

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 LOG0604"

Date: Sat, 1 Apr 2006 06:35:13 -0500
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Subject: Re: Online polls
Comments: To: jwerner@jwdp.com, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <442DB2FD.9060106@jwdp.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Surely Jan Werner knows that even a "rigorous comparison between two identical surveys" demonstrates nothing that can be the basis of a generalization about the validity of a methodology. The comparisons, even if done multiple times, will be favorable until they are unfavorable. Without an underlying set of principles one cannot rely on empiricism as a sound basis for a valid conclusion about the long term.

I also am intrigued by the comparisons made by Jonathan Brill. I would like to know more about these experiments.

And as long as Jan is so fond of Orwell's and analogies, let me offer my own. On-line surveys (using the op-in panels that are the typical source of respondents) is like turning coal into gold, or making a silk purse out of a sow's ear. But enough of this nonsense!
warren mitofsky

At 05:53 PM 3/31/2006, Jan Werner wrote:

>RAND conducted a rigorous comparison between two identical surveys
>administered using traditional and online methodologies, in this
>case, Harris Interactive's propensity scoring. The published results
>are available online at: <http://ssc.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/22/1/128>
>

>With respect to your post, Zogby is a particularly bad example to
>use, as many people have had serious questions about some of his
>results long before he began using online polls.
>

>Unfortunately, the attitude of the Hotline editor is all too typical
>of many in the press, who simply censor all online polls because
>they are too intellectually lazy to evaluate them on an individual
>basis and then explain their reservations to their readership.
>

>This attitude reminds me of Orwell's sheep bleating "Four legs good!
>Two legs bad!"
>

>Jan Werner
>
>_____

>

>Gary Andres wrote:

>>The little blurb below was posted on the National Journal's Hotline
>>today. Is anyone familiar with recent research comparing the
>>validity of online vs. telephone surveys on public policy questions?
>>

>>Beware Of Online Polls

>>There are a bunch of new poll numbers circulating in a bunch of
>>states, thanks to the release of the latest online polls Zogby Int'l
>>conducts for the Wall Street Journal's web site. We don't publish or
>>acknowledge the existence of these numbers in any of our outlets
>>because we are just not comfortable that online panels are reliable
>>indicators.

>>It's a very new technology and we applaud Zogby for trying because
>>some mix of phone calls, door-to-door and online will be used to
>>create reliable polls in the future. Zogby is uniquely situated for
>>the future, in fact, as he regularly conducts door-to-door surveys
>>via his int'l arm, so he's gaining crucial experience when he moves
>>toward using all three technologies for the same survey. (Note: Zogby
>>does do a few calls in each state he polls online, but, frankly, it's
>>not enough calls.)

>>But, to date, his online poll results are not just quirky, in some
>>cases they don't make any sense. BTW, we have the same policy on
>>Rasmussen (who uses automated callers) as well as his numbers
>>sometimes show movement where none should have occurred. Until the
>>track records of these surveys are proven over a long period of time,
>>we'll continue to ignore these poll results when conducting our own
>>analysis.

>>Finally, and here's the clincher for why we look at both Zogby online
>>and Rasmussen with such a jaundiced eye: if either method of polling
>>(online panels or automated callers) were consistently reliable,
>>wouldn't professional campaign pollsters be using it? It's certainly
>>cheaper [CHUCK TODD]

>>----- Conference info,
>>registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
>>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> . Please ask
>>authors before quoting outside AAPORNET. AAPOR e-voting problems?
>>write: aapor-info@goamp.com

>

>-----

>Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <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
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

=====
Date: Sat, 1 Apr 2006 08:29:50 -0500
Reply-To: "Rockwell, Richard" <richard.rockwell@UCONN.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

cGxliHRpbWVzLCB3aWxsIGJlIGZhdm9yYWJsZSB1bnRpbCB0aGV5IGFyZQ0KCXVuZmF2b3JhYmxl
LiBXaXRob3V0IGFuIHVuZGVyYbHlpbmecgc2V0IG9mIHByaW5jaXBsZXMgb25lIGNhbm5vdCBYZWx5
DQoJb24gZW1waXJpY2lzbSBhcyBhIHNVdW5kIGJhc2lZIGZvcjBhIHZhbGlkIGNvbmNsdXNpb24g
YWJvdXQgdGhllGxvbmecgdGVyYbS4NCgkNCglJIGFsc28gYW0gaW50cmIndWVklGJ5IHRoZSBjb21w
YXJpc29ucyBtYWRlIGJ5IEpvcjBhIGF5aWxsLiBJDQoJd291bGQgbGlrZSB0byBrbm93IG1v
cmUgYWJvdXQgdGhlc2UgZXhwZXJpbWVudHMudDQoJDQoJQW5kIGFzIGxvbmecgYXMGSmFuIGlzIHNV
IGZvbmQgb2YgT3J3ZWxsJ3MgYW5kIGFuYWxvZ2llcywgbGV0IG1lIG9mZmVydQoJbXkkgb3duLiBP
bi1saW5lIHNVcnZleXMgKHVzaW5nIHRoZSBvcC1pbiBwYW5lbHMgdGhhdCBhemUgdGhllHR5cGlj
YWwNCglzb3VyY2UgY2YgcmVzcG9uZGVudHMpIGlzIGxpa2UgdHVybmluZyBjb2FsIGludG8gZ29s
ZCwgb3lgbWFraW5nIGENCglzaWxrIHBlcnNlIG91dCBvZiBhIHNVdydzIGVhci4gQnV0IGVub3Vn
aCBvZiB0aGlzIG5vbnNlbnNlIQ0KCXdhcnJlbiBtaXRvZnNreQ0KCQ0KCQ0KQDQo=

Date: Sat, 1 Apr 2006 10:17:32 -0500
Reply-To: lindeman@BARD.EDU
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark Lindeman <lindeman@BARD.EDU>
Subject: Re: Online polls
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <7.0.1.0.2.20060401062253.03a01e88@mindspring.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 8bit

I have to admit that after reading Jan Werner's post and Warren Mitofsky's response, I was surprised by the actual findings of the RAND study that Jan Werner cited. RAND found that the telephone and on-line modes yielded significantly different results ($p < 0.01$) in 26 of 37 questions even after applying a Bonferroni correction. Factual questions more often yielded comparable results than non-factual questions. (There's more -- I won't try to synopsise it all.)

Of all my gripes with media coverage of polling, censoring of online poll results would not make my list. As an aside, a few online polls (Harris Interactive and YouGov) have figured in the arguments that John Kerry won the 2004 popular vote. I will say no more about that; on April 1, perhaps no one would believe me anyway. I bear no animus toward online surveys, but at least so far they don't seem ready for prime time.

Mark Lindeman
Bard College

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapor.net.html> .
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapor.net-request@asu.edu
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Sat, 1 Apr 2006 10:31:01 -0500
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing
Subject: Re: Online polls

Comments: To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <7.0.1.0.2.20060401062253.03a01e88@mindspring.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

One problem with this argument is that it is as valid against random sample surveys with substantive non-response as against online surveys.

All things being equal, a survey based on a random sample of the full target population will be a better estimator than one using statistical manipulation of a panel to emulate that population, but unfortunately, in the real world, all things are not equal.

Over 15 years ago Leslie Kish told an AAPOR audience that the era in which telephone samples could be considered representative random samples of the overall population had already come to an end, yet we find them today being held up as a paragon of exact science.

Or, as our dear friend Arianna Huffington might put it, "Within a 2.95% margin of error, 43.27% of a random sample of people who still have land-line telephones without Caller ID and are usually at home between 5 and 9 P.M. on weekdays told the minimum-wage part-time employees of a call center somewhere in the Mid-West (or India) that...."

Of course, purveyors of online surveys need to be a lot more open about the details of their operations before they deserve more credibility. It simply is not good enough to spout statistical mumbo jumbo and hide behind claims of proprietary technology and trade secrets. But the fact remains that, within our lifetimes, we probably will have no other means available for collecting much opinion data on a timely basis.

In any case, it is long past time for the press (and some members of AAPOR) to continue promulgating the fiction that sampling error is the full measure of survey error. That is the real justification used for not bothering to examine non-traditional surveys on their own merits.

Jan Werner

Warren Mitofsky wrote:

- > Surely Jan Werner knows that even a "rigorous comparison between two
- > identical surveys" demonstrates nothing that can be the basis of a
- > generalization about the validity of a methodology. The comparisons,
- > even if done multiple times, will be favorable until they are
- > unfavorable. Without an underlying set of principles one cannot rely on
- > empiricism as a sound basis for a valid conclusion about the long term.
- >
- > I also am intrigued by the comparisons made by Jonathan Brill. I would
- > like to know more about these experiments.
- >
- > And as long as Jan is so fond of Orwell's and analogies, let me offer my

> own. On-line surveys (using the op-in panels that are the typical source
> of respondents) is like turning coal into gold, or making a silk purse
> out of a sow's ear. But enough of this nonsense!

> warren mitofsky

>
> At 05:53 PM 3/31/2006, Jan Werner wrote:

>> RAND conducted a rigorous comparison between two identical surveys
>> administered using traditional and online methodologies, in this case,
>> Harris Interactive's propensity scoring. The published results are
>> available online at: <http://ssc.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/22/1/128>

>>
>> With respect to your post, Zogby is a particularly bad example to use,
>> as many people have had serious questions about some of his results
>> long before he began using online polls.

>>
>> Unfortunately, the attitude of the Hotline editor is all too typical
>> of many in the press, who simply censor all online polls because they
>> are too intellectually lazy to evaluate them on an individual basis
>> and then explain their reservations to their readership.

>>
>> This attitude reminds me of Orwell's sheep bleating "Four legs good!
>> Two legs bad!"

>>
>> Jan Werner

>> _____
>>
>> Gary Andres wrote:

>>> The little blurb below was posted on the National Journal's Hotline
>>> today. Is anyone familiar with recent research comparing the
>>> validity of online vs. telephone surveys on public policy questions?

>>>
>>> Beware Of Online Polls

>>> There are a bunch of new poll numbers circulating in a bunch of
>>> states, thanks to the release of the latest online polls Zogby Int'l
>>> conducts for the Wall Street Journal's web site. We don't publish or
>>> acknowledge the existence of these numbers in any of our outlets
>>> because we are just not comfortable that online panels are reliable
>>> indicators.

>>> It's a very new technology and we applaud Zogby for trying because
>>> some mix of phone calls, door-to-door and online will be used to
>>> create reliable polls in the future. Zogby is uniquely situated for
>>> the future, in fact, as he regularly conducts door-to-door surveys
>>> via his int'l arm, so he's gaining crucial experience when he moves
>>> toward using all three technologies for the same survey. (Note: Zogby
>>> does do a few calls in each state he polls online, but, frankly, it's
>>> not enough calls.)

>>> But, to date, his online poll results are not just quirky, in some
>>> cases they don't make any sense. BTW, we have the same policy on
>>> Rasmussen (who uses automated callers) as well as his numbers
>>> sometimes show movement where none should have occurred. Until the
>>> track records of these surveys are proven over a long period of time,
>>> we'll continue to ignore these poll results when conducting our own
>>> analysis.

>>> Finally, and here's the clincher for why we look at both Zogby online

>>> and Rasmussen with such a jaundiced eye: if either method of polling
>>> (online panels or automated callers) were consistently reliable,
>>> wouldn't professional campaign pollsters be using it? It's certainly
>>> cheaper [CHUCK TODD]
>>> ----- Conference info,
>>> registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> . Please ask
>>> authors before quoting outside AAPORNET. AAPOR e-voting problems?
>>> write: aapor-info@goamp.com

>>
>> -----
>> Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
>> <http://www.aapor.org/>
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>> AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com
>

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <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
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Sat, 1 Apr 2006 11:33:20 -0500
Reply-To: Mike Donatello <MDonatello@COX.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Donatello <MDonatello@COX.NET>
Subject: Re: Online polls
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <1143904652.442e998ce0a59@webmail.bard.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=windows-1250
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

My unsolicited two cents:

I've both used samples from online panels and worked at an online panel provider. Methodological issues aside, I can honestly say that I would never use an online-panel-based sample unless the vendor's recruitment, weighting and other procedures were completely validated by an independent audit. There's just too much of the "black-box" business practices going on for me to feel comfortable doing otherwise.

--
Mike Donatello
703.582.5680
MDonatello@cox.net

--
No virus found in this outgoing message.
Checked by AVG Free Edition.

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <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
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Sat, 1 Apr 2006 11:34:41 -0500
Reply-To: Amanda Marie Smith <smith.531@WRIGHT.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Amanda Marie Smith <smith.531@WRIGHT.EDU>
Subject: Take off list
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=UTF-8
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Can someone please take me off this list?

Thanks

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <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
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Sat, 1 Apr 2006 12:17:26 -0500
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Subject: Re: Online polls
Comments: To: "Rockwell, Richard" <richard.rockwell@UCONN.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <D5E378A9E781D44482EFB50B5A836CFF67213E@EXCHANGE.B.mgmt.ad.uconn.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

I believe that the examples that Richard Rockwell cites compare alternatives, neither of which has a scientific basis. In such situations an empirical test is the only way to conduct a test. In the comparison of telephone and on-line surveys the question is whether the sampling and estimation procedure using a probability methodology is equivalent to the on-line methodology. We are interested in whether we get similar estimates and biases.

As Richard points out, generalizing from the results is our goal. In order to do that there has to be constants over time in the methods. We could have an empirical test of random sampling and on-line surveys using the same panel and the same subject matter and conclude

the two give comparable results. What we should be uncomfortable with is changing either the panel (or its composition) or the subject matter. What I am suggesting is that for the acceptance of on-line survey results the empirical approach that Jan Werner endorses requires us to generalize when it is not justified.

As for Jan's argument about nonresponse invalidating telephone surveys he should look at some of the data presented in the study presented at the International Telephone Conference by Mike Battaglia of Apt. Telephone methodology has a serious problem of nonresponse, but not nearly the problem Jan alleges and certainly not serious enough to use nonresponse as an argument for conducting on-line surveys instead. That position is still wishful thinking.
warren mitofsky

At 08:29 AM 4/1/2006, Rockwell, Richard wrote:

>I must be missing something, which is often the case when I disagree
>with Warren Mitofsky. However, I had thought for about 40 years
>that we tested methodologies against each other through empirical
>studies. Wasn't that how we came to conclude that telephone surveys
>could produce valid results? The "underlying set of principles"
>underlying those studies was "do we get the same results? and "do
>the results differ between the methods within subgroups of the population?"

>
>To be sure, one can argue with the empirical studies: The test
>involved a limited set of measurements and may not generalize to
>other kinds of measurements, such as studies of sensitive personal
>behaviors or values. The test was of a fairly simple instrument; a
>more complex instrument, such as one involving items of a lengthy
>scale, might yield different results. A highly contingent
>questionnaire structure might not work so well (or might work
>better!). What was shown for this general population might not
>generalize to special populations, such as the barely literate, the
>poor, the elderly, etc. Does this finding apply in other
>cultures? To what extent is the finding dependent upon the
>sophisticated design of both methods (note that many Web surveys are
>pretty klutzy instruments)? Etc. This is basically a call for
>"more research" rather than a rejection of empirical studies as valid.

>
>Sometimes medicine has no underlying set of principles when it
>compares one treatment with another, except "does the patient get
>better?" That is because the mechanism by which many drugs work is
>poorly understood or not understood at all. Yet "raw empiricism"
>has probably saved a lot of lives.

>
>I was pleased to see the RAND study cited and hope that it is one of
>a succession of progressively persuasive studies about Web
>interviews. That is partly because I am convinced that the survey
>industry will increasingly turn to the Web for the host of reasons
>that have been discussed on AAPORNet and at AAPOR meetings. While
>the arguments in favor of Web interviewing are certainly not yet
>overwhelmingly convincing, the arguments that the survey industry
>faces a sea change are. Somebody has to find a way to spin silk
>thread out of a pig's ear, if that is what it takes.

>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: AAPORNET on behalf of Warren Mitofsky
> Sent: Sat 4/1/2006 6:35 AM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Cc:
> Subject: Re: Online polls
>
>
>

> Surely Jan Werner knows that even a "rigorous comparison between two
> identical surveys" demonstrates nothing that can be the basis of a
> generalization about the validity of a methodology. The comparisons,
> even if done multiple times, will be favorable until they are
> unfavorable. Without an underlying set of principles one cannot rely
> on empiricism as a sound basis for a valid conclusion about
> the long term.

> I also am intrigued by the comparisons made by Jonathan Brill. I
> would like to know more about these experiments.

> And as long as Jan is so fond of Orwell's and analogies, let me
offer

> my own. On-line surveys (using the op-in panels that are the typical
> source of respondents) is like turning coal into gold, or making a
> silk purse out of a sow's ear. But enough of this nonsense!
> warren mitofsky
>
>

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <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
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Sat, 1 Apr 2006 12:14:19 -0600
Reply-To: Rob Santos <rsantos@NUSTATS.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Rob Santos <rsantos@NUSTATS.COM>
Subject: Re: Online polls
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To:
<D5E378A9E781D44482EFB50B5A836CFF67213E@EXCHANGEB.mgmt.ad.uconn.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 8bit

Responding to Richard Rockwell (Hi Richard!): Just to be clear, an empirical comparison of two surveys using alternative methodologies (as in the RAND study & similar work others have done) is tantamount to conducting a clinical trial using *one* pair of subjects, with each person in the trial receiving either the treatment or the placebo. I

wouldn't want to make a firm conclusion about generalizing from the outcome such a limited trial... but I suspect others would. And if you decide do generalize form a clinical trial with n=1 pair, there is no way avoiding that such generalization would be fundamentally *subjective*.

So maybe it is time for us to call in the Bayesians for a short course in subjective probability... that train (of Bayesian ilk) is coming down the track, folks, it offers opportunity, and we should probably get ready to adapt our thinking/learning/research-methodologies to that paradigm... (I won't hold my breath waiting, though...)
:-)

Rob Santos
NuStats

Quoting "Rockwell, Richard" <richard.rockwell@UCONN.EDU>:

> I must be missing something, which is often the case when I
> disagree with Warren Mitofsky. However, I had thought for about
> 40 years that we tested methodologies against each other through
> empirical studies. Wasn't that how we came to conclude that
> telephone surveys could produce valid results? The "underlying
> set of principles" underlying those studies was "do we get the
> same results? and "do the results differ between the methods
> within subgroups of the population?"
>
> To be sure, one can argue with the empirical studies: The test
> involved a limited set of measurements and may not generalize to
> other kinds of measurements, such as studies of sensitive
> personal behaviors or values. The test was of a fairly simple
> instrument; a more complex instrument, such as one involving
> items of a lengthy scale, might yield different results. A
> highly contingent questionnaire structure might not work so well
> (or might work better!). What was shown for this general
> population might not generalize to special populations, such as
> the barely literate, the poor, the elderly, etc. Does this
> finding apply in other cultures? To what extent is the finding
> dependent upon the sophisticated design of both methods (note
> that many Web surveys are pretty klutzy instruments)? Etc.
> This is basically a call for "more research" rather than a
> rejection of empirical studies as valid.
>
> Sometimes medicine has no underlying set of principles when it
> compares one treatment with another, except "does the patient get
> better?" That is because the mechanism by which many drugs work
> is poorly understood or not understood at all. Yet "raw
> empiricism" has probably saved a lot of lives.
>
> I was pleased to see the RAND study cited and hope that it is one
> of a succession of progressively persuasive studies about Web
> interviews. That is partly because I am convinced that the
> survey industry will increasingly turn to the Web for the host of
> reasons that have been discussed on AAPORNet and at AAPOR

> meetings. While the arguments in favor of Web interviewing are
> certainly not yet overwhelmingly convincing, the arguments that
> the survey industry faces a sea change are. Somebody has to find
> a way to spin silk thread out of a pig's ear, if that is what it
> takes.

>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: AAPORNET on behalf of Warren Mitofsky
> Sent: Sat 4/1/2006 6:35 AM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Cc:
> Subject: Re: Online polls

>
>
> Surely Jan Werner knows that even a "rigorous comparison between
> two
> identical surveys" demonstrates nothing that can be the basis of
> a
> generalization about the validity of a methodology. The
> comparisons,
> even if done multiple times, will be favorable until they are
> unfavorable. Without an underlying set of principles one cannot
> rely
> on empiricism as a sound basis for a valid conclusion about the
> long term.

>
> I also am intrigued by the comparisons made by Jonathan Brill.
> I
> would like to know more about these experiments.

>
> And as long as Jan is so fond of Orwell's and analogies, let me
> offer
> my own. On-line surveys (using the op-in panels that are the
> typical
> source of respondents) is like turning coal into gold, or making
> a
> silk purse out of a sow's ear. But enough of this nonsense!
> warren mitofsky

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <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
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

=====
Date: Sat, 1 Apr 2006 14:12:22 -0500
Reply-To: Susan Carol Losh <slosh@GARNET.ACNS.FSU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Susan Carol Losh <slosh@GARNET.ACNS.FSU.EDU>

Subject: Re: Online polls
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <1143904652.442e998ce0a59@webmail.bard.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
Content-disposition: inline

I think it's wise to consider online "polls" in a way comparable to mail surveys, "useful in the right place with the right population and the right topic." With, of course, the various caveats of who fills out and how often...

At Florida State I have been involved one way or another for 20 years with United Faculty of Florida's bargaining unit surveys of job satisfaction, bargaining priorities, etc. The bargaining unit is both tenure track and non-tenure track faculty (e.g., librarians, computer specialists, research scientists, psychologists.) In the past we have had a relatively good response from tenure track and an abysmal response from non-tenure track (10%) faculty. The latter has typically been so awful that I try to persuade union leadership not to use it at all. Non-tenure track faculty have some differences and some interests in common with tenure track, but tend to be more isolated (the only computer specialist in their department).

