mr. Bush's overall job rating has fallen to 34 percent,=20  
> down from 42=20  
>> percent last month. Fifty-nine percent disapprove of the job the=20  
>> president is doing.  
>>  
>> For the first time in this poll, most Americans say the=20  
> president does=20  
>> not care much about people like themselves. Fifty-one percent now=20  
>> think he doesn't care, compared to 47 percent last fall.  
>>  
>> Just 30 percent approve of how Mr. Bush is handling the Iraq war,=20  
>> another all-time low.  
>>  
>> By two to one, the poll finds Americans think U.S. efforts to bring=20

>> stability to Iraq are going badly - the worst assessment yet of=20  
>> progress in Iraq.  
>>  
>> Even on fighting terrorism, which has long been a strong=20  
> suit for Mr.=20  
>> Bush, his ratings dropped lower than ever. Half of=20  
> Americans say they=20  
>> disapprove of how he's handling the war on terror, while 43 percent=20  
>> approve.  
>>  
>> In a bright spot for the administration, most Americans appeared to=20  
>> have heard enough about Vice President Dick Cheney's=20  
> hunting accident.  
>>  
>> More than three in four said it was understandable that the=20  
> accident=20  
>> had occurred and two-thirds said the media had spent too much time=20  
>> covering the story.  
>>  
>> Still, the incident appears to have made the public's=20  
> already negative=20  
>> view of Cheney a more so. Just 18 percent said they had a favorable=20  
>> view of the vice president, down from 23 percent in January.  
>>  
>> Americans were evenly split on whether or not Cheney's=20  
> explanation of=20  
>> why there was a delay in reporting the accident was satisfactory.  
>>  
>> (c)MMVI, CBS Broadcasting Inc. All Rights Reserved.  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>> CBS Slants Bush Poll in Favor of Democrats  
>>  
>> Posted by Greg Sheffield <<http://newsbusters.org/user/21>>=20  
> on February=20  
>> 28, 2006 - 08:57.  
>> In its classic "fair and balanced" tradition, CBS slanted=20  
> in favor of=20  
>> Democrats its poll that found Bush has a 34 percent approval rating=20  
>> and a 59 percent disapproval rating, an all-time high for a=20  
> CBS poll.  
>>  
>> On the bottom of the PDF version  
>> <[http://www.cbsnews.com/htdocs/pdf/poll\\_bush\\_022706.pdf](http://www.cbsnews.com/htdocs/pdf/poll_bush_022706.pdf)> of=20  
> the poll=20  
>> (page 18) it says how many Democrats versus Republicans=20  
> were contacted.  
>>  
>> "Total Republicans" contacted: 272 unweighted and 289 weighted.  
>>  
>> "Total Democrats" contacted: 409 unweighted and 381 weighted.  
>>  
>> "Total Independents" contacted: 337 unweighted and 348 weighted.

>>  
>> Brent Baker <<http://newsbusters.org/node/4206>> also noted how CBS=20  
>> failed to highlight a key portion of its poll on the Feb. 27 "CBS=20  
>> Evening News." 66 percent of respondents thought the media devoted=20  
>> "too much time" to Cheney's hunting accident.  
>>  
>> UPDATE 12:31. The Pew Research Center for the People and the Press=20  
>> <<http://people-press.org/reports/questionnaires/270.pdf>>=20  
> has a helpful=20  
>> table in this report (page 13) on what percentage of Americans=20  
>> consider themselves to be Republican or Democrat. It shows that in=20  
>> both 2004 and 2005, 30% said they were Republican compared=20  
> to 33% who=20  
>> said they were Democrats. The new CBS poll (even after=20  
> being weighted)=20  
>> had a population of only 28% Republicans to 37% Democrats.  
>>  
>> UPDATE 13:21. Aside from their bias, Jason Smith notes how mid-year=20  
>> polls are often unreliable predictors=20  
>>=20  
> <<http://texasrainmaker.blogspot.com/2006/02/if-election-were-held-toda>  
>> y-democrats.html>  
>> for future elections.

>>  
>>  
>>  
>> -----  
>> 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:=20  
>> [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>>=20

>> -----  
>> Conference info: <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:=20  
>> [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>>=20  
>>=20

-----  
Conference info: <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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
-----

Date: Tue, 28 Feb 2006 16:15:48 -0600  
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Subject: Early voting  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)



In-Reply-To:

<3248A9B21DD5574785FE5E2C8E5216844201D5@exchange.local.artsience.com>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Illinois has recently adopted an early voting system. Unlike absentee voting, this is a no excuses system that allows early voting for any reason.

Voting started yesterday - generally at single locations such as village halls, city halls or township halls. Chicago, where over 500,00 voted in the 2004 primary, has 20 locations. Early voting started yesterday and runs through March 16, one week before election day.

Can anyone point me to any material showing what turnout to expect for newly adopted early voting systems with similar features.

Nick

-----  
Conference info: <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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)