This past Fall, for the first time, we tried out the bargaining unit survey online. Not only was the response from tenure track faculty comparable to our mail (and much more expensive) surveys but the response rate from non-tenure track faculty quadrupled. Obviously we want to increase response further, but for these purposes, I am "converted." Perhaps because they feel a greater sense of privacy, non-tenure track faculty were far more likely to complete an online than a mail survey.

I remember years ago an doctoral candidate did a mail survey of divorced [denomination] ministers about their attitudes toward divorced clergy. She got an 81% response rate. Why? Targeted, highly literate population on a topic of extreme interest to them. (She did textbook on all the other stuff; endorsement letters of survey, stamps, etc.) And I think that's what UFF got with its online surveys: targeted highly literate population on topics of extreme interest (try parking on the FSU campus sometime).

So same cautions as for many mail surveys, but some of the same benefits as well.

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

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

visit the site:

<http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh/Index.htm> Quoting Mark Lindeman
<lindeman@BARD.EDU>:

> I have to admit that after reading Jan Werner's post and Warren Mitofsky's
> response, I was surprised by the actual findings of the RAND study that Jan
> Werner cited. RAND found that the telephone and on-line modes yielded
> significantly different results ($p < 0.01$) in 26 of 37 questions even after
> applying a Bonferroni correction. Factual questions more often yielded
> comparable results than non-factual questions. (There's more -- I
> won't try to
> synopsise it all.)
>
> Of all my gripes with media coverage of polling, censoring of online poll
> results would not make my list. As an aside, a few online polls (Harris
> Interactive and YouGov) have figured in the arguments that John Kerry won
> the
> 2004 popular vote. I will say no more about that; on April 1, perhaps no one
> would believe me anyway. I bear no animus toward online surveys, but
> at least so
> far they don't seem ready for prime time.
>
> Mark Lindeman
> Bard College
>
> -----
> Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
> <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
> AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com
>

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <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
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Sat, 1 Apr 2006 17:19:24 -0500
Reply-To: Sid Groeneman <sid@GROENEMAN.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Sid Groeneman <sid@GROENEMAN.COM>
Subject: Re: Online polls
Comments: To: Susan Carol Losh <slosh@GARNET.ACNS.FSU.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <20060401141222.1g2h0x6ews4occ44@webmail.fsu.edu>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I agree with Susan. Online surveys definitely have a role to play. In discussing this issue, I suggest that we more carefully differentiate between online surveys where the online sample is of unknown or doubtful representativeness (such as polls of the public at large) - which, for good reason, tend to generate the most controversy - and other types. I have used online surveys with good success in studies of a government agency's employees, congregants of a church, and others where everyone in the target population can be reached (or theoretically reached, when sampling) with a high degree of confidence. I'm not saying that online surveys are necessarily illegitimate in various other types of studies - only that obscuring this key distinction has the effect of tarring online data collection with too broad a brush.

Sid Groeneman

Groeneman Research & Consulting, Inc.

Bethesda, Maryland

sid@groeneman.com

301 469-0813

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Susan Carol Losh

Sent: Saturday, April 01, 2006 2:12 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: Online polls

I think it's wise to consider online "polls" in a way comparable to mail surveys, "useful in the right place with the right population and the right topic." With, of course, the various caveats of who fills out and how often...

At Florida State I have been involved one way or another for 20 years with United Faculty of Florida's bargaining unit surveys of job satisfaction, bargaining priorities, etc. The bargaining unit is both tenure track and non-tenure track faculty (e.g., librarians, computer specialists, research scientists, psychologists.) In the past we have had a relatively good response from tenure track and an abysmal response from non-tenure track (10%) faculty. The latter has typically been so awful that I try to persuade union leadership not to use it at all. Non-tenure track faculty have some differences and some interests in common with tenure track, but tend to be more isolated (the only computer specialist in their department).

This past Fall, for the first time, we tried out the bargaining unit survey online. Not only was the response from tenure track faculty comparable to our mail (and much more expensive) surveys but the response rate from non-tenure track faculty quadrupled. Obviously we want to increase response further, but for these purposes, I am "converted." Perhaps because they feel a greater sense of privacy, non-tenure track faculty were far more likely to complete an online than a mail survey.

I remember years ago an doctoral candidate did a mail survey of divorced [denomination] ministers about their attitudes toward divorced clergy. She got an 81% response rate. Why? Targeted, highly literate population on a topic of extreme interest to them. (She did textbook on all the other stuff; endorsement letters of survey, stamps, etc.) And I think that's what UFF got with its online surveys: targeted highly literate population on topics of extreme interest (try parking on the FSU campus sometime).

So same cautions as for many mail surveys, but some of the same benefits as well.

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

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

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <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
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Sun, 2 Apr 2006 12:20:22 -0400
Reply-To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Online polls
Comments: To: Jonathan Brill <brillje@UMDNJ.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

Thanks so much for your opinion. Since you made up your mind at least five years ago, and generalized from a particular sort of inquiry to all web surveys, and based your conclusions on "web survey experiments" embedded into your research studies, I won't bother to refute any of your soapbox message.

The defining trait of the fanatic is the utter refusal to allow anything as piddling as evidence to get in the way of an unshakable belief.

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 Jonathan Brill
Sent: Friday, March 31, 2006 6:28 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Fwd: Online polls

I want to take a moment to get up on my soapbox and offer the opinion that web surveys (which I assume subsumes the category of online polls) are completely and totally worthless and I doubt that there are any exceptions.

I say this based on careful and systematic observations undertaken for the purpose of acquiring generalizable knowledge pertaining to the conduct of web surveys when I was employed from 2000 to 2001 as the Director of Research for an internet division of a \$60 billion corporation with 106 separate commercial websites. I had a fairly sizeable budget to do research on conducting web based survey research; I used my budget to extend our applied research studies by embedding "web survey experiments" into them.

What I found about the reliability of published multi-item scale measures with known psychometric properties astonished me. Over the course of several surveys, I identified scales developed using mail questionnaires, face to face interviewing, or telephone interviewing with excellent reported values for Cronbach alpha (e.g., .9 or so) that were relevant for my studies and used them in web surveys. Consistently and without exception, the Cronbach alphas observed in the web surveys were lower and usually so much lower (e.g., 0.2 to 0.4) that one had to wonder if somehow I had managed to shuffle the data randomly. In fact, only about 10% of the time did I observe these scales to have Cronbach alphas over 0.6. This consistently happened over several studies and the results were somewhat repeatable when the same scale was used in more than one survey. I say somewhat repeatable because a published scale with alpha of 0.9 would come back in one study with observed alpha of 0.2 (for example) and in another study with alpha of 0.5 and in another with alpha of 0.1.

The problem of reliability was not limited to psychometric scale measures of attitudes. We often used sample lists of customers on which we had administrative records of various company demographics. But, when we compared the reported behavior and even the company demo survey results with our records, there was little correspondence. It seemed you could not trust any result, no matter how objective or factual the subject matter of the question.

How could this be? I have my hypotheses. Perhaps people do not pay attention to web surveys when they take them to the same extent they do

with surveys involving traditional media. When on the internet, you multitask. Clickin on radial buttons is kind of like an arcade experience. You don't need to take things too seriously. In contrast, with interviewer administered methods (face to face, telephone), social conditioning has taught us to pay attention to the person we are interacting with; to do otherwise would be rude. And with paper and pencil self administered surveys (e.g. mail), we have been conditioned from years of formal schooling to sit at a desk or table and take our "tests" with care and this extends to survey questionnaires and forms in general.

Furthermore, there is that old sample control bugaboo issue on the web.

Why would anyone ever consider using the web to do science? I surely would not.

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm)
Associate Director, Database & Panel Research
NEW JERSEY INSTITUTE FOR SUCCESSFUL AGING
School of Osteopathic Medicine
University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey
42 East Laurel Road, UDP Suite 2300
Stratford, New Jersey 08084
Telephone (direct): 856.566-6727
Fax (research group): 856.566-6874
E-mail: brillje@umdnj.edu

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email communication may contain private, confidential, or legally privileged information intended for the sole use of the designated and/or duly authorized recipient(s). If you are not the intended recipient or have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by email and permanently delete all copies of this email including all attachments without reading them. If you are the intended recipient, secure the contents in a manner that conforms to all applicable state and/or federal requirements related to privacy and confidentiality of such information.

>>> Gary Andres <Gary.Andres@DUTKOWORLDWIDE.COM> 03/31/06 3:07 PM >>>
The little blurb below was posted on the National Journal's Hotline today. Is anyone familiar with recent research comparing the validity of online vs. telephone surveys on public policy questions?

Beware Of Online Polls

There are a bunch of new poll numbers circulating in a bunch of states, thanks to the release of the latest online polls Zogby Int'l conducts for the Wall Street Journal's web site. We don't publish or acknowledge the existence of these numbers in any of our outlets because we are just not comfortable that online panels are reliable indicators.

It's a very new technology and we applaud Zogby for trying because some mix of phone calls, door-to-door and online will be used to create reliable polls in the future. Zogby is uniquely situated for the future, in fact, as he regularly conducts door-to-door surveys via his int'l arm, so he's gaining crucial experience when he moves toward using all three technologies for the same survey. (Note: Zogby does do a few calls in each state he polls online, but, frankly, it's not enough calls.)

But, to date, his online poll results are not just quirky, in some cases they don't make any sense. BTW, we have the same policy on Rasmussen (who uses automated callers) as well as his numbers sometimes show movement where none should have occurred. Until the track records of these surveys are proven over a long period of time, we'll continue to ignore these poll results when conducting our own analysis.

Finally, and here's the clincher for why we look at both Zogby online and Rasmussen with such a jaundiced eye: if either method of polling (online panels or automated callers) were consistently reliable, wouldn't professional campaign pollsters be using it? It's certainly cheaper [CHUCK TODD]

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:

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

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:

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

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

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

Date: Sun, 2 Apr 2006 16:45:54 -0400

Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>

Subject: Re: Online polls

Comments: To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU> ,

AAPORNET@asu.edu

In-Reply-To: <35FCEB3EFC8BD911B31900805FF5603A1C9D32@ssc.msu.edu>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

This is really uncalled for. It adds nothing to the discussion. If you must send rude messages why don't you do it off-line.

warren mitofsky

At 12:20 PM 4/2/2006, Ehrlich, Nathaniel wrote:

>Thanks so much for your opinion. Since you made up your mind at least five
>years ago, and generalized from a particular sort of inquiry to all web
>surveys, and based your conclusions on "web survey experiments" embedded
>into your research studies, I won't bother to refute any of your soapbox
>message.

>

>The defining trait of the fanatic is the utter refusal to allow anything as
>piddling as evidence to get in the way of an unshakable belief.

>

>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 Jonathan Brill

>Sent: Friday, March 31, 2006 6:28 PM

>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>Subject: Fwd: Online polls

>

>I want to take a moment to get up on my soapbox and offer the opinion
>that web surveys (which I assume subsumes the category of online polls)
>are completely and totally worthless and I doubt that there are any
>exceptions.

>

>I say this based on careful and systematic observations undertaken for
>the purpose of acquiring generalizable knowledge pertaining to the
>conduct of web surveys when I was employed from 2000 to 2001 as the
>Director of Research for an internet division of a \$60 billion
>corporation with 106 separate commercial websites. I had a fairly
>sizeable budget to do research on conducting web based survey research;
>I used my budget to extend our applied research studies by embedding
>"web survey experiments" into them.

>

>What I found about the reliability of published multi-item scale
>measures with known psychometric properties astonished me. Over the
>course of several surveys, I identified scales developed using mail
>questionnaires, face to face interviewing, or telephone interviewing
>with excellent reported values for Cronbach alpha (e.g., .9 or so) that

>were relevant for my studies and used them in web surveys. Consistently
>and without exception, the Cronbach alphas observed in the web surveys
>were lower and usually so much lower (e.g., 0.2 to 0.4) that one had to
>wonder if somehow I had managed to shuffle the data randomly. In fact,
>only about 10% of the time did I observe these scales to have Cronbach
>alphas over 0.6. This consistently happened over several studies and the
>results were somewhat repeatable when the same scale was used in more
>than one survey. I say somewhat repeatable because a published scale
>with alpha of 0.9 would come back in one study with observed alpha of
>0.2 (for example) and in another study with alpha of 0.5 and in another
>with alpha of 0.1.

>
>The problem of reliability was not limited to psychometric scale
>measures of attitudes. We often used sample lists of customers on which
>we had administrative records of various company demographics. But,
>when we compared the reported behavior and even the company demo survey
>results with our records, there was little correspondence. It seemed
>you could not trust any result, no matter how objective or factual the
>subject matter of the question.

>
>How could this be? I have my hypotheses. Perhaps people do not pay
>attention to web surveys when they take them to the same extent they do
>with surveys involving traditional media. When on the internet, you
>multitask. Clickin on radial buttons is kind of like an arcade
>experience. You don't need to take things too seriously. In contrast,
>with interviewer administered methods (face to face, telephone), social
>conditioning has taught us to pay attention to the person we are
>interacting with; to do otherwise would be rude. And with paper and
>pencil self administered surveys (e.g. mail), we have been conditioned
>from years of formal schooling to sit at a desk or table and take our
>"tests" with care and this extends to survey questionnaires and forms in
>general.

>
>Furthermore, there is that old sample control bugaboo issue on the
>web.

>
>Why would anyone ever consider using the web to do science? I surely
>would not.

>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

>Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
>General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm)
>Associate Director, Database & Panel Research
>NEW JERSEY INSTITUTE FOR SUCCESSFUL AGING
>School of Osteopathic Medicine
>University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey
>42 East Laurel Road, UDP Suite 2300
>Stratford, New Jersey 08084
>Telephone (direct): 856.566-6727

>Fax (research group): 856.566-6874

>E-mail: brillje@umdnj.edu

>

>CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email communication may contain private,
>confidential, or legally privileged information intended for the sole
>use of the designated and/or duly authorized recipient(s). If you are
>not the intended recipient or have received this email in error, please
>notify the sender immediately by email and permanently delete all copies
>of this email including all attachments without reading them. If you
>are the intended recipient, secure the contents in a manner that
>conforms to all applicable state and/or federal requirements related to
>privacy and confidentiality of such information.

>

>

> >>> Gary Andres <Gary.Andres@DUTKOWORLDWIDE.COM> 03/31/06 3:07 PM >>>

>The little blurb below was posted on the National Journal's Hotline
>today. Is anyone familiar with recent research comparing the validity
>of online vs. telephone surveys on public policy questions?

>

>

>Beware Of Online Polls

>

>There are a bunch of new poll numbers circulating in a bunch of states,
>thanks to the release of the latest online polls Zogby Int'l conducts
>for the Wall Street Journal's web site. We don't publish or acknowledge
>the existence of these numbers in any of our outlets because we are just
>not comfortable that online panels are reliable indicators.

>

>It's a very new technology and we applaud Zogby for trying because some
>mix of phone calls, door-to-door and online will be used to create
>reliable polls in the future. Zogby is uniquely situated for the future,
>in fact, as he regularly conducts door-to-door surveys via his int'l
>arm, so he's gaining crucial experience when he moves toward using all
>three technologies for the same survey. (Note: Zogby does do a few calls
>in each state he polls online, but, frankly, it's not enough calls.)

>

>But, to date, his online poll results are not just quirky, in some
>cases they don't make any sense. BTW, we have the same policy on
>Rasmussen (who uses automated callers) as well as his numbers sometimes
>show movement where none should have occurred. Until the track records
>of these surveys are proven over a long period of time, we'll continue
>to ignore these poll results when conducting our own analysis.

>

>Finally, and here's the clincher for why we look at both Zogby online
>and Rasmussen with such a jaundiced eye: if either method of polling
>(online panels or automated callers) were consistently reliable,
>wouldn't professional campaign pollsters be using it? It's certainly
>cheaper [CHUCK TODD]

>

>-----

>Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:

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

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

>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

>

>-----

>Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:

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

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

>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

>

>-----

>Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

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

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

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

=====
Date: Sun, 2 Apr 2006 16:53:20 -0400

Reply-To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>

Subject: Re: Online polls

Comments: To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>, AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain

My apologies to the list. I had intended to reply to Dr. Brill only. The posting to the rest of the net was inadvertant.

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

517-353-2639

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

From: Warren Mitofsky [mailto:mitofsky@mindspring.com]

Sent: Sunday, April 02, 2006 4:46 PM

To: Ehrlich, Nathaniel; AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: Online polls

This is really uncalled for. It adds nothing to the discussion. If you must send rude messages why don't you do it off-line.

warren mitofsky

At 12:20 PM 4/2/2006, Ehrlich, Nathaniel wrote:

Thanks so much for your opinion. Since you made up your mind at least five years ago, and generalized from a particular sort of inquiry to all web surveys, and based your conclusions on "web survey experiments" embedded into your research studies, I won't bother to refute any of your soapbox message.

The defining trait of the fanatic is the utter refusal to allow anything as piddling as evidence to get in the way of an unshakable belief.

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> mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jonathan Brill
Sent: Friday, March 31, 2006 6:28 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Fwd: Online polls

I want to take a moment to get up on my soapbox and offer the opinion that web surveys (which I assume subsumes the category of online polls) are completely and totally worthless and I doubt that there are any exceptions.

I say this based on careful and systematic observations undertaken for the purpose of acquiring generalizable knowledge pertaining to the conduct of web surveys when I was employed from 2000 to 2001 as the Director of Research for an internet division of a \$60 billion corporation with 106 separate commercial websites. I had a fairly sizeable budget to do research on conducting web based survey research; I used my budget to extend our applied research studies by embedding "web survey experiments" into them.

What I found about the reliability of published multi-item scale measures with known psychometric properties astonished me. Over the course of several surveys, I identified scales developed using mail questionnaires, face to face interviewing, or telephone interviewing with excellent reported values for Cronbach alpha (e.g., .9 or so) that were relevant for my studies and used them in web surveys. Consistently and without exception, the Cronbach alphas observed in the web surveys were lower and usually so much lower (e.g., 0.2 to 0.4) that one had to wonder if somehow I had managed to shuffle the data randomly. In fact, only about 10% of the time did I observe these scales to have Cronbach

alphas over 0.6. This consistently happened over several studies and the results were somewhat repeatable when the same scale was used in more than one survey. I say somewhat repeatable because a published scale with alpha of 0.9 would come back in one study with observed alpha of 0.2 (for example) and in another study with alpha of 0.5 and in another with alpha of 0.1.

The problem of reliability was not limited to psychometric scale measures of attitudes. We often used sample lists of customers on which we had administrative records of various company demographics. But, when we compared the reported behavior and even the company demo survey results with our records, there was little correspondence. It seemed you could not trust any result, no matter how objective or factual the subject matter of the question.

How could this be? I have my hypotheses. Perhaps people do not pay attention to web surveys when they take them to the same extent they do with surveys involving traditional media. When on the internet, you multitask. Clickin on radial buttons is kind of like an arcade experience. You don't need to take things too seriously. In contrast, with interviewer administered methods (face to face, telephone), social conditioning has taught us to pay attention to the person we are interacting with; to do otherwise would be rude. And with paper and pencil self administered surveys (e.g. mail), we have been conditioned from years of formal schooling to sit at a desk or table and take our "tests" with care and this extends to survey questionnaires and forms in general.

Furthermore, there is that old sample control bugaboo issue on the web.

Why would anyone ever consider using the web to do science? I surely would not.

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm)
Associate Director, Database & Panel Research
NEW JERSEY INSTITUTE FOR SUCCESSFUL AGING
School of Osteopathic Medicine
University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey
42 East Laurel Road, UDP Suite 2300
Stratford, New Jersey 08084
Telephone (direct): 856.566-6727
Fax (research group): 856.566-6874
E-mail: brillje@umdnj.edu

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email communication may contain private, confidential, or legally privileged information intended for the sole

use of the designated and/or duly authorized recipient(s). If you are not the intended recipient or have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by email and permanently delete all copies of this email including all attachments without reading them. If you are the intended recipient, secure the contents in a manner that conforms to all applicable state and/or federal requirements related to privacy and confidentiality of such information.

>>> Gary Andres <Gary.Andres@DUTKOWORLDWIDE.COM> 03/31/06 3:07 PM >>>
The little blurb below was posted on the National Journal's Hotline today. Is anyone familiar with recent research comparing the validity of online vs. telephone surveys on public policy questions?

Beware Of Online Polls

There are a bunch of new poll numbers circulating in a bunch of states, thanks to the release of the latest online polls Zogby Int'l conducts for the Wall Street Journal's web site. We don't publish or acknowledge the existence of these numbers in any of our outlets because we are just not comfortable that online panels are reliable indicators.

It's a very new technology and we applaud Zogby for trying because some mix of phone calls, door-to-door and online will be used to create reliable polls in the future. Zogby is uniquely situated for the future, in fact, as he regularly conducts door-to-door surveys via his int'l arm, so he's gaining crucial experience when he moves toward using all three technologies for the same survey. (Note: Zogby does do a few calls in each state he polls online, but, frankly, it's not enough calls.)

But, to date, his online poll results are not just quirky, in some cases they don't make any sense. BTW, we have the same policy on Rasmussen (who uses automated callers) as well as his numbers sometimes show movement where none should have occurred. Until the track records of these surveys are proven over a long period of time, we'll continue to ignore these poll results when conducting our own analysis.

Finally, and here's the clincher for why we look at both Zogby online and Rasmussen with such a jaundiced eye: if either method of polling (online panels or automated callers) were consistently reliable, wouldn't professional campaign pollsters be using it? It's certainly cheaper [CHUCK TODD]

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:

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

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

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:

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

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

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:

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

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

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

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

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

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

Date: Sun, 2 Apr 2006 17:01:00 -0400

Reply-To: Jonathan Brill <brillje@UMDNJ.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Jonathan Brill <brillje@UMDNJ.EDU>

Subject: Re: Online polls

Comments: To: Nathaniel Ehrlich <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@ssc.msu.edu>

Comments: cc: aapornet@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Dr. Ehrlich:

"The defining trait of the fanatic is the utter refusal to allow anything as piddling as evidence to get in the way of an unshakable belief."

Excellent point. An unlike the fanatic you deride, I collected evidence despite working for a company in which I was expected to use and endorse web surveys. And, though it was an expectation of my job that I promote and advance the technology of web based research, the evidence was so overwhelming and consistent against the validity of the web as a medium for survey research that I could not ignore it.

That behavior is not the hallmark of a fanatic trying to prove anything. Rather, that behavior is truly scientific. Show me evidence to the contrary, and as a scientist, I will consider it in the light of numerous investigations I have done that yielded amazingly strong evidence that I (obviously) found exceedingly convincing. Again, that is called science.

But what I will not do is be cowed by your ad hominem attack (i.e., replying to an argument or assertion by attacking the person presenting the argument or assertion rather than discussing the argument itself). As any competent scientist knows, such attacks are typically a strong sign that the attacker has nothing of logical substance with which to counter. Certainly you are entitled to disagree with me; I just wish you would demonstrate the professionalism and common courtesy to argue the issue with thoughtful evidence or some specific criticism(s) of or questions about my work rather than by hurling insults at me (or anyone else) in public.

Regardless of whether I am right or wrong, personal attacks have no place on AAPORNET. I simply chose to share my experience and my admittedly extraordinarily pointed opinion with members of the listserve. Like any member of the listserve community, you are free to discount whatever is shared. That is cool. What is not cool, however, is to be nasty.

I would urge you to consider your behavior more carefully in future AAPORNET postings.

Regards,

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm)
Associate Director, Database & Panel Research
NEW JERSEY INSTITUTE FOR SUCCESSFUL AGING
School of Osteopathic Medicine
University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey
42 East Laurel Road, UDP Suite 2300
Stratford, New Jersey 08084
Telephone (direct): 856.566-6727
Fax (research group): 856.566-6874
E-mail: brillje@umdnj.edu

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email communication may contain private, confidential, or legally privileged information intended for the sole use of the designated and/or duly authorized recipient(s). If you are not the intended recipient or have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by email and permanently delete all copies of this email including all attachments without reading them. If you are the intended recipient, secure the contents in a manner that conforms to all applicable state and/or federal requirements related to privacy and confidentiality of such information.

>>> "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@ssc.msu.edu> 04/02/06 12:20 PM >>>

Thanks so much for your opinion. Since you made up your mind at least five years ago, and generalized from a particular sort of inquiry to all

web surveys, and based your conclusions on "web survey experiments" embedded into your research studies, I won't bother to refute any of your soapbox message.

The defining trait of the fanatic is the utter refusal to allow anything as piddling as evidence to get in the way of an unshakable belief.

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 Jonathan Brill
Sent: Friday, March 31, 2006 6:28 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Fwd: Online polls

I want to take a moment to get up on my soapbox and offer the opinion that web surveys (which I assume subsumes the category of online polls) are completely and totally worthless and I doubt that there are any exceptions.

I say this based on careful and systematic observations undertaken for the purpose of acquiring generalizable knowledge pertaining to the conduct of web surveys when I was employed from 2000 to 2001 as the Director of Research for an internet division of a \$60 billion corporation with 106 separate commercial websites. I had a fairly sizeable budget to do research on conducting web based survey research; I used my budget to extend our applied research studies by embedding "web survey experiments" into them.

What I found about the reliability of published multi-item scale measures with known psychometric properties astonished me. Over the course of several surveys, I identified scales developed using mail questionnaires, face to face interviewing, or telephone interviewing with excellent reported values for Cronbach alpha (e.g., .9 or so) that were relevant for my studies and used them in web surveys. Consistently and without exception, the Cronbach alphas observed in the web surveys were lower and usually so much lower (e.g., 0.2 to 0.4) that one had to

wonder if somehow I had managed to shuffle the data randomly. In fact, only about 10% of the time did I observe these scales to have Cronbach alphas over 0.6. This consistently happened over several studies and the results were somewhat repeatable when the same scale was used in more than one survey. I say somewhat repeatable because a published scale with alpha of 0.9 would come back in one study with observed alpha of 0.2 (for example) and in another study with alpha of 0.5 and in another with alpha of 0.1.

The problem of reliability was not limited to psychometric scale measures of attitudes. We often used sample lists of customers on which we had administrative records of various company demographics. But, when we compared the reported behavior and even the company demo survey results with our records, there was little correspondence. It seemed you could not trust any result, no matter how objective or factual the subject matter of the question.

How could this be? I have my hypotheses. Perhaps people do not pay attention to web surveys when they take them to the same extent they do with surveys involving traditional media. When on the internet, you multitask. Clickin on radial buttons is kind of like an arcade experience. You don't need to take things too seriously. In contrast, with interviewer administered methods (face to face, telephone), social conditioning has taught us to pay attention to the person we are interacting with; to do otherwise would be rude. And with paper and pencil self administered surveys (e.g. mail), we have been conditioned from years of formal schooling to sit at a desk or table and take our "tests" with care and this extends to survey questionnaires and forms in general.

Furthermore, there is that old sample control bugaboo issue on the web.

Why would anyone ever consider using the web to do science? I surely would not.

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm)
Associate Director, Database & Panel Research

NEW JERSEY INSTITUTE FOR SUCCESSFUL AGING
School of Osteopathic Medicine
University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey
42 East Laurel Road, UDP Suite 2300
Stratford, New Jersey 08084
Telephone (direct): 856.566-6727
Fax (research group): 856.566-6874
E-mail: brillje@umdnj.edu

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email communication may contain private, confidential, or legally privileged information intended for the sole use of the designated and/or duly authorized recipient(s). If you are not the intended recipient or have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by email and permanently delete all copies of this email including all attachments without reading them. If you are the intended recipient, secure the contents in a manner that conforms to all applicable state and/or federal requirements related to privacy and confidentiality of such information.

>>> Gary Andres <Gary.Andres@DUTKOWORLDWIDE.COM> 03/31/06 3:07 PM >>>
The little blurb below was posted on the National Journal's Hotline today. Is anyone familiar with recent research comparing the validity of online vs. telephone surveys on public policy questions?

Beware Of Online Polls

There are a bunch of new poll numbers circulating in a bunch of states, thanks to the release of the latest online polls Zogby Int'l conducts for the Wall Street Journal's web site. We don't publish or acknowledge the existence of these numbers in any of our outlets because we are just not comfortable that online panels are reliable indicators.

It's a very new technology and we applaud Zogby for trying because some mix of phone calls, door-to-door and online will be used to create reliable polls in the future. Zogby is uniquely situated for the future, in fact, as he regularly conducts door-to-door surveys via his int'l arm, so he's gaining crucial experience when he moves toward using all three technologies for the same survey. (Note: Zogby does do a few calls in each state he polls online, but, frankly, it's not enough calls.)

But, to date, his online poll results are not just quirky, in some cases they don't make any sense. BTW, we have the same policy on Rasmussen (who uses automated callers) as well as his numbers

sometimes

show movement where none should have occurred. Until the track records of these surveys are proven over a long period of time, we'll continue to ignore these poll results when conducting our own analysis.

Finally, and here's the clincher for why we look at both Zogby online and Rasmussen with such a jaundiced eye: if either method of polling (online panels or automated callers) were consistently reliable, wouldn't professional campaign pollsters be using it? It's certainly cheaper [CHUCK TODD]

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:

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

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:

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

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

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

Date: Sun, 2 Apr 2006 20:35:55 -0400

Reply-To: Michel Rochon <mrochon@SURVEYSAMPLER.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Michel Rochon <mrochon@SURVEYSAMPLER.COM>

Subject: Re: Online polls

Comments: To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I totally agree with Warren, N Ehrlich's message added nothing to the discussion. Whether Warren reached his conclusions five years ago or ten years ago for that matter, has nothing to do with the topic unless you want to prove that he was ahead of the curve.=20

Michel Rochon

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

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

Sent: April 2, 2006 4:46 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: Online polls

This is really uncalled for. It adds nothing to the discussion. If=20
you must send rude messages why don't you do it off-line.
warren mitofsky

At 12:20 PM 4/2/2006, Ehrlich, Nathaniel wrote:

>Thanks so much for your opinion. Since you made up your mind at least
five

>years ago, and generalized from a particular sort of inquiry to all web
>surveys, and based your conclusions on "web survey experiments"
embedded

>into your research studies, I won't bother to refute any of your
soapbox
>message.

>
>The defining trait of the fanatic is the utter refusal to allow
anything as

>piddling as evidence to get in the way of an unshakable belief.

>
>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 Jonathan Brill

>Sent: Friday, March 31, 2006 6:28 PM

>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>Subject: Fwd: Online polls

>
>I want to take a moment to get up on my soapbox and offer the opinion
>that web surveys (which I assume subsumes the category of online polls)
>are completely and totally worthless and I doubt that there are any
>exceptions.

>
>I say this based on careful and systematic observations undertaken for
>the purpose of acquiring generalizable knowledge pertaining to the
>conduct of web surveys when I was employed from 2000 to 2001 as the
>Director of Research for an internet division of a \$60 billion
>corporation with 106 separate commercial websites. I had a fairly
>sizeable budget to do research on conducting web based survey research;
>I used my budget to extend our applied research studies by embedding
>"web survey experiments" into them.

>
>What I found about the reliability of published multi-item scale
>measures with known psychometric properties astonished me. Over the
>course of several surveys, I identified scales developed using mail
>questionnaires, face to face interviewing, or telephone interviewing

>with excellent reported values for Cronbach alpha (e.g., .9 or so)
that
>were relevant for my studies and used them in web surveys.
Consistently
>and without exception, the Cronbach alphas observed in the web surveys
>were lower and usually so much lower (e.g., 0.2 to 0.4) that one had to
>wonder if somehow I had managed to shuffle the data randomly. In fact,
>only about 10% of the time did I observe these scales to have Cronbach
>alphas over 0.6. This consistently happened over several studies and
the
>results were somewhat repeatable when the same scale was used in more
>than one survey. I say somewhat repeatable because a published scale
>with alpha of 0.9 would come back in one study with observed alpha of
>0.2 (for example) and in another study with alpha of 0.5 and in another
>with alpha of 0.1.
>
>The problem of reliability was not limited to psychometric scale
>measures of attitudes. We often used sample lists of customers on
which
>we had administrative records of various company demographics. But,
>when we compared the reported behavior and even the company demo survey
>results with our records, there was little correspondence. It seemed
>you could not trust any result, no matter how objective or factual the
>subject matter of the question.
>
>How could this be? I have my hypotheses. Perhaps people do not pay
>attention to web surveys when they take them to the same extent they do
>with surveys involving traditional media. When on the internet, you
>multitask. Clickin on radial buttons is kind of like an arcade
>experience. You don't need to take things too seriously. In contrast,
>with interviewer administered methods (face to face, telephone), social
>conditioning has taught us to pay attention to the person we are
>interacting with; to do otherwise would be rude. And with paper and
>pencil self administered surveys (e.g. mail), we have been conditioned
>from years of formal schooling to sit at a desk or table and take our
>"tests" with care and this extends to survey questionnaires and forms
in
>general.
>
>Furthermore, there is that old sample control bugaboo issue on the
>web.
>
>Why would anyone ever consider using the web to do science? I surely
>would not.
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
>General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm)
>Associate Director, Database & Panel Research

>NEW JERSEY INSTITUTE FOR SUCCESSFUL AGING

>School of Osteopathic Medicine

>University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey

>42 East Laurel Road, UDP Suite 2300

>Stratford, New Jersey 08084

>Telephone (direct): 856.566-6727

>Fax (research group): 856.566-6874

>E-mail: brillje@umdnj.edu

>

>CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email communication may contain private,

>confidential, or legally privileged information intended for the sole

>use of the designated and/or duly authorized recipient(s). If you are

>not the intended recipient or have received this email in error, please

>notify the sender immediately by email and permanently delete all

>copies

>of this email including all attachments without reading them. If you

>are the intended recipient, secure the contents in a manner that

>conforms to all applicable state and/or federal requirements related to

>privacy and confidentiality of such information.

>

>

> >>> Gary Andres <Gary.Andres@DUTKOWORLDWIDE.COM> 03/31/06 3:07 PM >>>

>The little blurb below was posted on the National Journal's Hotline

>today. Is anyone familiar with recent research comparing the validity

>of online vs. telephone surveys on public policy questions?

>

>

>Beware Of Online Polls

>

>There are a bunch of new poll numbers circulating in a bunch of states,

>thanks to the release of the latest online polls Zogby Int'l conducts

>for the Wall Street Journal's web site. We don't publish or acknowledge

>the existence of these numbers in any of our outlets because we are

just

>not comfortable that online panels are reliable indicators.

>

>It's a very new technology and we applaud Zogby for trying because some

>mix of phone calls, door-to-door and online will be used to create

>reliable polls in the future. Zogby is uniquely situated for the

future,

>in fact, as he regularly conducts door-to-door surveys via his int'l

>arm, so he's gaining crucial experience when he moves toward using all

>three technologies for the same survey. (Note: Zogby does do a few

calls

>in each state he polls online, but, frankly, it's not enough calls.)

>

>But, to date, his online poll results are not just quirky, in some

>cases they don't make any sense. BTW, we have the same policy on

>Rasmussen (who uses automated callers) as well as his numbers sometimes

>show movement where none should have occurred. Until the track records

>of these surveys are proven over a long period of time, we'll continue

>to ignore these poll results when conducting our own analysis.

>

>Finally, and here's the clincher for why we look at both Zogby online

>and Rasmussen with such a jaundiced eye: if either method of polling
>(online panels or automated callers) were consistently reliable,
>wouldn't professional campaign pollsters be using it? It's certainly
>cheaper [CHUCK TODD]

>-----
>Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
><http://www.aapor.org/>
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

>-----
>Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
><http://www.aapor.org/>
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

>-----
>Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
<http://www.aapor.org/>
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com
>Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
<http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Sun, 2 Apr 2006 19:15:30 -0700
Reply-To: Linda Bourque <lbourque@UCLA.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Linda Bourque <lbourque@UCLA.EDU>
Subject: Re: Online polls
Comments: To: Michel Rochon <mrochon@SURVEYSAMPLER.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <0BA5A3ACC0EAB94E9BA0B59E5DB4B6CA32B284@exchangeasde.ASDE.1ocal>
MIME-version: 1.0

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

I am confused. Do people have some problem with others expressing their opinions and experience? It does appear that they do.

Linda Bourque

At 05:35 PM 4/2/06, Michel Rochon wrote:

>I totally agree with Warren, N Ehrlich's message added nothing to the
>discussion. Whether Warren reached his conclusions five years ago or ten
>years ago for that matter, has nothing to do with the topic unless you
>>want to prove that he was ahead of the curve.

>
>Michel Rochon

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

>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Warren Mitofsky
>Sent: April 2, 2006 4:46 PM
>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>Subject: Re: Online polls

>
>This is really uncalled for. It adds nothing to the discussion. If
>you must send rude messages why don't you do it off-line.
>warren mitofsky

>
>At 12:20 PM 4/2/2006, Ehrlich, Nathaniel wrote:

>>Thanks so much for your opinion. Since you made up your mind at least
>>five
>>years ago, and generalized from a particular sort of inquiry to all web
>>surveys, and based your conclusions on "web survey experiments"
>>embedded
>>into your research studies, I won't bother to refute any of your
>>soapbox
>>message.

>>
>>The defining trait of the fanatic is the utter refusal to allow
>>anything as
>>piddling as evidence to get in the way of an unshakable belief.

>>
>>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 Jonathan Brill
>>Sent: Friday, March 31, 2006 6:28 PM
>>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>>Subject: Fwd: Online polls

>>

>>I want to take a moment to get up on my soapbox and offer the opinion
>>that web surveys (which I assume subsumes the category of online polls)
>>are completely and totally worthless and I doubt that there are any
>>exceptions.

>>
>>I say this based on careful and systematic observations undertaken for
>>the purpose of acquiring generalizable knowledge pertaining to the
>>conduct of web surveys when I was employed from 2000 to 2001 as the
>>Director of Research for an internet division of a \$60 billion
>>corporation with 106 separate commercial websites. I had a fairly
>>sizeable budget to do research on conducting web based survey research;
>>I used my budget to extend our applied research studies by embedding
>>"web survey experiments" into them.

>>
>>What I found about the reliability of published multi-item scale
>>measures with known psychometric properties astonished me. Over the
>>course of several surveys, I identified scales developed using mail
>>questionnaires, face to face interviewing, or telephone interviewing
>>with excellent reported values for Cronbach alpha (e.g., .9 or so)
>>that
>>were relevant for my studies and used them in web surveys.

>>Consistently
>>and without exception, the Cronbach alphas observed in the web surveys
>>were lower and usually so much lower (e.g., 0.2 to 0.4) that one had to
>>wonder if somehow I had managed to shuffle the data randomly. In fact,
>>only about 10% of the time did I observe these scales to have Cronbach
>>alphas over 0.6. This consistently happened over several studies and
>>the
>>results were somewhat repeatable when the same scale was used in more
>>than one survey. I say somewhat repeatable because a published scale
>>with alpha of 0.9 would come back in one study with observed alpha of
>>0.2 (for example) and in another study with alpha of 0.5 and in another
>>with alpha of 0.1.

>>
>>The problem of reliability was not limited to psychometric scale
>>measures of attitudes. We often used sample lists of customers on
>>which
>>we had administrative records of various company demographics. But,
>>when we compared the reported behavior and even the company demo survey
>>results with our records, there was little correspondence. It seemed
>>you could not trust any result, no matter how objective or factual the
>>subject matter of the question.

>>
>>How could this be? I have my hypotheses. Perhaps people do not pay
>>attention to web surveys when they take them to the same extent they do
>>with surveys involving traditional media. When on the internet, you
>>multitask. Clickin on radial buttons is kind of like an arcade
>>experience. You don't need to take things too seriously. In contrast,
>>with interviewer administered methods (face to face, telephone), social
>>conditioning has taught us to pay attention to the person we are
>>interacting with; to do otherwise would be rude. And with paper and
>>pencil self administered surveys (e.g. mail), we have been conditioned
>>from years of formal schooling to sit at a desk or table and take our
>>"tests" with care and this extends to survey questionnaires and forms

>in
>>general.
>>
>>Furthermore, there is that old sample control bugaboo issue on the
>>web.
>>
>>Why would anyone ever consider using the web to do science? I surely
>>would not.
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
>>General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm)
>>Associate Director, Database & Panel Research
>>NEW JERSEY INSTITUTE FOR SUCCESSFUL AGING
>>School of Osteopathic Medicine
>>University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey
>>42 East Laurel Road, UDP Suite 2300
>>Stratford, New Jersey 08084
>>Telephone (direct): 856.566-6727
>>Fax (research group): 856.566-6874
>>E-mail: brillje@umdnj.edu
>>
>>CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email communication may contain private,
>>confidential, or legally privileged information intended for the sole
>>use of the designated and/or duly authorized recipient(s). If you are
>>not the intended recipient or have received this email in error, please
>>notify the sender immediately by email and permanently delete all
>copies
>>of this email including all attachments without reading them. If you
>>are the intended recipient, secure the contents in a manner that
>>conforms to all applicable state and/or federal requirements related to
>>privacy and confidentiality of such information.
>>
>>
>>>> Gary Andres <Gary.Andres@DUTKOWORLDWIDE.COM> 03/31/06 3:07 PM >>>
>>The little blurb below was posted on the National Journal's Hotline
>>today. Is anyone familiar with recent research comparing the validity
>>of online vs. telephone surveys on public policy questions?
>>
>>
>>Beware Of Online Polls
>>
>>There are a bunch of new poll numbers circulating in a bunch of states,
>>thanks to the release of the latest online polls Zogby Int'l conducts
>>for the Wall Street Journal's web site. We don't publish or acknowledge
>>the existence of these numbers in any of our outlets because we are
>just
>>not comfortable that online panels are reliable indicators.
>>

>>It's a very new technology and we applaud Zogby for trying because some
>>mix of phone calls, door-to-door and online will be used to create
>>reliable polls in the future. Zogby is uniquely situated for the
>future,
>>in fact, as he regularly conducts door-to-door surveys via his int'l
>>arm, so he's gaining crucial experience when he moves toward using all
>>three technologies for the same survey. (Note: Zogby does do a few
>calls
>>in each state he polls online, but, frankly, it's not enough calls.)
>>
>>But, to date, his online poll results are not just quirky, in some
>>cases they don't make any sense. BTW, we have the same policy on
>>Rasmussen (who uses automated callers) as well as his numbers sometimes
>>show movement where none should have occurred. Until the track records
>>of these surveys are proven over a long period of time, we'll continue
>>to ignore these poll results when conducting our own analysis.
>>
>>Finally, and here's the clincher for why we look at both Zogby online
>>and Rasmussen with such a jaundiced eye: if either method of polling
>>(online panels or automated callers) were consistently reliable,
>>wouldn't professional campaign pollsters be using it? It's certainly
>>cheaper [CHUCK TODD]

>>-----
>>Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
>><http://www.aapor.org/>
>>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>>AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

>>-----
>>Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
>><http://www.aapor.org/>
>>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>>AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

>>-----
>>Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
>><http://www.aapor.org/>
>>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>>AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com
>>Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
>>aapornet-request@asu.edu

>>-----
>>Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
>><http://www.aapor.org/>
>>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>>AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com
>>Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:

>aapornet-request@asu.edu

>

>-----

>Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

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

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

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

=====

Date: Mon, 3 Apr 2006 00:43:37 -0400

Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>

Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing

Subject: Re: Online polls

Comments: To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>

Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu

In-Reply-To: <7.0.1.0.2.20060401114043.03ed49c0@mindspring.com>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

This misses the point completely. I did not "allege" that telephone research is invalidated by the problem of nonresponse.

What I did say was that the empirical comparison methodologies used to support the validity of online surveys are exactly the same as are used to justify safely ignoring high nonresponse rates in telephone surveys.

The fact is that in neither case (online surveys or telephone surveys with high nonresponse) can we derive mathematically the probability of the estimate being accurate, so we must rely on empirical evidence, which, as you correctly pointed out earlier in this thread, can never fully prove the correctness of the findings. This is Hume's "problem of induction," popularized by Popper as the "black swan" problem.

Furthermore, I have never said that telephone nonresponse justifies using online surveys instead. We don't really know enough about online surveys yet to be able to trust them for many purposes. But I am more likely to trust thoughtfully designed and carefully implemented online surveys than sloppy probability surveys, and the more we work with them, the more we will learn about just when and how we can rely on online (and other non-traditional) surveys.

What I do find inexcusable is the attitude that only surveys that claim (however tenuously) to use a probability sample can be reported on. The only reason for this is that it is easier to pretend that the sampling

error is the only survey error and that therefore any survey that is not based on a probability sample is "junk." That is simply not true.

Jan Werner

Warren Mitofsky wrote:

>
> As for Jan's argument about nonresponse invalidating telephone surveys
> he should look at some of the data presented in the study presented at
> the International Telephone Conference by Mike Battaglia of Apt.
> Telephone methodology has a serious problem of nonresponse, but not
> nearly the problem Jan alleges and certainly not serious enough to use
> nonresponse as an argument for conducting on-line surveys instead. That
> position is still wishful thinking.
> warren mitofsky
>

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 3 Apr 2006 08:39:58 -0400
Reply-To: jeffrey.l.dalzell@CENSUS.GOV
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jeffrey Dalzell <jeffrey.l.dalzell@CENSUS.GOV>
Subject: Remove from List
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Can you please remove me from the aapornet list.

Thank you

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
<http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Mon, 3 Apr 2006 09:37:34 -0400
Reply-To: pd@kerr-downs.com

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Phillip Downs <pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM>
Subject: online surveys
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

We have had some success in predicting local election results with an online panel of 3,000+ residents in Leon County Florida. The pro bono panel was developed to ensure that local leaders would heed public opinion (since local governments here spend no money on assessing public opinion). While the panel shows some promise, we have received criticism from media and academic circles because the sample is not a probability sample. I agree with those who say our industry must come up with alternatives to relying solely on RDD telephone surveys. We have telephone and internet data for several client studies, but have not yet run any statistical analyses to compare the two methodologies. We'll share results with the community as we get them.

Phillip

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, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

=====

Date: Mon, 3 Apr 2006 09:28:43 -0400
Reply-To: Reg_Baker@MARKETSTRATEGIES.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Reginald Baker <Reg_Baker@MARKETSTRATEGIES.COM>
Subject: Re: Online polls
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <s4300373.056@smtppnc.umdnc.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Moving beyond the unfortunate ad hominem attack it seems to be me that this discussion is mixing at least three things into the same pot when it might be better to evaluate each of them individually if we are to understand the value and role of Web surveys and shed light on why Web surveys may produce different results than other methodologies.

The first is probability sampling, or the absence thereof in the case of Web surveys using online panels (and recognizing Knowledge Networks as the

exception). As Warren has been pointing out for at least five years, this is terribly problematic and may or may not be solved by weighting schemes such as the propensity scoring methods used by Harris Interactive. That's a good debate to have. Nonetheless, there are lots of Web surveys that use what we all would agree to be "good samples" and differences observed, especially in mixed-mode, are attributable to differences beyond sampling.

The second is the mode effects issue, whether couched in terms of aural vs. visual or interviewer vs. self administration. It is not clear, for example, whether the differences reported in the Rand study are due to non-probability sampling and the failure of propensity scoring or to differences in mode (e.g., social desirability due to the survey's health focus or the visual presentation of certain types of scales).

The third is the tentative state of our current knowledge about the best ways to present questions via the Web. The literature there is emerging quickly but is nowhere near the consensus that has developed around other modes.

As someone has said somewhere in this thread, Web surveys are here to stay. But it is clear that we don't know how to do them as well as we should. Good news for the methodologists.

Reg Baker
Market Strategies

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Mon, 3 Apr 2006 09:55:34 -0400
Reply-To: Nancy Belden <nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nancy Belden <nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM>
Subject: Getting the word out on reporting of unscientific polls
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

AAPOR members: As you may be aware, the AAPOR council members have been seeking ways to become more vocal about good and bad research. Given the way news travels these days - via blogging, emailing, web casting, etc. - we can't sit still if we want to have a voice. I thought you all might be interested to see how President Cliff Zukin responded to a non-probability sample survey that got a lot of news use and was being presented by the American Medical Association and in the press as if it were a probability sample. You can go on mysterypollster.com - scroll down to the Spring Break story (or read the good stuff on focus groups before you get there!) and see how Cliff succeeded on several fronts with the AMA and the media.

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, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Mon, 3 Apr 2006 09:51:22 -0400
Reply-To: Anna Greenberg <agreenberg@GQRR.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Anna Greenberg <agreenberg@GQRR.COM>
Subject: Re: Online polls
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I have to agree with Jan on this debate. We cannot ignore the proliferation of web survey research and the fact that in many cases, they are viable alternatives to RDD samples. For example, RDD samples grossly under-represent people under 30 years of age (never home, mobile, cell phones, group housing) and the kind of young people who answer phone surveys are different from those who do not (less likely to be college educated, less likely to be minorities). Web surveys, conducted in parallel with phone surveys, can help us understand young people better than RDD samples alone. There are other examples of hard to reach populations where web surveys are the only affordable option or the phone alternatives such as listed samples have as many problems as web surveys in terms of representativeness (despite the fact that they still might be probability samples). Moreover, the collection of qualitative data, I would argue, in many cases can be superior to focus groups. Dismissing web survey research because it does not use probability sampling misses the creative and varied uses of web based research that is being conducted right now in the private sector and in academia. =20

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Jan Werner
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2006 12:44 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Online polls

This misses the point completely. I did not "allege" that telephone=20 research is invalidated by the problem of nonresponse.

What I did say was that the empirical comparison methodologies used to=20

support the validity of online surveys are exactly the same as are used to justify safely ignoring high nonresponse rates in telephone surveys.

The fact is that in neither case (online surveys or telephone surveys with high nonresponse) can we derive mathematically the probability of the estimate being accurate, so we must rely on empirical evidence, which, as you correctly pointed out earlier in this thread, can never fully prove the correctness of the findings. This is Hume's "problem of induction," popularized by Popper as the "black swan" problem.

Furthermore, I have never said that telephone nonresponse justifies using online surveys instead. We don't really know enough about online surveys yet to be able to trust them for many purposes. But I am more likely to trust thoughtfully designed and carefully implemented online surveys than sloppy probability surveys, and the more we work with them,

the more we will learn about just when and how we can rely on online (and other non-traditional) surveys.

What I do find inexcusable is the attitude that only surveys that claim (however tenuously) to use a probability sample can be reported on. The only reason for this is that it is easier to pretend that the sampling error is the only survey error and that therefore any survey that is not

based on a probability sample is "junk." That is simply not true.

Jan Werner

Warren Mitofsky wrote:

- > As for Jan's argument about nonresponse invalidating telephone surveys
 - > he should look at some of the data presented in the study presented at
 - > the International Telephone Conference by Mike Battaglia of Apt. Telephone methodology has a serious problem of nonresponse, but not nearly the problem Jan alleges and certainly not serious enough to use
 - > nonresponse as an argument for conducting on-line surveys instead.
- That position is still wishful thinking.
- > warren mitofsky

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:

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

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:

aapornet-request@asu.edu

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com
=====

Date: Mon, 3 Apr 2006 11:33:51 -0400
Reply-To: "Steve, Kenneth" <Kenneth.Steve@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Steve, Kenneth" <Kenneth.Steve@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>
Subject: AAPOR Conference Golf Outing
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

To all attending the conference in Montreal... =20

For various reasons, there are a number of regular golfers who are unable to participate this year. As such there are still many spaces available. I would like to take this opportunity to encourage anyone who might be interested to come on out and join us for what will surely be a wonderful morning.

=20

The golf outing will be on the Thursday morning (May 18th) of the conference at Le Challenger Golf Course, a track that rates 70.0 / 121 for men (Blue tees, 6518 yards) and 69.5 / 117 for women (Red Tees, 5218 yards). It's about 15 minutes from the hotel. You can check it out at: <http://www.golflechallenger.com/> <<http://www.golflechallenger.com/>> . =20

=20

The game of golf was originally played in the country, through long grass and beautiful fescue. Bois-Franc wanted to recreate this atmosphere and so decided to build Le Challenger as a links type golf course, in the heart of the city, with a breathtaking view of the Mont Royal. Le Challenger is a public golf course. Those who play on this magnificent course will be treated like VIP's. The condition of the course will delight the novice as well as the experienced golfers.

=20

The greens fee is \$75 plus tax (includes cart). Both fees included unlimited range balls before the round. The course has rental clubs available for rent (\$40). The first tee time is 7:00 a.m., as early as possible, so anyone that needs to be back at the conference at lunch time can get their round in. =20

=20

Entry forms can be found on the conference registration site, or I can send one to you upon request. If you would like to play, please fax a copy of the completed form to me at (813)366-0022. =20

=20

My apologies for multiple postings. =20

Thanks, and best wishes ... =20

Kenneth Steve
AAPOR Social Activities Coordinator

=20

Research Methodologist
Nielsen Media Research
501 Brooker Creek Blvd.=20
Oldsmar, FL 34677
Phone: (813) 366-4378

=20

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Mon, 3 Apr 2006 12:20:17 -0400
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Subject: Re: Online polls
Comments: To: jwerner@jwdp.com
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <4430A7F9.2030103@jwdp.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Let's clarify a few notions. All probability samples are not well done and neither are all online surveys useless. My remarks were limited to online surveys of the general population or voting population conducted with opt-in panels. My remarks had nothing to do with mode effects, or samples of well-defined online populations (lists of ALL members of a class), substitutes for focus groups, or any of the other considerations commented upon in this discussion.

No one needs to pretend that sampling error is the only error. The only time I hear that is from people arguing for alternatives to probability sampling. Any one familiar with probability sampling tries to look at components of the total error in addition to sampling error. So let's stop offering this as a red herring in the discussion.

The argument is not about sampling error. It is about bias in the selection of the respondents. There is no argument that a web panel is a biased source of respondents. It is.

There are two questions to guide this discussion. First, can we get rid of that bias by magical weighting algorithms? And second, are probability samples sufficiently biased because of nonresponse to produce something less useful than we get from web surveys?

My answers: I have not seen any evidence that the weighting algorithms are of much value. Nor is there any scientific basis for the claims of these weighting algorithms.

Next, there are a number of good studies showing the effects of nonresponse on probability based surveys. The Pew Center has done two and Mike Battaglia at Apt has a rather interesting study. Some experiments were cited on aapornet by Jonathan Brill. The bottom line on these studies is that telephone surveys, nonresponse problems and all, remain the most reliable and cost efficient way to do surveys.

If Anna Greenberg wants to survey rare populations that would be cost prohibitive for a probability survey more power to her. We can have a debate some other time about whether some information, no matter how biased the source, is better than no information. Her point is not the basis of my remarks.

I think this is a good discussion for aapornet. Let's see if we can make more progress.

warren mitofsky

At 12:43 AM 4/3/2006, Jan Werner wrote:

>What I do find inexcusable is the attitude that only surveys that
>claim (however tenuously) to use a probability sample can be
>reported on. The only reason for this is that it is easier to
>pretend that the sampling error is the only survey error and that
>therefore any survey that is not based on a probability sample is
>"junk." That is simply not true.

>

>Jan Werner

>_____

>

>Warren Mitofsky wrote:

>>As for Jan's argument about nonresponse invalidating telephone
>>surveys he should look at some of the data presented in the study
>>presented at the International Telephone Conference by Mike
>>Battaglia of Apt. Telephone methodology has a serious problem of
>>nonresponse, but not nearly the problem Jan alleges and certainly
>>not serious enough to use nonresponse as an argument for conducting
>>on-line surveys instead. That position is still wishful thinking.

>>warren mitofsky

>

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

212 980-3031
212 980-3107 Fax

www.mitofskyinternational.com
mitofsky@mindspring.com

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Mon, 3 Apr 2006 11:24:23 -0500
Reply-To: Rob Santos <rsantos@NUSTATS.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Rob Santos <rsantos@NUSTATS.COM>
Subject: Re: Online polls
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
In-Reply-To: <A596446760EC454295A8ADEC2961A62A35682E@EVS1.GQRR.local>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I do not think anyone was stating that nonprobability samples (and qualitative data) have no value. I thought the issue was making valid statistical estimates of the population.

There is no question (from statistical theory) that probability samples require fewer blind faith assumptions than nonprobability samples when making statistical inference to the total population.

There are certainly many insightful, non-statistical inferences that can and should be made from non-prob samples. But if you want to make point estimates of a population then probability sampling is the way to go. Stat theory shows the error properties of statistics generated from prob. samples. There is no similar theory to support non-probability samples. Instead you need to assume some 'model' underlying the empirical data. Then if your model holds, you can generalize with impunity. But -- unlike probability sampling -- you never know if or when your model is valid.

Truth be told, even prob sample surveys rely on models to adjust for nonresponse and noncoverage, although to the extent that response rates and coverage is high, the reliance on the nonresp/coverag model becomes moot. Methodologists have even worked on models to adjust for measurement error (e.g, latent variable analysis). Naturally, I would rather embrace a prob sample and limit my reliance of models to nonresponse/noncoverage, than rely on a model for ALL my inferences.

Finally, I want to acknowledge that *both* probability and nonprob sample surveys are subject to measurement error. And when sample sizes are large, then it can very well be misleading to ignore measurement error. On that I totally agree...

Rob Santos
NuStats

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Anna Greenberg
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2006 8:51 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Online polls

I have to agree with Jan on this debate. We cannot ignore the

proliferation of web survey research and the fact that in many cases, they are viable alternatives to RDD samples. For example, RDD samples grossly under-represent people under 30 years of age (never home, mobile, cell phones, group housing) and the kind of young people who answer phone surveys are different from those who do not (less likely to be college educated, less likely to be minorities). Web surveys, conducted in parallel with phone surveys, can help us understand young people better than RDD samples alone. There are other examples of hard to reach populations where web surveys are the only affordable option or the phone alternatives such as listed samples have as many problems as web surveys in terms of representativeness (despite the fact that they still might be probability samples). Moreover, the collection of qualitative data, I would argue, in many cases can be superior to focus groups. Dismissing web survey research because it does not use probability sampling misses the creative and varied uses of web based research that is being conducted right now in the private sector and in academia.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jan Werner
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2006 12:44 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Online polls

This misses the point completely. I did not "allege" that telephone research is invalidated by the problem of nonresponse.

What I did say was that the empirical comparison methodologies used to support the validity of online surveys are exactly the same as are used to justify safely ignoring high nonresponse rates in telephone surveys.

The fact is that in neither case (online surveys or telephone surveys with high nonresponse) can we derive mathematically the probability of the estimate being accurate, so we must rely on empirical evidence, which, as you correctly pointed out earlier in this thread, can never fully prove the correctness of the findings. This is Hume's "problem of induction," popularized by Popper as the "black swan" problem.

Furthermore, I have never said that telephone nonresponse justifies using online surveys instead. We don't really know enough about online surveys yet to be able to trust them for many purposes. But I am more likely to trust thoughtfully designed and carefully implemented online surveys than sloppy probability surveys, and the more we work with them,

the more we will learn about just when and how we can rely on online (and other non-traditional) surveys.

What I do find inexcusable is the attitude that only surveys that claim (however tenuously) to use a probability sample can be reported on. The only reason for this is that it is easier to pretend that the sampling error is the only survey error and that therefore any survey that is not

based on a probability sample is "junk." That is simply not true.

Jan Werner

Warren Mitofsky wrote:

- >
 - > As for Jan's argument about nonresponse invalidating telephone surveys

 - > he should look at some of the data presented in the study presented at

 - > the International Telephone Conference by Mike Battaglia of Apt.
 - > Telephone methodology has a serious problem of nonresponse, but not
 - > nearly the problem Jan alleges and certainly not serious enough to use

 - > nonresponse as an argument for conducting on-line surveys instead.
- That
- > position is still wishful thinking.
 - > warren mitofsky
 - >

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:

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

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:

aapornet-request@asu.edu

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:

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

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Mon, 3 Apr 2006 17:24:57 +0100

Reply-To: "Moon, Nick" <nick.moon@GFK.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Moon, Nick" <nick.moon@GFK.COM>

Subject: Ballot paper design

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Is anyone out there aware of any research on the physical design of election ballot papers?

Nick Moon

Director

GfK NOP Social Research
245 Blackfriars Road, London SE1 9UL
tel 020 7890 9830 fax 020 7890 9589
<http://www.gfknop.co.uk/>

Please update your records with my new email
address shown at the top of this message.

Any views or opinions are solely those of the
author and do not necessarily represent those of
GfK NOP or any of its associated companies.

The information transmitted is intended only for
the person or entity to which it is addressed
and may contain confidential and/or privileged
material. If you are not the intended recipient of
this message, please do not read, copy, use or
disclose this communication and notify the
sender immediately. It should be noted that
any review, retransmission, dissemination or
other use of, or taking action in reliance
upon, this information by persons or entities
other than the intended recipient is prohibited.

Recipients are warned that GfK NOP cannot guarantee
that attachments or enclosures are secure or error-free
as information could be intercepted, corrupted,
or contain viruses

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Mon, 3 Apr 2006 09:47:51 -0700
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>
Subject: Re: Online polls
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
In-Reply-To: <OF8DF38439.69D7653B-ON85257145.004861B4-85257145.004A0B88@marketstrategies.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

I'd like to add a fourth issue to Reginald Baker's list about why web surveys deliver different results and tend to get a lot of criticism.

It's my experience that a lot of people who write questionnaires for web surveys are not trained. Self-serve web-based technology is so easy to use that basically anyone can field a web survey. With telephone surveys, a company that purchased CATI software, bought equipment, trained interviewers, etc. etc., is also more likely to invest in someone with proper survey training. At a minimum, my sense is that training should include a research design course, a survey research course, and at least one multivariate statistics course (or equivalents). An MBA in and of itself is insufficient. A disproportionate number of web research projects are poorly designed, which contributes to the bad rap.

leora

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

On Mon, 3 Apr 2006, Reginald Baker wrote:

- > ... it seems to be me that this
- > discussion is mixing at least three things into the same pot when it might
- > be better to evaluate each of them individually if we are to understand the
- > value and role of Web surveys and shed light on why Web surveys may
- > produce different results than other methodologies.
- >
- > The first is probability sampling, or the absence thereof in the case of
- > Web surveys using online panels (and recognizing Knowledge Networks as the
- > exception). As Warren has been pointing out for at least five years, this
- > is terribly problematic and may or may not be solved by weighting schemes
- > such as the propensity scoring methods used by Harris Interactive. That's
- > a good debate to have. Nonetheless, there are lots of Web surveys that use
- > what we all would agree to be "good samples" and differences observed,
- > especially in mixed-mode, are attributable to differences beyond sampling.
- >
- > The second is the mode effects issue, whether couched in terms of aural vs.
- > visual or interviewer vs. self administration. It is not clear, for
- > example, whether the differences reported in the Rand study are due to
- > non-probability sampling and the failure of propensity scoring or to
- > differences in mode (e.g., social desirability due to the survey's health
- > focus or the visual presentation of certain types of scales).
- >
- > The third is the tentative state of our current knowledge about the best
- > ways to present questions via the Web. The literature there is emerging
- > quickly but is nowhere near the consensus that has developed around other
- > modes.
- >
- > As someone has said somewhere in this thread, Web surveys are here to stay.
- > But it is clear that we don't know how to do them as well as we should.

> Good news for the methodologists.
>
> Reg Baker
> Market Strategies
>
> -----
> Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
http://www.aapor.org/
> Archives: http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html .
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
> AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com
>

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: http://www.aapor.org/
Archives: http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com
=====

Date: Mon, 3 Apr 2006 14:43:25 -0400
Reply-To: Claire Durand <Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Claire Durand <Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA>
Subject: Re: Online polls
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <20060403093649.X25565@synergy.transbay.net>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

It seems to me that the only question is "What is the population". If we=20
take a sample of car owners, we may generalize to car owners. If we manage=
=20
to get a good probability sample of internet users -- which does not seem=20
to be easy to do -- , we may generalize to internet users. In either=20
case, I do not see how we can generalize from these samples to the whole=20
population in the same way as it was not possible to use telephone surveys=
=20
when a substantial part of the population didn't have a phone...

Weighting in such a situation may do more harm than good. If older people=
=20
who are internet users do not have the same opinion as other older people=20
and you boost them, you worsen the situation.

Best,

Claire Durand

Link for AAPOR Montreal Conference:

=

<<https://www.webdepot.umontreal.ca/Usagers/durandc/MonDepotPublic>><https://www.webdepot.umontreal.ca/Usagers/durandc/MonDepotPublic>=20

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, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

=====
Date: Mon, 3 Apr 2006 15:04:42 -0400
Reply-To: Michel Rochon <mrochon@SURVEYSAMPLER.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Michel Rochon <mrochon@SURVEYSAMPLER.COM>
Subject: Re: Online polls
Comments: To: Linda Bourque <lbouque@ucla.edu>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Mrs Bourque is completely right of course, I made the wrong assumption, from Warren's message and quote, without taking the trouble to read the whole thread. This was laziness on my part. I apologize if it led to confusion. Thanks to the people who noted my error and let me know, privately or publicly. The factual issue needed to be corrected.

Michel Rochon

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

From: Linda Bourque [<mailto:lbouque@ucla.edu>]=20
Sent: April 2, 2006 10:16 PM
To: Michel Rochon; AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Online polls

I am confused. Do people have some problem with others expressing their opinions and experience? It does appear that they do.
Linda Bourque

At 05:35 PM 4/2/06, Michel Rochon wrote:

>I totally agree with Warren, N Ehrlich's message added nothing to the
>discussion. Whether Warren reached his conclusions five years ago or
ten
>years ago for that matter, has nothing to do with the topic unless you
>>want to prove that he was ahead of the curve.
>

>Michel Rochon

>

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

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

>>Sent: April 2, 2006 4:46 PM

>>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>>Subject: Re: Online polls

>

>>This is really uncalled for. It adds nothing to the discussion. If

>>you must send rude messages why don't you do it off-line.

>>warren mitofsky

>

>>At 12:20 PM 4/2/2006, Ehrlich, Nathaniel wrote:

>>>Thanks so much for your opinion. Since you made up your mind at least

>>>five

>>>years ago, and generalized from a particular sort of inquiry to all
>>>web

>>>surveys, and based your conclusions on "web survey experiments"

>>>embedded

>>>into your research studies, I won't bother to refute any of your

>>>soapbox

>>>message.

>>>

>>>The defining trait of the fanatic is the utter refusal to allow

>>>anything as

>>>piddling as evidence to get in the way of an unshakable belief.

>>>

>>>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 Jonathan Brill

>>>Sent: Friday, March 31, 2006 6:28 PM

>>>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>>>Subject: Fwd: Online polls

>>>

>>>I want to take a moment to get up on my soapbox and offer the opinion

>>>that web surveys (which I assume subsumes the category of online
>>>polls)

>>>are completely and totally worthless and I doubt that there are any

>>>exceptions.

>>>

>>>I say this based on careful and systematic observations undertaken

>>>for

>>>the purpose of acquiring generalizable knowledge pertaining to the

>>>conduct of web surveys when I was employed from 2000 to 2001 as the

>>>Director of Research for an internet division of a \$60 billion

>>corporation with 106 separate commercial websites. I had a fairly
>>sizeable budget to do research on conducting web based survey
research;
>>I used my budget to extend our applied research studies by embedding
>>"web survey experiments" into them.
>>
>>What I found about the reliability of published multi-item scale
>>measures with known psychometric properties astonished me. Over the
>>course of several surveys, I identified scales developed using mail
>>questionnaires, face to face interviewing, or telephone interviewing
>>with excellent reported values for Cronbach alpha (e.g., .9 or so)
>that
>>were relevant for my studies and used them in web surveys.
>Consistently
>>and without exception, the Cronbach alphas observed in the web
surveys
>>were lower and usually so much lower (e.g., 0.2 to 0.4) that one had
to
>>wonder if somehow I had managed to shuffle the data randomly. In
fact,
>>only about 10% of the time did I observe these scales to have
Cronbach
>>alphas over 0.6. This consistently happened over several studies and
>the
>>results were somewhat repeatable when the same scale was used in more
>>than one survey. I say somewhat repeatable because a published scale
>>with alpha of 0.9 would come back in one study with observed alpha of
>>0.2 (for example) and in another study with alpha of 0.5 and in
another
>>with alpha of 0.1.
>>
>>The problem of reliability was not limited to psychometric scale
>>measures of attitudes. We often used sample lists of customers on
>which
>>we had administrative records of various company demographics. But,
>>when we compared the reported behavior and even the company demo
survey
>>results with our records, there was little correspondence. It seemed
>>you could not trust any result, no matter how objective or factual
the
>>subject matter of the question.
>>
>>How could this be? I have my hypotheses. Perhaps people do not pay
>>attention to web surveys when they take them to the same extent they
do
>>with surveys involving traditional media. When on the internet, you
>>multitask. Clickin on radial buttons is kind of like an arcade
>>experience. You don't need to take things too seriously. In
contrast,
>>with interviewer administered methods (face to face, telephone),
social
>>conditioning has taught us to pay attention to the person we are
>>interacting with; to do otherwise would be rude. And with paper and
>>pencil self administered surveys (e.g. mail), we have been

conditioned

>>from years of formal schooling to sit at a desk or table and take our
>>"tests" with care and this extends to survey questionnaires and forms
>in
>>general.

>>
>>Furthermore, there is that old sample control bugaboo issue on the
>>web.

>>
>>Why would anyone ever consider using the web to do science? I surely
>>would not.

>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
>>General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm)
>>Associate Director, Database & Panel Research
>>NEW JERSEY INSTITUTE FOR SUCCESSFUL AGING
>>School of Osteopathic Medicine
>>University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey
>>42 East Laurel Road, UDP Suite 2300
>>Stratford, New Jersey 08084
>>Telephone (direct): 856.566-6727
>>Fax (research group): 856.566-6874
>>E-mail: brillje@umdnj.edu

>>
>>CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email communication may contain private,
>>confidential, or legally privileged information intended for the sole
>>use of the designated and/or duly authorized recipient(s). If you are
>>not the intended recipient or have received this email in error,
please
>>notify the sender immediately by email and permanently delete all
>copies
>>of this email including all attachments without reading them. If you
>>are the intended recipient, secure the contents in a manner that
>>conforms to all applicable state and/or federal requirements related
to
>>privacy and confidentiality of such information.

>>
>>
>>>> Gary Andres <Gary.Andres@DUTKOWORLDWIDE.COM> 03/31/06 3:07 PM
>>>>

>>The little blurb below was posted on the National Journal's Hotline
>>today. Is anyone familiar with recent research comparing the
validity
>>of online vs. telephone surveys on public policy questions?

>>
>>
>>Beware Of Online Polls
>>

>>There are a bunch of new poll numbers circulating in a bunch of states,
>>thanks to the release of the latest online polls Zogby Int'l conducts
>>for the Wall Street Journal's web site. We don't publish or acknowledge
>>the existence of these numbers in any of our outlets because we are
>just
>>not comfortable that online panels are reliable indicators.
>>
>>It's a very new technology and we applaud Zogby for trying because some
>>mix of phone calls, door-to-door and online will be used to create
>>reliable polls in the future. Zogby is uniquely situated for the
>future,
>>in fact, as he regularly conducts door-to-door surveys via his int'l
>>arm, so he's gaining crucial experience when he moves toward using
all
>>three technologies for the same survey. (Note: Zogby does do a few
>calls
>>in each state he polls online, but, frankly, it's not enough calls.)
>>
>>But, to date, his online poll results are not just quirky, in some
>>cases they don't make any sense. BTW, we have the same policy on
>>Rasmussen (who uses automated callers) as well as his numbers
sometimes
>>show movement where none should have occurred. Until the track
records
>>of these surveys are proven over a long period of time, we'll
continue
>>to ignore these poll results when conducting our own analysis.
>>
>>Finally, and here's the clincher for why we look at both Zogby online
>>and Rasmussen with such a jaundiced eye: if either method of polling
>>(online panels or automated callers) were consistently reliable,
>>wouldn't professional campaign pollsters be using it? It's certainly
>>cheaper [CHUCK TODD]

>>-----
>>Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
>><http://www.aapor.org/>
>>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>>AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

>>-----
>>Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
>><http://www.aapor.org/>
>>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>>AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

>>-----
>>Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
>><http://www.aapor.org/>

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

>
>
>-----
>Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:

><http://www.aapor.org/>
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com
>Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
>aapornet-request@asu.edu

>
>-----
>Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:

<http://www.aapor.org/>
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com
>Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Mon, 3 Apr 2006 15:38:16 -0500
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: Job Opportunity
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Comments: cc: 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 Office.

=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.

=20

Please send resume and cover letter to:

=20

Recruitment Director

KRC Research

Fax 202-585-2078

E-mail: jobs@krcresearch.com

=20

No phone calls, please.

=20

=20

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

=====
Date: Mon, 3 Apr 2006 13:48:43 -0700

Reply-To: "P. Moy" <pmoy@U.WASHINGTON.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "P. Moy" <pmoy@U.WASHINGTON.EDU>

Subject: Conference chairs and discussants

Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Dear AAPORnet,

Thanks to the many who volunteered to serve as a chair and/or discussant for this year's conference. If you have not yet seen the preliminary program, it is available online at www.aapor.org.

Assignments noted in that document were made in February 2006. To date, any individual who has contacted me or David Moore regarding a time conflict or an issue of availability has been moved from that time slot and notified of the change. These changes will be reflected in the final program to be distributed in Montreal.

All presenters, chairs, and discussants will be receiving additional information regarding logistics and contact information later this month. In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact us if you have questions.

Many thanks again,

Patricia Moy

Patricia Moy, Ph.D.
Christy Cressey Associate Professor

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

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

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Mon, 3 Apr 2006 14:20:36 -0700
Reply-To: "P. Moy" <pmoy@U.WASHINGTON.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "P. Moy" <pmoy@U.WASHINGTON.EDU>
Subject: Follow-up: Conference chairs and discussants
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII; format=flowed

Dear AAPORnet,

Thanks to the many who volunteered to serve as a chair and/or discussant for this year's conference. If you have not yet seen the preliminary program, it is available online at www.aapor.org.

Assignments noted in that document were made in February 2006. To date, any individual who has contacted me or David Moore regarding a time conflict or an issue of availability has been moved from that time slot and notified of the change. These changes will be reflected in the final program to be distributed in Montreal.

All presenters, chairs, and discussants will be receiving additional information regarding logistics and contact information later this month. In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact us if you have questions.

Many thanks again,

Patricia Moy

Patricia Moy, Ph.D.
Christy Cressey Associate Professor

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

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

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Mon, 3 Apr 2006 15:52:45 -0700
Reply-To: Jennifer Franz <jdfranz@JDFRANZ.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jennifer Franz <jdfranz@JDFRANZ.COM>
Subject: Response Rates by Mode
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=Windows-1252
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

A client has asked if there is any literature on response rates for various ethnic groups by mode (i.e., differences among ethnicities by telephone, mail, Internet, and so forth). Can anyone point me in the right direction? I'm sure this has to be out there somewhere, and I'd love to avoid having to do the literature search myself if someone can help.

Jennifer D. Franz, Ph.D.
President
JD Franz Research, Inc.
(916) 440-8777 Telephone

(916) 440-8787 Fax
(916) 296-3400 Mobile

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Tue, 4 Apr 2006 09:02:18 -0400
Reply-To: pd@kerr-downs.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Phillip Downs <pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM>
Subject: Online surveys
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I am interested in AAPOR members' reaction to the following description of an internet survey - "the results have been weighted to reflect the demographics of POPULATION and results are representative of all individuals in the POPULATION who have access to the Internet at home, work, or school."
If you don't think this is acceptable, please offer alternatives. Thanks,
Phillip

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, registration, and preliminary program: <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
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Tue, 4 Apr 2006 08:46:41 -0500
Reply-To: Rob Santos <rsantos@NUSTATS.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Rob Santos <rsantos@NUSTATS.COM>
Subject: Re: Online surveys
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <NEBBJNECELDEFCLBMELLCEJCFNAA.pd@kerr-downs.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

In the absence of documentation of the sampling & data collection

methodologies, I suggest changing

"... are representative of..."

to

"... are intended to represent..."

Whether or not a given survey actually represents a specific population is contingent upon survey design & implementation.

Rob Santos
NuStats

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Phillip Downs
Sent: Tuesday, April 04, 2006 8:02 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Online surveys

I am interested in AAPOR members' reaction to the following description of an internet survey - "the results have been weighted to reflect the demographics of POPULATION and results are representative of all individuals in the POPULATION who have access to the Internet at home, work, or school." If you don't think this is acceptable, please offer alternatives. Thanks,
Phillip

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, registration, and preliminary program:
<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
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <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
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

=====
Date: Tue, 4 Apr 2006 15:06:01 +0100
Reply-To: Iain.NOBLE@DFES.GSI.GOV.UK
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Iain Noble <Iain.NOBLE@DFES.GSI.GOV.UK>
Subject: Re: Online surveys

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

I=20would=20certainly=20object=20to=20the=20phrase=20'representative=20of=20=
all
individuals=20in=20the=20POPULATION...'.=20What=20does=20'representative'=20=
mean=20here?
This=20is=20the=20same=20old=20same=20old=20whereby=20because=20some=20dat=
a=20have=20been
weighted=20to=20reproduce=20certain=20demographic=20characteristics=20of=20=
a=20target
population=20it=20is=20implied=20that=20they=20are=20as=20good=20as=20a=20=
probability=20sample
in=20measuring=20all=20the=20other=20characteristics=20of=20said=20populat=
ion.

I=20try=20and=20stop=20people=20using=20the=20word=20'representative'=20wh=
en=20talking=20about
samples,=20it's=20so=20open=20to=20abuse.=20Reserve=20the=20R=20word=20to=20=
describe=20samples
(set=20not=20achieved)=20taken=20by=20probability=20methods=20from=20a=20f=
rame=20that
contains=20all,=20or=20as=20near=20as=20dammit=20all,=20of=20the=20target=20=
population.

Iain=20Noble=20
Department=20for=20Education=20and=20Skills=20
Creating=20opportunity,=20releasing=20potential,=20achieving=20excellence=20=

Strategic=20Analysis:=20RM=201=20(YCS=20and=20Next=20Steps=20Study),=20
W606,=20Moorfoot,=20Sheffield,=20S1=204PQ.=20
0114=20259=201180=20
For=20information=20about=20the=20Next=20Steps=20Study=20go=20to
www.dfes.gov.uk/research=20

>-----Original=20Message-----

>From:=20AAPORNET=20[mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu]=20On=20Behalf=20Of=20Phillip=
=20Downs

>Sent:=2004=20April=202006=2014:02

>To:=20AAPORNET@asu.edu

>Subject:=20Online=20surveys

>

>I=20am=20interested=20in=20AAPOR=20members'=20reaction=20to=20the=20follo=
wing=20description

of

>an=20internet=20survey=20--=20"the=20results=20have=20been=20weighted=20to=
=20reflect=20the

>demographics=20of=20POPULATION=20and=20results=20are=20representative=20o=
f=20all

individuals

>in=20the=20POPULATION=20who=20have=20access=20to=20the=20Internet=20at=20=

home,=20work,=20or
school."
>If=20you=20don't=20think=20this=20is=20acceptable,=20please=20offer=20alt=
ernatives.
Thanks,
>Phillip

>
>Phillip=20E.=20Downs,=20PhD
>Partner,=20Kerr=20&=20Downs=20Research
>Professor=20of=20Marketing,=20FSU
>2992=20Habersham=20Drive
>Tallahassee,=20FL=2032309
>Phone:=20850.906.3111
>Fax:=20850.906.3112
>www.kerr-downs.com

>
>-----
>Conference=20info,=20registration,=20and=20preliminary=20program:
<http://www.aapor.org/>
>Archives:=20<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>=20.
>Problems?-don't=20reply=20to=20this=20message,=20write=20to:
aapor-net-request@asu.edu
>AAPOR=20e-voting=20problems?=20write:=20aapor-info@goamp.com

>
>PLEASE=20NOTE:=20THE=20ABOVE=20MESSAGE=20WAS=20RECEIVED=20FROM=20THE=20IN=
TERNET.

>
>On=20entering=20the=20GSI,=20this=20email=20was=20scanned=20for=20viruses=
=20by=20the
Government=20Secure=20Intranet
>(GSI)=20virus=20scanning=20service=20supplied=20exclusively=20by=20Cable=20=
&=20Wireless
in=20partnership=20with
>MessageLabs.

>
>Please=20see
<http://www.gsi.gov.uk/main/notices/information/gsi-003-2002.pdf>=20for
further
>details.

>
>In=20case=20of=20problems,=20please=20call=20your=20organisational=20IT=20=
helpdesk

This=20email=20and=20any=20files=20transmitted=20with=20it=20are=20confide=
ntial=20and
intended=20solely=20for=20the=20use=20of=20the=20individual=20or=20entity=20=
to=20whom=20they
are=20addressed.=20If=20you=20have=20received=20this=20email=20in=20error=20=
please=20notify
the=20system=20manager.

This=20footnote=20also=20confirms=20that=20this=20email=20message=20has=20=

been=20swept=20by
MIMEsweeper=20for=20the=20presence=20of=20computer=20viruses.

www.mimesweeper.com

The=20original=20of=20this=20email=20was=20scanned=20for=20viruses=20by=20=
the=20Government=20Secure=20Intranet=20(GSi)=20virus=20scanning=20service=20=
supplied=20exclusively=20by=20Cable=20&=20Wireless=20in=20partnership=20wi=
th=20MessageLabs.

On=20leaving=20the=20GSI=20this=20email=20was=20certified=20virus-free

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <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

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

=====

Date: Tue, 4 Apr 2006 10:12:30 -0400

Reply-To: "Butterworth, Michael" <MXB@CBSNEWS.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Butterworth, Michael" <MXB@CBSNEWS.COM>

Subject: Re: Online surveys

Comments: To: pd@kerr-downs.com, AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Perhaps you could make it clearer whether the results represent the
POPULATION or the subset of the POPULATION with access to the internet.

A relatively minor point: do you really exclude people with access at
cyber cafes, at friends, on Blackberries while they're windsurfing?

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

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

Sent: Tuesday, April 04, 2006 9:02 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Online surveys

I am interested in AAPOR members' reaction to the following description
of an internet survey - "the results have been weighted to reflect the
demographics of POPULATION and results are representative of all
individuals in the POPULATION who have access to the Internet at home,
work, or school." If you don't think this is acceptable, please offer
alternatives. Thanks, Phillip

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, registration, and preliminary program:

<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 AAPOR e-voting
problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <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
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

=====
Date: Tue, 4 Apr 2006 10:59:46 -0400
Reply-To: "Wolf, James G" <jamwolf@IUPUI.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Wolf, James G" <jamwolf@IUPUI.EDU>
Subject: Re: Online surveys
Comments: To: pd@kerr-downs.com, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

It has been my understanding that we can only properly weight data that
has been sampled in such a way that the cases selected have a known
probability of selection. When dealing with convenience samples and
other non-probability samples, applying weights is merely dressing up
what could very well be complete garbage. =20

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

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

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>] On Behalf Of Phillip Downs
Sent: Tuesday, April 04, 2006 9:02 AM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Online surveys

I am interested in AAPOR members' reaction to the following description
of

an internet survey - "the results have been weighted to reflect the
demographics of POPULATION and results are representative of all
individuals
in the POPULATION who have access to the Internet at home, work, or
school."

If you don't think this is acceptable, please offer alternatives.

Thanks,

Phillip

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, registration, and preliminary program:

<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

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <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

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

=====
Date: Tue, 4 Apr 2006 11:08:05 -0400

Reply-To: Claire Durand <Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Claire Durand <Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA>

Subject: Re: Online surveys

Comments: To: pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM, AAPORNET@asu.edu

In-Reply-To: <NEBBJNECELDEFCLBMELLCEJCFNAA.pd@kerr-downs.com>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Le 09:02 2006-04-04, vous avez =E9crit:

>I am interested in AAPOR members' reaction to the following description of

>an internet survey - "the results have been weighted to reflect the

>demographics of POPULATION

They have been weighted to represent the demographics of ... "the=20
population of internet users" would be ok and ... should be done?

Best,

>and results are representative of all individuals

>in the POPULATION who have access to the Internet at home, work, or=
school."

>If you don't think this is acceptable, please offer alternatives. Thanks,

>Phillip

>

>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, registration, and preliminary program:=
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
>AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Claire Durand

Link for AAPOR Montreal Conference:

=
<<https://www.webdepot.umontreal.ca/Usagers/durandc/MonDepotPublic>><https://www.webdepot.umontreal.ca/Usagers/durandc/MonDepotPublic>=20

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, registration, and preliminary program: <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
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

=====
Date: Tue, 4 Apr 2006 16:17:32 +0100
Reply-To: Iain.NOBLE@DFES.GSI.GOV.UK
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Iain Noble <Iain.NOBLE@DFES.GSI.GOV.UK>
Subject: Re: Online surveys
Comments: To: MXB@CBSNEWS.COM, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Interesting=20point.=20In=20theory,=20everyone=20has=20potential=20access=20=
to=20the=20Internet.=20All=20they=20have=20to=20do=20is=20travel=20to=20th=
e=20nearest=20cybercaf=E9,=20library=20or=20friendly=20user.=20Some=20folk=
s=20might=20have=20to=20travel=20quite=20a=20way=20though.

Iain=20Noble=20
Department=20for=20Education=20and=20Skills=20

Creating=20opportunity,=20releasing=20potential,=20achieving=20excellence=20=

Strategic=20Analysis:=20RM=201=20(YCS=20and=20Next=20Steps=20Study),=20
W606,=20Moorfoot,=20Sheffield,=20S1=204PQ.=20
0114=20259=201180=20
For=20information=20about=20the=20Next=20Steps=20Study=20go=20to=20www.dfe=
s.gov.uk/research=20

>-----Original=20Message-----

>From:=20AAPORNET=20[mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu]=20On=20Behalf=20Of=20Butterw=
orth,=20Michael
>Sent:=2004=20April=202006=2015:13
>To:=20AAPORNET@asu.edu
>Subject:=20Re:=20Online=20surveys

>
>Perhaps=20you=20could=20make=20it=20clearer=20whether=20the=20results=20r=
epresent=20the
>POPULATION=20or=20the=20subset=20of=20the=20POPULATION=20with=20access=20=
to=20the=20internet.

>
>A=20relatively=20minor=20point:=20do=20you=20really=20exclude=20people=20=
with=20access=20at
>cyber=20cafes,=20at=20friends,=20on=20Blackberries=20while=20they're=20wi=
ndsurfing?

>
>-----Original=20Message-----

>From:=20AAPORNET=20[mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu]=20On=20Behalf=20Of=20Phillip=
=20Downs
>Sent:=20Tuesday,=20April=202004,=202006=2009:02=20AM
>To:=20AAPORNET@asu.edu
>Subject:=20Online=20surveys

>
>
>I=20am=20interested=20in=20AAPOR=20members'=20reaction=20to=20the=20follo=
wing=20description
>of=20an=20internet=20survey=20-20"the=20results=20have=20been=20weighted=
=20to=20reflect=20the
>demographics=20of=20POPULATION=20and=20results=20are=20representative=20o=
f=20all
>individuals=20in=20the=20POPULATION=20who=20have=20access=20to=20the=20In=
ternet=20at=20home,
>work,=20or=20school."=20If=20you=20don't=20think=20this=20is=20acceptable=
,=20please=20offer
>alternatives.=20=20Thanks,=20Phillip

>
>Phillip=20E.=20Downs,=20PhD
>Partner,=20Kerr=20&=20Downs=20Research
>Professor=20of=20Marketing,=20FSU
>2992=20Habersham=20Drive
>Tallahassee,=20FL=2032309
>Phone:=20850.906.3111
>Fax:=20850.906.3112
>www.kerr-downs.com

>

>-----
>Conference=20info,=20registration,=20and=20preliminary=20program:
><http://www.aapor.org/>
>Archives:=20<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>=20.
>Problems?-don't
>reply=20to=20this=20message,=20write=20to:=20aapor-net-request@asu.edu=20A=
APOR=20e-voting
>problems?=20write:=20aapor-info@goamp.com
>

>-----
>Conference=20info,=20registration,=20and=20preliminary=20program:=20<http://www.aapor.org/>
>Archives:=20<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>=20.
>Problems?-don't=20reply=20to=20this=20message,=20write=20to:=20aapor-net-r=
equest@asu.edu
>AAPOR=20e-voting=20problems?=20write:=20aapor-info@goamp.com
>
>PLEASE=20NOTE:=20THE=20ABOVE=20MESSAGE=20WAS=20RECEIVED=20FROM=20THE=20IN=
TERNET.
>

>On=20entering=20the=20GSI,=20this=20email=20was=20scanned=20for=20viruses=
=20by=20the=20Government=20Secure=20Intranet
>(GSI)=20virus=20scanning=20service=20supplied=20exclusively=20by=20Cable=20=
&=20Wireless=20in=20partnership=20with
>MessageLabs.
>

>Please=20see=20<http://www.gsi.gov.uk/main/notices/information/gsi-003-2002.pdf>=
20for=20further
>details.
>

>In=20case=20of=20problems,=20please=20call=20your=20organisational=20IT=20=
helpdesk

This=20email=20and=20any=20files=20transmitted=20with=20it=20are=20confide=
ntial=20and
intended=20solely=20for=20the=20use=20of=20the=20individual=20or=20entity=20=
to=20whom=20they
are=20addressed.=20If=20you=20have=20received=20this=20email=20in=20error=20=
please=20notify
the=20system=20manager.

This=20footnote=20also=20confirms=20that=20this=20email=20message=20has=20=
been=20swept=20by
MIMESweeper=20for=20the=20presence=20of=20computer=20viruses.

www.mimesweeper.com

The=20original=20of=20this=20email=20was=20scanned=20for=20viruses=20by=20=
the=20Government=20Secure=20Intranet=20(GSI)=20virus=20scanning=20service=20=
supplied=20exclusively=20by=20Cable=20&=20Wireless=20in=20partnership=20wi=

th=20MessageLabs.

On=20leaving=20the=20GSI=20this=20email=20was=20certified=20virus-free

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <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
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

=====
Date: Tue, 4 Apr 2006 11:33:11 -0400
Reply-To: BLUMWEP@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Micheline (Mickey) Blum" <BLUMWEP@AOL.COM>
Subject: Re: Response Rates by Mode
Comments: To: jdf Franz@JDFRANZ.COM, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Please reply to the whole listserv. I have a client with a similar question.

Mickey Blum

Micheline Blum
President
Blum & Weprin Associates, Inc.
80 University Place
New York, NY 10003
212-929-6510
blumwep@aol.com

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <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
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

=====
Date: Tue, 4 Apr 2006 11:36:44 -0400
Reply-To: "Steve, Kenneth" <Kenneth.Steve@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Steve, Kenneth" <Kenneth.Steve@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>
Subject: Re: Online surveys
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Your statement forces us to make certain assumptions. I assume by results, you mean a significance test or confidence interval of a population parameter or a difference in population parameters. I also assume, for sake of argument, that you are referring to an "opt in" survey. Proceeding from these assumptions:=20

If it is an "opt in" survey, the statement cannot be verified.

Weighting does not compensate for the lack of a random sample. The assumption that the sample was drawn randomly from the population of interest is not robust to violation. An opt in survey, by definition, violates this assumption and thus breaks down the logical argument your trying to make.

Again assuming you are referring to an opt in survey, the error is not so much in the weighting, but the fact that you have no evidence to refute the idea that you haven't grabbed a handful of outliers (i.e., that your observations do not represent each particular demographics to which you are weighting). In fact, you have stronger evidence to assume that there is something very different about those who choose to participate, and those who do not.

I personally do not think of online survey as being synonymous with a lack of random sampling. We have to be careful that by trying to capitalize on certain efficiencies, we do not throw the baby out with the bath water. Sampling method and data collection mode are two independent variables. If the online survey is drawn randomly from the population of interest, then I would be more inclined to accept the statement below. In theory however, the argument might be made that as the response rate from a randomly drawn sample decreases, it becomes more like an opt in sample. =20

Go Noles!

Ken Steve

=20

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

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

Sent: Tuesday, April 04, 2006 9:02 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Online surveys

I am interested in AAPOR members' reaction to the following description of an internet survey - "the results have been weighted to reflect the demographics of POPULATION and results are representative of all individuals in the POPULATION who have access to the Internet at home, work, or school."

If you don't think this is acceptable, please offer alternatives.

Thanks, Phillip

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, registration, and preliminary program:
<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 AAPOR e-voting problems? write:
aapor-info@goamp.com

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <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
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Tue, 4 Apr 2006 11:51:21 -0400
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing
Subject: Re: Online surveys
Comments: To: pd@kerr-downs.com
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <NEBBJNECELDEFCLBMELLCEJCFNAA.pd@kerr-downs.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I also object to the use of the word "representative" because the only population that such a sample could be representative of is the panel from which it is drawn.

More generally, I think that we need to consider online surveys not as representative samples but rather as models that attempt to replicate certain aspects of a target population and would like to see language used that makes that point.

However, based on my own past experience, I would suggest that demographic variables alone may not be adequate to generate adequate models in many situation. One should consider building check variables into online surveys to test for similarity to the general population on known characteristics related to those the survey seeks to evaluate.

To some extent, this is what Harris Interactive claims to have done, but since they won't disclose details, I remain skeptical.

Jan Werner

Phillip Downs wrote:

- > I am interested in AAPOR members' reaction to the following description of
- > an internet survey - "the results have been weighted to reflect the
- > demographics of POPULATION and results are representative of all individuals
- > in the POPULATION who have access to the Internet at home, work, or school."
- > If you don't think this is acceptable, please offer alternatives. Thanks,

> Phillip
>
> 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, registration, and preliminary program:
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
> AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com
>
>

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: 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
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com
=====

Date: Tue, 4 Apr 2006 11:56:26 -0400
Reply-To: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Subject: Online Surveys
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

"The results have been weighted to reflect the demographics of =
POPULATION and results are representative of all individuals in the =
POPULATION who have access to the Internet at home, work, or school."

It is difficult enough to draw a sample that can be defended as =
representing the universe (population) of Internet users. Why would one =
accept the challenge of demonstrating that conclusions based on samples =
of Internet users represent the entire population? (Answer: commercial =
applications.) Internet non-users are by definition outside the universe =
of users and no online sampling methodology can encompass them. It would =
make more sense, I believe, to weight the results to known =
characteristics of the universe of Internet users and then have to =
defend only the sampling process for the survey (i.e. is it unbiased?) =
Yes, pressures exist to project results of online surveys to the total =
population and it is my impression that Harris Interactive's propensity =
weighting model claims to do that. For all I know, it may. But so long =
as it or any other proprietary weighting procedures remain inaccessible =
to external investigators, the results of such studies cannot be =

considered fully scientific because they cannot be shown to have passed =
the test of independent replication.

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, registration, and preliminary program: <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
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Tue, 4 Apr 2006 12:14:01 -0400
Reply-To: "Butterworth, Michael" <MXB@CBSNEWS.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Butterworth, Michael" <MXB@CBSNEWS.COM>
Subject: Re: Online surveys
Comments: To: Claire Durand <Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

But is it true? Not if the weights were derived from a census of the =
whole population.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Claire Durand
Sent: Tuesday, April 04, 2006 11:08 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Online surveys

Le 09:02 2006-04-04, vous avez =E9crit:

>I am interested in AAPOR members' reaction to the following description =

>of an internet survey - "the results have been weighted to reflect the=20
>demographics of POPULATION

They have been weighted to represent the demographics of ... "the=20
population of internet users" would be ok and ... should be done?

Best,

>and results are representative of all individuals
>in the POPULATION who have access to the Internet at home, work, or=20
>school." If you don't think this is acceptable, please offer=20
>alternatives. Thanks, Phillip
>

>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, registration, and preliminary program:=20
><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
>AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Claire Durand

Link for AAPOR Montreal Conference:

=
<<https://www.webdepot.umontreal.ca/Usagers/durandc/MonDepotPublic>>[https://](https://www.webdepot.umontreal.ca/Usagers/durandc/MonDepotPublic)
/www.webdepot.umontreal.ca/Usagers/durandc/MonDepotPublic=20

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, registration, and preliminary program: =
<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 AAPOR e-voting =
problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <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
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

=====
Date: Tue, 4 Apr 2006 12:16:14 -0400
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Subject: Re: Online surveys
Comments: To: pd@kerr-downs.com
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <NEBBJNECELDEFCLBMELLCEJCFNAA.pd@kerr-downs.com>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

The results are NOT representative of all individuals in the POPULATION. They don't represent the Internet population. Worst of all they don't even represent the panel for which the respondents volunteered, unless of course there was some random selection. The only thing we know for sure is that these respondents represent are themselves.

Why not say, "the results have been weighted to reflect the demographics of the POPULATION. It may or may not represent the population." All that other stuff is doing nothing but misleading or obfuscating the truth. Isn't that a violation of the AAPOR Code? Where is our Standards Chair on this issue? Shouldn't she be speaking up here?

warren mitofsky

At 09:02 AM 4/4/2006, Phillip Downs wrote:

>I am interested in AAPOR members' reaction to the following description of
>an internet survey - "the results have been weighted to reflect the
>demographics of POPULATION and results are representative of all individuals
>in the POPULATION who have access to the Internet at home, work, or school."
>If you don't think this is acceptable, please offer alternatives. Thanks,
>Phillip

>
>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, registration, and preliminary program: <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
>AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

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

212 980-3031
212 980-3107 Fax

www.mitofskyinternational.com
mitofsky@mindspring.com

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <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
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Tue, 4 Apr 2006 12:33:45 -0400
Reply-To: Joseph.Bauer@CANCER.ORG
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Joseph E. Bauer" <Joseph.Bauer@CANCER.ORG>
Subject: Fw: Online surveys
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Comments: cc: pd@kerr-downs.com
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Hello Phil, (Others on AAPORNET)

Internet surveys have been a hot topic recently. I think it is a topic that needs to be openly discussed and thought about. I am new to the LISTSERV - so I have been just a listener thus far. It is my thought that the technology to do internet surveys has been disseminated widely, and thus we have an explosion of people who are doing web-based/ e-mail-based surveys. Because of the ease of doing them and the economic imperative of saving money/conserving resources - the new frontier has been thrust upon us. The issue that is being explored - is whether the modality of using the internet can be harnessed in a meaningful way. Quite aside from contemplating representativeness and study design and research question issues - we have a Brave New World - where we will need to come up with standards to try and apply a rational/scientific rigor. This would include reporting standards.

With respect to your description below - I would say I would reserve judgement - because I have no context. When someone does an 'internet survey' - what does that mean exactly? It could mean many things. The research question asked/ the study design used/ sampling frame/ is the study exploratory - what is the study trying to do? How are the POPULATION parameters determined - (i.e. by definition, the cachement group that have 'access' could mean many things as well). I think a big issue that has been discussed these last several days - is the nature of the sample. Doing post-stratification weighting (to those POPULATION parameters) does not magically make it 'representative'. For me - I would think of it like this: The research design and how it is operationalized is extremely important. If I have a 'bad' design and/or the operationalization is poorly carried out - I gather 'bad' data. After the fact - no matter how you squeeze and manipulate that data - - its nature is that it is still 'bad' data. It may not simply be a function of 'non-response' - but a design flaw/operational flaw that did not give everyone (in the POPULATION of interest) an equal probability of selection.

I look forward to others insights/perspective on this.

I am interested in AAPOR members' reaction to the following description of

an internet survey - "the results have been weighted to reflect the demographics of POPULATION and results are representative of all individuals in the POPULATION who have access to the Internet at home, work, or school."
If you don't think this is acceptable, please offer alternatives. Thanks,
Phillip

*** Now, I'll pose two related questions - that I have thought about previously. I just know that they will generate some great discussion. :
-)
(Also, if anyone can cite some excellent references for these topics - that would be appreciated).

Example # 1

Non-probability samples can and are used all the time (i.e. they have utility). Case in point - Fortune 500 companies who utilize 'focus groups' to inform their market strategy. These companies spend billions of dollars per year on the results of these 'focus groups' - which are (claimed) to be 'representative' of the markets of interest. These are not probability samples - and yet they are a tool that are used. This modality would not be used
- if it didn't generate useable results (i.e. that made money).

Example # 2

Marketing research to make business decisions utilize RDD's. Studies that use an RDD methodology of the general population (i.e. those with landline phones - listed and unlisted) - can produce say - N=1000 respondents (and generate reasonable 95% confidence limits around point estimates). Now, quite aside from the issue of cell phone only/ or primarily usage bias (which is arguably 'low' at this time) - the response rates are not usually mentioned.

From my experience, many of these marketing studies are in the 20% to 35% response rate range. With CENSUS data (for those that indicate they have a landline) in their household - post-stratification weighting - adjusts the response rate proportions accordingly. Now, if the weights for all the basic sociodemographic variables are 'small' (less than 2.0?) - might we say that we have a fairly representative sample - even though the response rate is low?

Cheers,

Joe

Joseph E. Bauer, Ph.D.
Program Director - Survey Research
Statistics & Evaluation Center (SEC)
American Cancer Society - National Home Office
1599 Clifton Road NE
Atlanta, Georgia 30329-4251
(404) 929-6905 (Office)
(404) 321-4669 (Fax)

Phillip Downs
<pd@KERR-DOWNS.CO
M> To
Sent by: AAPORNET AAPORNET@asu.edu
<AAPORNET@asu.edu cc
>

Subject

Online surveys

04/04/2006 09:02
AM

Please respond to
pd@kerr-downs.com

I am interested in AAPOR members' reaction to the following description of an internet survey - "the results have been weighted to reflect the demographics of POPULATION and results are representative of all individuals in the POPULATION who have access to the Internet at home, work, or school."
If you don't think this is acceptable, please offer alternatives. Thanks,
Phillip

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, registration, and preliminary program:
<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
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <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
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com
=====

Date: Tue, 4 Apr 2006 11:30:23 -0700
Reply-To: Cathy Cirina <ccirina@MAIL.SDSU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Cathy Cirina <ccirina@MAIL.SDSU.EDU>
Subject: online studies: response rates?
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Another question re: online studies - Has AAPOR or anyone come up with a standard for discussing/calculating response rates?

Cathy Cirina, MA, MPH

Coordinator, Research Services

Social Science Research Lab

San Diego State University

619.594.1363

ccirina@mail.sdsu.edu

<http://ssrl.sdsu.edu/>

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <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
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

=====

Date: Tue, 4 Apr 2006 15:22:39 -0400
Reply-To: Jim Kitchens <JimTKG@CFL.RR.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jim Kitchens <JimTKG@CFL.RR.COM>
Subject: Re: Online surveys
Comments: To: "Steve, Kenneth" <Kenneth.Steve@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>,
AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; format=flowed; charset=iso-8859-1; reply-type=original
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Could you take me off this email list please

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

From: "Steve, Kenneth" <Kenneth.Steve@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>
To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Sent: Tuesday, April 04, 2006 11:36 AM
Subject: Re: Online surveys

Your statement forces us to make certain assumptions. I assume by results, you mean a significance test or confidence interval of a population parameter or a difference in population parameters. I also assume, for sake of argument, that you are referring to an "opt in" survey. Proceeding from these assumptions:

If it is an "opt in" survey, the statement cannot be verified.

Weighting does not compensate for the lack of a random sample. The assumption that the sample was drawn randomly from the population of interest is not robust to violation. An opt in survey, by definition, violates this assumption and thus breaks down the logical argument your trying to make.

Again assuming you are referring to an opt in survey, the error is not so much in the weighting, but the fact that you have no evidence to refute the idea that you haven't grabbed a handful of outliers (i.e., that your observations do not represent each particular demographics to which you are weighting). In fact, you have stronger evidence to assume that there is something very different about those who choose to participate, and those who do not.

I personally do not think of online survey as being synonymous with a lack of random sampling. We have to be careful that by trying to capitalize on certain efficiencies, we do not throw the baby out with the bath water. Sampling method and data collection mode are two independent variables. If the online survey is drawn randomly from the population of interest, then I would be more inclined to accept the statement below. In theory however, the argument might be made that as the response rate from a randomly drawn sample decreases, it becomes more like an opt in sample.

Go Noles!

Ken Steve

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Phillip Downs
Sent: Tuesday, April 04, 2006 9:02 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Online surveys

I am interested in AAPOR members' reaction to the following description of an internet survey - "the results have been weighted to reflect the demographics of POPULATION and results are representative of all individuals in the POPULATION who have access to the Internet at home, work, or school."

If you don't think this is acceptable, please offer alternatives.

Thanks, Phillip

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, registration, and preliminary program:
<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 AAPOR e-voting problems? write:
aapor-info@goamp.com

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
<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
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <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
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

=====

Date: Tue, 4 Apr 2006 17:42:38 -0400
Reply-To: Roger Tourangeau <rtourangeau@SURVEY.UMD.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Roger Tourangeau <rtourangeau@SURVEY.UMD.EDU>
Subject: Final Reminder: Distinguished Lecture at JPSM on April 7
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
Content-disposition: inline

JPSM is sponsoring a Distinguished Lecture by Nora Cate Schaeffer on Friday, April 7. The title is "Conversational Practices with a Purpose: Interaction within the Standardized Interview." The talk will begin at 3:30 pm at 2205 Lefrak Hall on the University of Maryland, College Park Campus. There will be a reception immediately afterwards.

Nora Cate Schaeffer is Professor of Sociology at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, where she teaches courses in survey research methods and conducts research on instrument design and interaction in the survey interview.

There will be two discussants-Frederick Conrad from the University of

Sara Lichtin Boyd, Senior Project Manager
Ohio University: Voinovich Center for Leadership and Public Affairs
Building 22, The Ridges,
Athens, OH 45701
740-593-9798 (Tel) 740-593-4398 (Fax)

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Cathy Cirina
Sent: Tuesday, April 04, 2006 2:30 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: online studies: response rates?

Another question re: online studies - Has AAPOR or anyone come up with a standard for discussing/calculating response rates?

Cathy Cirina, MA, MPH

Coordinator, Research Services

Social Science Research Lab

San Diego State University

619.594.1363

ccirina@mail.sdsu.edu

<http://ssrl.sdsu.edu/>

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:

<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

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

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

=====
Date: Wed, 5 Apr 2006 14:31:34 +0100

Reply-To: Iain.NOBLE@DFES.GSI.GOV.UK

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Iain Noble <Iain.NOBLE@DFES.GSI.GOV.UK>
Subject: Re: New Orleans sampling
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

>-----Original=20Message-----

>From:=20AAPORNET=20[mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu]=20On=20Behalf=20Of=20Rob=20S=20=20antos

>Sent:=2005=20April=202006=2013:13

>To:=20AAPORNET@asu.edu

>Subject:=20Re:=20New=20Orleans=20sampling

>

>Hi=20folks,

>

>I=20beg=20to=20differ=20--=20a=20prob=20sample=20is=20possible=20indeed=20=20via=20area

probability

>sampling.=20=20Area=20probability=20samples=20of=20households=20and/or=20=20

persons=20have

been

>routinely=20drawn=20in=20under-developed=20countries=20with=20limited=20t=20=20echnical

>resources=20(eg,=20little=20or=20no=20census=20data)=20for=20decades.=20=20=20It=20is=20not=20rocket

>science=20but=20does=20demand=20creativity=20(focusing=20the=20'art'=20pa=20=20

rt=20of

sampling).

>The=20real=20issues=20here=20are=20available=20resources=20(ie,=20persona=20=20

l=20interview

>methodology=20is=20not=20economically=20viable)=20and/or=20time.

Indeed=20and=20here=20is=20a=20recent=20example=20from=20Bosnia=20and=20He=20=20

rzegovina=20of=20how

it=20can=20be=20done:

<http://www.iser.essex.ac.uk/pubs/pubs/workpaps/pdf/2003-26.pdf>=20

>

>Rob=20Santos

>NuStats

>

>-----Original=20Message-----

>From:=20AAPORNET=20[mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu]=20On=20Behalf=20Of=20Paul=20=20Braun

>Sent:=20Wednesday,=20April=202005,=202006=206:59=20AM

>To:=20AAPORNET@asu.edu

>Subject:=20Re:=20New=20Orleans=20sampling

>

>Patricia,

>

>Thank=20you=20very=20much=20and=20thanks=20to=20everyone=20else=20who=20e=20=20mailed=20me=20this

week.

>
>Regards
>
>Paul
>
>
>-----Original=20Message-----
>From:=20Patricia=20A.=20Gwartney=20[mailto:pgwartney@GMAIL.COM]
>Sent:=20Tuesday,=20April=202004,=202006=2010:22=20PM
>To:=20AAPORNET@asu.edu
>Subject:=20New=20Orleans=20sampling
>
>
>Paul,
>Jim=20Elliott=20at=20Tulane=20U.=20is=20in=20the=20midst=20of=20a=20large=
=20NSF-sponsored
survey=20in
>N.O.=20His=20latest=20message=20to=20me=20(quoted=20with=20permission)=20=
says:
>
>"As=20for=20the=20NOLA=20survey,=20I'd=20be=20happy=20to=20discuss=20the=20=
project=20with
whoever=20is
>interested.=20At=20this=20point,=20I've=20collected=20roughly=20400=20sur=
veys=20from=204
census
>tracts=20(2=20low/no=20flood=20damage,=20and=202=20moderate=20damage).=20=
The=20next=20phase
is=20to
>begin=20collecting=20info=20in=20multiple=20heavy-damage=20tracts/neighbo=
rhods,
which
>is=20complicated=20given=20dispersal,=20poor=20mail-forwarding,=20and=20d=
ead=20phone
lines.
>The=20Census=20and=20Brookings=20folks=20that=20I=20spoke=20with=20at=20t=
he=20Population
meetings
>last=20week=20in=20LA=20weren't=20much=20help;=20nor=20were=20researchers=
=20facing=20similar
>challenges=20in=20the=20tsunami-affected=20region.=20I'm=20meeting=20with=
=20someone=20in
our
>International=20Health=20dept.=20later=20this=20week=20to=20talk=20more=20=
about
methodological
>issues.=20Bottomline,=20though,=20is=20that=20a=20perfect=20random=20samp=
le=20is
impossible."
>
>You=20can=20reach=20him=20at:=20*Jim=20Elliott=20**jre@tulane.edu*=20<jre=
@tulane.edu>
In=20the
>fall,=20he=20will=20join=20the=20University=20of=20Oregon=20Sociology=20D=

>Please=20see
http://www.gsi.gov.uk/main/notices/information/gsi-003-2002.pdf=20for
further
>details.
>
>In=20case=20of=20problems,=20please=20call=20your=20organisational=20IT=20=
helpdesk

This=20email=20and=20any=20files=20transmitted=20with=20it=20are=20confide=
ntial=20and
intended=20solely=20for=20the=20use=20of=20the=20individual=20or=20entity=20=
to=20whom=20they
are=20addressed.=20If=20you=20have=20received=20this=20email=20in=20error=20=
please=20notify
the=20system=20manager.

This=20footnote=20also=20confirms=20that=20this=20email=20message=20has=20=
been=20swept=20by
MIMESweeper=20for=20the=20presence=20of=20computer=20viruses.

www.mimesweeper.com

The=20original=20of=20this=20email=20was=20scanned=20for=20viruses=20by=20=
the=20Government=20Secure=20Intranet=20(GSi)=20virus=20scanning=20service=20=
supplied=20exclusively=20by=20Cable=20&=20Wireless=20in=20partnership=20wi=
th=20MessageLabs.

On=20leaving=20the=20GSI=20this=20email=20was=20certified=20virus-free

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Wed, 5 Apr 2006 10:56:17 -0400
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Subject: capitalism's image around the world
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

A PIPA survey that was released in January is getting renewed attention because it found low approval for free-market capitalism in France - lower than in China. That inspired me to take a look at some of the details.

According to the release:

> A new poll of 20 countries from around the world finds a striking
>global consensus that the free market economic system is best, but
>that governments should also do more to regulate large companies. In
>all but one country polled, a majority or plurality agreed with the
>statement that "the free enterprise system and free market economy
>is the best system on which to base the future of the world." On
>average, 61% agreed while 28% disagreed. The poll of 20,791
>individuals was conducted by the international polling firm
>GlobeScan and analyzed in conjunction with the Program on
>International Policy Attitudes (PIPA) of the University of Maryland.
> Ironically, the country that showed the highest level of support
>for the free enterprise system was China, with 74% agreeing that it
>is the best system. Others that were nearly as enthusiastic were the
>Philippines (73%), the US (71%), and India (70%).

But a look at the methodology

<http://65.109.167.118/pipa/pdf/jan06/FreeMarkets_Jan06_quaire.pdf>
shows that in China, India, and the Philippines, the survey was
restricted to urban areas. That's ludicrous in countries that are
predominantly to heavily rural - the sample for India, for example,
covers 5% of the population. And in China, the poll was done by
phone, which almost certainly rules out coverage of the poor and
working class.

Can we take the results of a poll like this seriously?

--

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

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

producer, Behind the News
Thursdays, 5-6 PM, WBAI, New York 99.5 FM
<<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, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Wed, 5 Apr 2006 16:24:55 +0100
Reply-To: Iain.NOBLE@DFES.GSI.GOV.UK
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Iain Noble <Iain.NOBLE@DFES.GSI.GOV.UK>
Subject: Re: capitalism's image around the world
Comments: To: dhenwood@PANIX.COM, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

>-----Original=20Message-----

>From:=20AAPORNET=20[mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu]=20On=20Behalf=20Of=20Doug=20=Henwood

>Sent:=2005=20April=202006=2015:56

>To:=20AAPORNET@asu.edu

>Subject:=20capitalism's=20image=20around=20the=20world

>

>A=20PIPA=20survey=20that=20was=20released=20in=20January=20is=20getting=20=renewed

>attention=20because=20it=20found=20low=20approval=20for=20free-market=20c=apitalism=20in

>France=20=20lower=20than=20in=20China.=20That=20inspired=20me=20to=20tak=e=20a=20look=20at=20some

>of=20the=20details.

>

>According=20to=20the=20release:

>

>Can=20we=20take=20the=20results=20of=20a=20poll=20like=20this=20seriously=

?

>

>

I=20don't=20know=20about=20that=20but=20thirty=20years=20ago,=20before=20I=20=20took=20up=20this

survey=20thing,=20I=20was=20for=20several=20years=20a=20sociologist=20work=ing=20on=20the=20then

USSR=20and=20Poland.=20Whenever=20I=20visited=20either=20of=20these=20or=20=the=20other=20Warsaw

pact=20countries=20I=20always=20found=20that=20local=20enthusiasm=20for=20=capitalism=20was

far=20greater=20than=20in=20the=20UK=20or,=20certainly,=20France.=20I=20wo=nder=20why.

Iain=20Noble=20

Department=20for=20Education=20and=20Skills=20

Creating=20opportunity,=20releasing=20potential,=20achieving=20excellence=20=

Strategic=20Analysis:=20RM=201=20(YCS=20and=20Next=20Steps=20Study),=20

W606,=20Moorfoot,=20Sheffield,=20S1=204PQ.=20

0114=20259=201180=20

For=20information=20about=20the=20Next=20Steps=20Study=20go=20to
www.dfes.gov.uk/research=20

This=20email=20and=20any=20files=20transmitted=20with=20it=20are=20confide=
ntial=20and
intended=20solely=20for=20the=20use=20of=20the=20individual=20or=20entity=20=
to=20whom=20they
are=20addressed.=20If=20you=20have=20received=20this=20email=20in=20error=20=
please=20notify
the=20system=20manager.

This=20footnote=20also=20confirms=20that=20this=20email=20message=20has=20=
been=20swept=20by
MIMESweeper=20for=20the=20presence=20of=20computer=20viruses.

www.mimesweeper.com

The=20original=20of=20this=20email=20was=20scanned=20for=20viruses=20by=20=
the=20Government=20Secure=20Intranet=20(GSi)=20virus=20scanning=20service=20=
supplied=20exclusively=20by=20Cable=20&=20Wireless=20in=20partnership=20wi=
th=20MessageLabs.

On=20leaving=20the=20GSI=20this=20email=20was=20certified=20virus-free

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Wed, 5 Apr 2006 11:56:16 -0400
Reply-To: aaa1@COLUMBIA.EDU
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Angela A Aidala <aaa1@COLUMBIA.EDU>
Subject: Re: Unique identifiers for longitudinal surveys with school aged
children

Comments: To: sara boyd <boyds1@ohio.edu>
Comments: cc: aapornet@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <200604051313.k35DDwun2197989@oak.cats.ohiou.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII; format=flowed

We have had success with homeless/runaway 'street kids' using respondent
generated id number: first 3 letters of last name and birthday month and
day. We found that kids dont mind giving this information and can remember
it for follow-up interviews, and we've done well linking overtime datasets
by combining with other info (gender, birthplace, mothers first name,

etc). Not perfect but the best we've come up with and acceptable to kids and our IRB.

Angela Aidala

Angela A. Aidala, PhD
Research Scientist
Mailman School of Public Health
Columbia University
722 W 168th St, Suite 1119
New York, NY 10032

tel: 212-305-7023
fax: 212-305-3702
email: aaa1@columbia.edu

On Wed, 5 Apr 2006, sara boyd wrote:

> Does anyone have any recommendations for a unique identifier scheme to apply
> to longitudinal survey research conducted with middle and high school aged
> children? We are not permitted to incorporate any personal identifiers such
> as name or social security number. We are considering as components of this
> identifier such items as first and last initial of mother's first name, date
> of birth, gender, school code, and first initial of child's first name
> This is a large scale survey and we are concerned about duplicate IDs but do
> not want to make it so difficult the respondent cannot comply accurately or
> consistently over time.

> Any suggestions would be greatly appreciated.

> Sara Lichtin Boyd, Senior Project Manager
> Ohio University: Voinovich Center for Leadership and Public Affairs
> Building 22, The Ridges,
> Athens, OH 45701
> 740-593-9798 (Tel) 740-593-4398 (Fax)

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

> From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Cathy Cirina
> Sent: Tuesday, April 04, 2006 2:30 PM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: online studies: response rates?

> Another question re: online studies - Has AAPOR or anyone come up with a
> standard for discussing/calculating response rates?

> Cathy Cirina, MA, MPH

> Coordinator, Research Services
>
> Social Science Research Lab
>
> San Diego State University
>
> 619.594.1363
>

> ccirina@mail.sdsu.edu
>
> http://ssrl.sdsu.edu/
>
>
>
>
>

> -----
> Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
> 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
> AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com
>

> -----
> Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
http://www.aapor.org/
> Archives: http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
> AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: http://www.aapor.org/
Archives: http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Wed, 5 Apr 2006 13:02:33 -0400
Reply-To: "Mulrow, Jeri M." <jmulrow@NSF.GOV>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Mulrow, Jeri M." <jmulrow@NSF.GOV>
Subject: Job Announcement
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Vacancy Announcements:

Where: Division of Science Resources Statistics, National Science =
Foundation

For: Mathematical Statistician

Grade/Series: GS-1529-13/14 and AD-1529-3

Closing Date: May 2, 2006

For more information or to apply: =

http://www.nsf.gov/publications/vacancy.jsp?org=3DSRS&nsf_org=3DSRS

Jeri Mulrow
Senior Mathematical Statistician
Division of Science Resources Statistics
National Science Foundation
4201 Wilson Blvd, Suite 965
Arlington, VA 22230
703-292-4784

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Wed, 5 Apr 2006 13:03:08 -0400
Reply-To: Dave Howell <dahowell@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Dave Howell <dahowell@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
Subject: ANES Announcement: Online Commons is open for Pilot Study
content

proposals
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Dear AAPOR members,

Last month, The American National Election Studies inaugurated the ANES Online Commons (OC). The goal of the OC is to improve the quality and scientific value of each of our data collections, to encourage the submission of new ideas, and to make such experiences more beneficial to, and enjoyable for, individual investigators.

The OC is a collection of proposal and message board web-pages designed to foster innovation and debate about the most effective ways to measure electorally-relevant concepts and relationships in upcoming ANES surveys. It is faithful to best practices in "open source" development, with the special adjustments made for the ANES.

The OC is open to anyone who wants to make a constructive contribution to the development of ANES data collections. Any Internet user can view the OC, but posting proposals, comments, or other study-relevant materials will require OC membership. To learn how to register, visit this website:

<http://www.electionstudies.org/onlinecommons.htm>

After registering, members may write proposals advocating for the inclusion of new questions in the questionnaires or suggesting that we continue to ask questions that have been asked in the past or suggesting that particular questions not be asked again. Members are also eligible to post comments about each proposal, and proposal authors can update or revise their proposals in response to advice they receive.=20

In addition to proposals and comments, OC members can write short essays about research topics that they view as important for the ANES and its user community to consider. These essays may be no more than 500 words in length. The essays differ from the formal proposals that are the OC's focal elements. OC proposals must specify the exact wording for a proposed question accompanied by a scientific rationale, whereas the essays need only offer advice for others about potentially valuable lines of inquiry. The OC is devoted to the improvement and development of scientific election studies, and all essays should adopt the same focus.=20

Please pass this invitation along to anyone (e.g., your students) who you think might be interested. We hope to hear from you now and in the coming years as we strive to enhance the study of elections through the ANES.

Please note that the deadline for submitting questions to the OC for the 2006 Pilot Study is June 15, 2006.

Jon A. Krosnick and Arthur Lupia
Principal Investigators
American National Election Studies

=20

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

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

=====
Date: Wed, 5 Apr 2006 12:45:16 -0600

Reply-To: danjones@DJASURVEY.COM

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Dan Jones <danjones@DJASURVEY.COM>

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 8bit

Hi,

I am looking into doing focus groups in Ghana, Africa and in the Phillipines. does anyone know reputable research firms in those areas? PLease contact me directly at danjone@djasurvey.com. Thank you for your help

Dan E. Jones, Ph.D.

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Wed, 5 Apr 2006 14:00:29 -0500
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: Job Opportunity
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Comments: cc: Donna Eisenhower <deisenho@health.nyc.gov>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

City of New York

Department of Health

125 Worth Street, Room 908

New York, NY 10013

=20

Civil Service Title: City Research Scientist
Level: II

Salary: \$60,312 - \$73,859

Office Title: Division of Epidemiology =20

Work Location: 125 Worth Street

Division/Work Unit: Epidemiological Services
No. of Positions: 1

Hours/Shift: Duration: 35 hours/week - Full Time

=20

JOB DESCRIPTION:

The Bureau of Epidemiology Services within the New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene is a multidisciplinary unit with the goal of combining cutting-edge epidemiologic research, research design, data collection and data analyses to support rapid turnaround policy recommendations. The unit will undertake study design, collection, and analysis which have broad Departmental applications and will also be available to provide epidemiologic consultation services with all categorical Departmental programs (including those responsible for infectious diseases, chronic diseases, community health, environmental/occupational health, and access to health care). Central to this surveillance effort is the Community Health Survey conducted annually with just under 10,000 randomly chosen New Yorkers to assess health risk factors citywide and by neighborhood and the Youth Risk Factor Survey conducted with over 8,000 public high school students in just under ninety high schools biannually.

=20

The City Research Scientist II will work with the Director of Surveys and the Assistant Commissioner of Health, to assure quality in survey design and implementation. This will involve a wide range of survey skills and general ability for project direction or substantial project support. Preference will be given to those with knowledge and skills in assisting with applied sampling, survey methodology, and data collection. Specific skills include sampling from lists, questionnaire design, procedures development, working with IRBs, monitoring contractors, and assisting other related departments and agencies with the same. It will also involve methodological analysis and research to reduce sources of sampling error, measurement error and response bias to assure quality, test new methods, and improve survey quality. There is also opportunity to participate in data analysis and report writing.

=20

QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS:

1. A doctorate degree from an accredited college or university with specialization in public health or survey research and one year of full-time experience in a survey research capacity in the appropriate field ; or
2. A master's degree from an accredited college or university with specialization in an appropriate field of social science, survey research or public health and three years of full-time experience in a survey research capacity ideally in health surveys; or
3. Education and/or experience which is equivalent to "1" or "2" above. However, all candidates must have a master's degree in an appropriate field of specialization and one year of full-time experience in a responsible survey research capacity as described in "2" above

=20

NOTE: NEW YORK CITY RESIDENCY IS REQUIRED

Respond only to email or regular mail with resume and cover letter to
(NO CALLS PLEASE):

Donna Eisenhower, Ph.D.

Director of Surveys

deisenho@health.nyc.gov

Department of Health and Mental Hygiene

125 Worth St Room 315, CN-6

New York, New York 10013

=20

>=20

=20

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Thu, 6 Apr 2006 11:52:27 +0100
Reply-To: Iain.NOBLE@DFES.GSI.GOV.UK
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Iain Noble <Iain.NOBLE@DFES.GSI.GOV.UK>
Subject: An alternative to RDD
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Silvio=20Berlusconi=20continues=20to=20be=20at=20the=20forefront=20of=20in=
novative
research=20techniques.=20This=20week,=20a=20Milan=20newspaper=20reported=20=
that=20he=20had
told=20a=20party=20meeting=20about=20a=20straw=20poll=20of=20sex=20chat=20=
lines=20he=20had
conducted=20during=20a=20sleepless=20night.=20"Seven=20out=20of=20nine=20o=
f=20the=20young
ladies=20who=20answered=20acknowledged=20they=20preferred=20me=20[to=20Mr=20=
Prodi], "=20he
was=20quoted=20as=20telling=20his=20followers.

Earlier in the campaign, he compared himself to Napoleon and then to Jesus.

Iain Noble

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept by MIMESweeper for the presence of computer viruses.

www.mimesweeper.com

The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intranet (GSi) virus scanning service supplied exclusively by Cable & Wireless in partnership with MessageLabs.

On leaving the GSi this email was certified virus-free

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

=====
Date: Thu, 6 Apr 2006 11:34:47 -0400
Reply-To: Kate Stewart <katestewart@brspoll.com>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Kate Stewart <katestewart@BRSPOLL.COM>
Organization: Belden, Russonello & Stewart
Subject: attitudes of people in other countries about US
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Comments: cc: Chris Jackson <chrisjackson@brspoll.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Hi all -- we are looking for surveys conducted in other countries about attitudes toward the US or Americans.

If folks have any insights please send them to Chris jackson at =
Chrisjackson@brspoll.com.

Thanks.

Kate Stewart
Belden Russonello & Stewart
1320 19th Street, Suite 700
WDC 20036
(w) 202-822-6090
(h) 301-270-8090=

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

=====
Date: Thu, 6 Apr 2006 12:07:58 -0400
Reply-To: JChandler@gc.cuny.edu
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Jamie P. Chandler" <JChandler@GC.CUNY.EDU>
Organization: graduate center
Subject: Re: attitudes of people in other countries about US
Comments: To: Kate Stewart <katestewart@brspoll.com>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <003f01c6598f\$a353a080\$1b01a8c0@Kate>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Pew Global Attitudes Project has some good data

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Kate Stewart
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2006 11:35 AM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: attitudes of people in other countries about US

Hi all -- we are looking for surveys conducted in other countries about
attitudes toward the US or Americans.

If folks have any insights please send them to Chris jackson at
Chrisjackson@brspoll.com.

Thanks.

Kate Stewart
Belden Russonello & Stewart
1320 19th Street, Suite 700
WDC 20036
(w) 202-822-6090
(h) 301-270-8090

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:

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

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

=====
Date: Thu, 6 Apr 2006 12:30:16 -0400

Reply-To: John Mitchell <john@BUZZBACK.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: John Mitchell <john@BUZZBACK.COM>

Subject: Re: attitudes of people in other countries about US

Comments: To: Kate Stewart <katestewart@brspoll.com>, Chrisjackson@brspoll.com, AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I have a couple of French sources.

France's CSA has an online collection of published polls. Apparently the most recent questions about the US were around the elections in 04.=20

<http://csa-fr.com/dataset/data2004/opi20041103a.htm>

Attitudes towards US (again, 2004)

<http://csa-fr.com/dataset/data2004/opi20040923b.htm>

Ipsos France also has an online library of published polls.

Here's a survey of attitudes toward the US, and towards political/social issues from mid '04 (with a very interesting juxtaposition of American attitudes toward the French or toward the same political/social issues)

<http://www.ipsos.fr/CanalIpsos/poll/7915.asp=20>

<http://www.ipsos.fr/CanalIpsos/poll/8060.asp>

This links to a general political poll from April '05 which includes attitudes about the US and globalization

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

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

Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2006 11:35 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: attitudes of people in other countries about US

Hi all -- we are looking for surveys conducted in other countries about attitudes toward the US or Americans.=20

If folks have any insights please send them to Chris Jackson at
Chrisjackson@brspoll.com.

Thanks.

Kate Stewart
Belden Russonello & Stewart
1320 19th Street, Suite 700
WDC 20036
(w) 202-822-6090
(h) 301-270-8090

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
<http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

=====
Date: Thu, 6 Apr 2006 13:49:42 -0400
Reply-To: skull@pipa.org
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Steven Kull <skull@PIPA.ORG>
Subject: Re: attitudes of people in other countries about US
Comments: To: Kate Stewart <katestewart@brspoll.com>,
AAPORNET@asu.edu, chrisjackson@brspoll.com
In-Reply-To: <003f01c6598f\$a353a080\$1b01a8c0@Kate>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Probably the most recent and comprehensive poll is a 35 nation poll done by PIPA and GlobeScan for BBC which asked whether the US is having a positive or negative influence in the world. It was conducted in Fall 2005 and includes 20 countries that were asked the same question in Fall 2004 as well. The poll also asked the same question about all of the major powers and Iran. By the way Iran was the one country that received more negative ratings than the US and Russia was not a lot better than the US. Japan and France were at the top of the list, though France has slipped a bit.

You can find all of this on the WorldPublicOpinion.org site at

http://www.worldpublicopinion.org/pipa/articles/views_on_countriesregions_bt/168.php?nid=&id=&pnt=168&lb=btvoc

Steven Kull

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Kate Stewart
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2006 11:35 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: attitudes of people in other countries about US

Hi all -- we are looking for surveys conducted in other countries about attitudes toward the US or Americans.

If folks have any insights please send them to Chris Jackson at Chrisjackson@brspoll.com.

Thanks.

Kate Stewart
Belden Russonello & Stewart
1320 19th Street, Suite 700
WDC 20036
(w) 202-822-6090
(h) 301-270-8090

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
<http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapor.net.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapor.net.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Thu, 6 Apr 2006 14:19:29 -0700
Reply-To: Jerold Pearson <jpearson@STANFORD.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jerold Pearson <jpearson@STANFORD.EDU>
Subject: Gag survey
Comments: To: por@vance.irss.unc.edu, aapor.net@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

A couple years ago, someone sent me a pretty funny gag survey about job satisfaction. It's a small executable file that asks if you're happy with your job, but it won't accept any answer except yes. If you try to click on "no," the image scoots across the screen.

Does anyone have this little file? I seem to have lost mine, and would appreciate it if someone could send it to me. Thanks.

Jerold Pearson, '75
Director of Market Research
Stanford Alumni Association
650-723-9186
<http://www.stanford.edu/~jpearson/>

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com
=====

Date: Fri, 7 Apr 2006 08:55:09 -0500
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: Job Opportunity
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Comments: cc: Martha.Om@warnerbros.com
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Posting Job Title - Director, Market Research

=20

Posting Job Description

=20

Warner Home Video Inc. seeks a Director, Market Research for the Marketing Services department. WHV seeks a Director of Market Research focusing on the Theatrical New Release and Theatrical Catalog DVD categories. Acting as a strategic business partner to internal clients, candidate effectively leverages consumer insight to identify opportunities and risks and provides clear, concise recommendations. Director will develop and manage all title specific research including Exit Studies, Title Tracking, Volume Forecasting, Copytesting, Package Testing and other Title and DVD Category research. Responsibilities include both primary and secondary research with a strong focus on quantitative research methodologies. Under the supervision of VP, the Director of Market Research is charged with providing the marketing team, and ultimately the organization, with information and analyses to support high-quality business decisions. Responsible for the development and management of all domestic market research projects on behalf of WHV Theatrical New Release and Theatrical Catalog categories. Oversee the design and implementation of market research studies. This includes activities such as supplier selection, study design and scope and project management to ensure that deliverables meet the needs of internal customers. Analyze and prepare reports of research findings. Respond to data requests and other related analysis requests from internal customers; assure high levels of confidence and reliability to results. Provide high level insights and compelling supporting rationale/analysis that are fully responsive to the Category's learning needs, doing so with fast turnaround, cost, and quality. Support ad hoc Title, Category and DVD market research requests on an as required basis. Delegate tactical and operational project components to available support staff. Develop proposed annual budget for assigned area of

responsibility, based on discussions with both internal customers about anticipated needs. Keep up with relevant secondary research sources such as syndicated research reports relevant to assigned area. Share results with stakeholders and clients as needed. Create, develop and maintain research databases as needed.=20

Requirements

BS/BA in related field required. MBA or PhD preferred. Five years of progressive Market Research experience required. Substantial quantitative and qualitative research experience. Strong quantitative background. Managerial/Supervisory experience preferred. A strong understanding and knowledge of the entertainment industry desirable. Research experience at a Studio or with an entertainment-based research vendor. Experience managing diverse personalities in a fast-paced creative environment. Have demonstrable problem solving and independent decision making skills. Be able to meet specific deadlines while balancing multiple projects and priorities. Strong organizational and excellent project management skills in a fast-paced, deadline driven environment. Proficiency in Microsoft Office including Word, Excel and PowerPoint.

=20

About our Company

=20

Warner Bros. is a division of Time Warner, Inc. which is a \$39 Billion Dollar Media Company (the largest media company in the world). In terms of revenues, Warner Bros. Home Entertainment 2004 Sales were \$2.9 Billion. Our competitors for 2004: Universal Home Entertainment- \$1.9B, Disney/Buena Vista Home Entertainment- \$2.2B, 20th Century Fox Home Entertainment - \$1.8B, Sony Pictures Home Entertainment-\$2.2B.

=20

Warner Home Video is currently #1 in terms of market share, as it has been for the past 8 years. We currently hold 20% of the market, which means 1 out of every five DVD's sold in a Warner Brothers DVD. Home Video is Warner Bros the largest division in terms of revenues for the studio.

=20

Some of our latest successes: Million Dollar Baby, Batman, Wedding Crashers, Sex and The City, Sopranos, Charlie and the Chocolate Factory, 2001's top-grossing Harry Potter and the Sorcerer's Stone (positioned to be one of the 5 top selling DVD/videos of all time!), Austin Powers, Ocean's Twelve, My Big Fat Greek Wedding, and Lord of the Rings, to name a few.

=20

This is a full time position

To apply, please submit your resume to:

=20

Martha K. Om

Martha.om@warnerbros.com

www.wbjobs.com

=20

=20

=20

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
EARLY REGISTRATION DEADLINE APRIL 10th!
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Fri, 7 Apr 2006 11:07:14 -0400
Reply-To: "Kotler-Berkowitz, Laurence" <Laurence.Kotler-Berkowitz@UJC.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Kotler-Berkowitz, Laurence" <Laurence.Kotler-Berkowitz@UJC.ORG>
Subject: Multi-wave web surveys
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

My agency is looking for companies that can host multi-wave web surveys of closed populations with known email addresses, with a unique identifier to link respondents across the waves. Please respond off-list to laurence.kotler-berkowitz@ujc.org.
Thank you.

Laurence Kotler-Berkowitz, Ph.D.
Director, Research and Analysis
United Jewish Communities
e: laurence.kotler-berkowitz@ujc.org
p: 212.284.6578
f: 212.284.6805
www.ujc.org and www.ujc.org/njps

Live Generously.(r) It does a world of good.

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
EARLY REGISTRATION DEADLINE APRIL 10th!
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com
=====

Date: Fri, 7 Apr 2006 17:22:19 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Doing the Frug
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Tom Guterbock alerted me to this op-ed piece and tells me that he has written a letter to the editor condemning this practice as Associate Standards Chair.

Grand Old Preying

By David S. Holland
Thursday, April 6, 2006; A29
http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/04/05/AR2006040501953_pf.html

Political fundraising solicitations cater to the lowest common denominator, a fact with which everyone other than those in the lowest common denominator will probably agree. Recently, however, I received a solicitation that might give pause to even the lowest common denominator.

The solicitation was from the Republican side of the aisle, but Democrats should not feel too superior: Their communications are certainly not aimed at rocket scientists. Still, this particular Republican effort sets a new low.

SNIP

A characteristic of low-life solicitations, both political and otherwise, is an official, government-like look. The theory apparently is that the more the thing looks like an official communique from the government, the greater the response from the more trusting members of the populace. Aunt Maude sees the official-looking envelope and thinks, "Oh, the government needs my help." The fact that the more trusting members of the populace are likely to be old, gullible and financially

strapped doesn't seem to bother too many consciences.

Dole's solicitation certainly looks official. In the upper left corner is an official-looking American eagle. In white letters over a black bar above the address window is "U.S. INDIVIDUAL RESIDENT." In the bottom left corner is "Form 1163 (2006) Return Enclosed." Aunt Maude's hands are already shaking.

Stamped in red and black on the upper right corner of the covering letter is the imposing label "Registration#: 54.93.252." The letter starts off: "Your immediate attention is required on a confidential and time-sensitive matter." And then, "Enclosed, please find your official SURVEY DOCUMENT -- REGISTERED in your name only -- assigned to you as a REPRESENTATIVE of ALL REPUBLICANS living in your voting district." By now, Aunt Maude is in a sweat.

SNIP

The document has 28 questions ranging from the innocuous, "Do you think we should fix the federal tax code so that it is simpler and fairer?" (go ahead, Maude, check no), to the real gist of the matter: "Will you help continue to build a strong foundation of Republican grassroots support for President Bush and his agenda by making a generous contribution to the NRSC today?"

And then comes the insult to the intellect of even the lowest common denominator. Aunt Maude has three choices. She can check "YES!" she wants to help defend the Republican Senate Majority with a contribution of \$500, or several lesser alternatives. She can check "No," she does not wish to participate in "this vital Republican Senate Leadership Survey," but she does want to give a generous donation of \$500, or several lesser alternatives, to "help build Republican grassroots support for President Bush and his agenda."

Or she can claim membership in the group below the lowest common denominator by checking No: "I do not wish to participate in the Survey, nor do I wish to make a donation to help the Republican Party. I am returning my Survey Document, along with a contribution of \$11 to help cover the cost of tabulating and redistributing my Survey."

Two questions. First, how was the odd figure of \$11 determined? Second, Aunt Maude, you're really not gonna send them \$11, are you?

The writer lives in Alexandria. He unsuccessfully sought the Democratic nomination for a congressional seat from Northern Virginia in 1984.

(c) 2006 The Washington Post Company

--=20

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

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
EARLY REGISTRATION DEADLINE APRIL 10th!
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com
=====

Date: Fri, 7 Apr 2006 18:20:54 -0400
Reply-To: Claire Durand <Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Claire Durand <Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA>
Subject: Quebec chronicle no. 2
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Hi,

This is going to be my crash crash course in history before coming back to=
=20
modern Montreal in my next chronicle.

So, what was Daniel Boone=92s real name? He was a Daniel Beaulne, Beaulne=
=20
being a typical Acadian name. In fact, you may be yourself part French and=
=20
you don=92t know. It is estimated that between 20 and 31 million Americans=
=20
are of French Canadian origin. Among them, people named Bush (originally=20
Boucher), Carter (Cartier), Fairfield (Beauchamp), Burke (Bourque), Willard=
=20
(Ouellet) and evidently all those who have a real French Canadian name like=
=20
a Mr Aubry who has been mayor of San Francisco and Toussaint Charbonneau=20
who guided the Lewis and Clark expedition to the West with his Indian wife=
=20
Sacagawea.
If you know the U.S. well, you also know that the motto of Minnesota is in=
=20
French : L=92=E9toile du Nord. Go see the flag at=20
<http://www.50states.com/flag/mnflag.htm>.

And there are also the French Canadian names you all know, Morin,=20
Tourangeau, Marquis, etc. How do we know that these names are of French=20
canadian origin? Well, only 5,000 French people came to North America and=20
stayed after the British conquest. And after the conquest, for almost 200=
=20
years, there were almost no immigration coming to the French Canadian=20
society (Immigrants would integrate into the English community). So, here=20
is a country where the number of different family names is very restricted=
=20
and lots of people have the same first and second name. In fact, it is not=

=20
rare to have Faculty working in the same university with the same name. So=
=20
we recognize =93our=94 names everywhere we see them...

If you live in parts of the United States where there are many American=20
Indians, particularly in the Midwest, you may notice a substantial presence=
=20
of French Family names. This is because the French were very rapidly=20
outnumbered by the British in North America. So they had to make=20
allies. And their allies were the Indians. In fact it is said that when=20
the British conquered Quebec City in 1760, it was difficult to=20
differentiate the French from the Indians. This followed Champlain=92s=20
vision : In his speech to an Indian chief in 1609, he said =93Our sons will=
=20
marry your daughters and we will create a new people=94. This was =93before=
=20
the invention of race=94 as the sociologists say. So this to say that =96=
and=20
it has been forgotten now =96 the beginning of the colonization of North=20
America followed, on the French side, a Metis vision. A metis people in=20
fact developed with its own language called mischief, living in Western=20
Ontario and Manitoba, where the verbs were in Cree and the nouns and=20
adjectives in French. This explains in part why women here are considered=
=20
more assertive than in France, for example. The French who immigrated here=
=20
were much influenced by Indian society which was a matriarchal society,=20
with women having a much more important place in society than in the=20
European societies of that time.

At some point, North America was under French rule from Acadia to=20
Louisiana. What happened? The French colony was established by fur=20
traders who would travel all over the place. But trade needs peace and at=
=20
that time, Indian tribes were always at war with each other. The French=20
initiated the =93Great Peace of Montreal=94 in 1701, a treaty signed by all=
the=20
Indian nations. Everything looked fine for the French and, with the help=20
of their Indian friends, they could beat the British, confined in the East=
=20
at that time. But then, in a few years, the Indian tribes were completely=
=20
decimated by diseases brought by the Europeans. Whole tribes of 30,000=20
almost completely disappeared. Without their Indian allies, the French=20
could not resist for long. The British finally attacked Acadia and then=20
Quebec City. Promised help from France never came. France preferred the=20
spices from Martinique... I say that this is when French cuisine was=20
born! The French elite left and let the ordinary people behind under=20
British rule. It is said that the deal made at that time was that , in=20
exchange for our cooperation, we could keep our language, our religion, our=
=20
civil code and... we would never be asked to fight in British wars, which=20
may explain a bit the pacifist tendency here.

I end this short history course by a final information. How come the descendants of 5000 people end up being that many? This is because of the revenge of the crib. The clergy, afraid that we would disappear as a catholic and French society, incited people to have as many kids as possible. This meant that, till the 1960's, families of 10 to 20 kids were normal here. Small families had 6 to 8 kids.. But since there was not enough land for all these people, about one million of them emigrate to the U.S. (Mostly New England) to work in the factories between 1840 and 1930. However, in 1960, Quebec finally entered the modern era with what was called the Quiet revolution and Quebec became in a few years the western society that had the lowest birth rate.

For those interested in the presence of French people in the Lewis and Clark expedition:
(see the following <http://www.vehiculepress.com/vaugeois.html>).

And the first novel written in America is by a woman Frances Brooke who wrote "The History of Emily Montagu". The novel is considered one of the first feminist novel. It is a description of the society of Quebec City, two years after the British conquest. Mrs Brooke is the wife of a protestant minister who came to Quebec City for a few years.

Next chronicle, back to Montreal in 2006. Outdoor activities in Montreal, what about kayaking downtown, a few blocks from your hotel?

Claire Durand

Link for AAPOR Montreal Conference:

=
<<https://www.webdepot.umontreal.ca/Usagers/durandc/MonDepotPublic>><https://www.webdepot.umontreal.ca/Usagers/durandc/MonDepotPublic>

professeur titulaire et directrice des études supérieures
<http://www.mapageweb.umontreal.ca/durandc>
Département de sociologie,
Université de Montréal
C.P. 6128, succ. Centre-ville,
Montréal, H3C 3J7

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
EARLY REGISTRATION DEADLINE APRIL 10th!
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Sun, 9 Apr 2006 14:42:07 -0500
Reply-To: Diane O'Rourke <DOroureke@SRL.UIC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Diane O'Rourke <DOroureke@SRL.UIC.EDU>
Subject: 9th Conference on Health Survey Research Methods - Call for Papers
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable
Content-disposition: inline

The Ninth Conference on Health Survey Research Methods (CHSRM) will continue the series that began in 1975 to discuss new, innovative survey research methods that improve the quality of health survey data. The CHSRM will bring together researchers from various disciplines who are at the forefront of survey methods research, who are responsible for major health surveys, and who use survey data to develop health policy. This call seeks abstracts for original empirical studies, innovative theoretical essays, and general overview papers that describe research beyond what is currently known about survey methods and their application to health-related issues using the following topics as general guidelines:

TOPIC 1: The Relationship between Survey Participants and Survey Researchers

TOPIC 2: Challenges of Collecting Survey-based Biomarker and Genetic Data

TOPIC 3: Emergency Preparedness and Surveillance

TOPIC 4: Tradeoffs in Health Survey Design

TOPIC 5: Measurement Error and Health Disparities

The CHSRM Proceedings will be published. Proceedings from the last three conferences are located at <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/products/pubs/pubd/other/miscpub/miscpub.htm> (scroll down to Health Survey Research Methods).

CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE:

Attendance will be limited to approximately 90 invited individuals who will present papers, chair sessions, discuss presentations and the state of knowledge in specific areas, and serve as rapporteurs. To have a paper considered, send a 500- to 1,000-word abstract (in Word document form) to Kris Hertenstein, at krish@srl.uic.edu, no later than August 1, 2006. Final selection of papers will be made in mid-September.

The conference will be held in March 2007 (March 2-5, 23-26, or March 30-April 2), beginning on Friday evening and continuing through Monday morning. It will most likely be conducted at the Wyndham Peachtree Conference Center, Peachtree City (suburban Atlanta), Georgia. Lodging, meals, and most travel expenses will be covered for all invited participants.

s who are not federal employees. All participants must be present for the =
entire conference. For further information, go to <http://www.srl.uic.edu/hs=rm.htm>=20

Diane O'Rourke
Survey Research Laboratory
University of Illinois
505 E. Green St., Suite 3, MC-442
Champaign IL 61820
217-333-7170 (office)
217-244-4408 (fax)
217-840-7180 (mobile)

EARLY REGISTRATION DEADLINE APRIL 10th!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Mon, 10 Apr 2006 10:54:47 -0400
Reply-To: James Ellis <jmellis@VCU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: James Ellis <jmellis@VCU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Doing the Frug
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To:
<3248A9B21DD5574785FE5E2C8E5216844567FB@exchange.local.artsience.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I'm pretty sure I saved my copy of this "survey" that I received from Elizabeth Dole. I also noted the rather constrained field of choices that was offered to the recipient regarding degree of his/her support. I think I also saved a similar "survey" I received a few days later from Bill Frist, but I'm not sure about that one. The first "survey" that I recall receiving with the processing fee come-on was a year or two ago from the National Rifle Association. The questions on these things are bad jokes. They are quite obviously all about frugging and nothing but frugging. Why is it that those who are engaged in certain fields of human endeavor are simply expected to lie as part of the deal, and those who believe the lies are the ones who receive the ridicule or censure rather than those who perpetrate the lies?

Jim Ellis
Virginia Commonwealth University

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta
Sent: Friday, April 07, 2006 5:22 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Doing the Frug

Tom Guterbock alerted me to this op-ed piece and tells me that he has

written a letter to the editor condemning this practice as Associate Standards Chair.

Grand Old Preying

By David S. Holland

Thursday, April 6, 2006; A29

http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/04/05/AR2006040501953_pf.html

Political fundraising solicitations cater to the lowest common denominator, a fact with which everyone other than those in the lowest common denominator will probably agree. Recently, however, I received a solicitation that might give pause to even the lowest common denominator.

The solicitation was from the Republican side of the aisle, but Democrats should not feel too superior: Their communications are certainly not aimed at rocket scientists. Still, this particular Republican effort sets a new low.

SNIP

A characteristic of low-life solicitations, both political and otherwise, is an official, government-like look. The theory apparently is that the more the thing looks like an official communique from the government, the greater the response from the more trusting members of the populace. Aunt Maude sees the official-looking envelope and thinks, "Oh, the government needs my help." The fact that the more trusting members of the populace are likely to be old, gullible and financially strapped doesn't seem to bother too many consciences.

Dole's solicitation certainly looks official. In the upper left corner is an official-looking American eagle. In white letters over a black bar above the address window is "U.S. INDIVIDUAL RESIDENT." In the bottom left corner is "Form 1163 (2006) Return Enclosed." Aunt Maude's hands are already shaking.

Stamped in red and black on the upper right corner of the covering letter is the imposing label "Registration#: 54.93.252." The letter starts off: "Your immediate attention is required on a confidential and time-sensitive matter." And then, "Enclosed, please find your official SURVEY DOCUMENT -- REGISTERED in your name only -- assigned to you as a REPRESENTATIVE of ALL REPUBLICANS living in your voting district." By now, Aunt Maude is in a sweat.

SNIP

The document has 28 questions ranging from the innocuous, "Do you think we should fix the federal tax code so that it is simpler and fairer?" (go ahead, Maude, check no), to the real gist of the matter: "Will you help continue to build a strong foundation of Republican grassroots

support for President Bush and his agenda by making a generous contribution to the NRSC today?"

And then comes the insult to the intellect of even the lowest common denominator. Aunt Maude has three choices. She can check "YES!" she wants to help defend the Republican Senate Majority with a contribution of \$500, or several lesser alternatives. She can check "No," she does not wish to participate in "this vital Republican Senate Leadership Survey," but she does want to give a generous donation of \$500, or several lesser alternatives, to "help build Republican grassroots support for President Bush and his agenda."

Or she can claim membership in the group below the lowest common denominator by checking No: "I do not wish to participate in the Survey, nor do I wish to make a donation to help the Republican Party. I am returning my Survey Document, along with a contribution of \$11 to help cover the cost of tabulating and redistributing my Survey."

Two questions. First, how was the odd figure of \$11 determined? Second, Aunt Maude, you're really not gonna send them \$11, are you?

The writer lives in Alexandria. He unsuccessfully sought the Democratic nomination for a congressional seat from Northern Virginia in 1984.

(c) 2006 The Washington Post Company

--

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

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:

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

EARLY REGISTRATION DEADLINE APRIL 10th!

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

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

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

EARLY REGISTRATION DEADLINE APRIL 10th!

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

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

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Mon, 10 Apr 2006 12:44:35 -0500

Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>

Subject: PublicOpinionPros

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

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

Dear AAPOR members -

=20

The April issue of Public Opinion Pros is now available on our website
at

=20

www.PublicOpinionPros.com

=20

This month features two youth-oriented articles: one on survey findings revealing how today's young people express their concept of citizenship, and the second a look into the thoughts of college students from the United States and the Middle East as they discuss their respective views on terrorism. Also featured is an op-ed on the value of apathy (for anyone who cares), and the second part of our three-part series reporting findings from the "Memory of the Holocaust" study. Finally, the Roper Center reports in on its part in the Data-PASS project, a major undertaking whose goal is to locate and preserve as many survey datasets as possible for the benefit of present and future researchers.

=20

As usual, commentary "From the Editor" can be accessed by nonsubscribers
at

=20

http://www.publicopinionpros.com/from_editor/2006/apr/editor.asp

=20

Author guidelines are also available to anyone interested in writing for
POP at

=20

<http://www.publicopinionpros.com/submit/2006/apr/submit.asp>

=20

We look forward to hearing from you!

=20

Thanks and best wishes -

=20

Lisa

=20

Lisa Ferraro Parmelee, Ph.D.

Manager, LFP Editorial Enterprises, LLC

Editor, Public Opinion Pros

www.PublicOpinionPros.com=20

=20

=20

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
EARLY REGISTRATION DEADLINE APRIL 10th!
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Mon, 10 Apr 2006 15:47:49 -0400
Reply-To: "Guerino, Paul" <PGuerino@AIR.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Guerino, Paul" <PGuerino@AIR.ORG>
Subject: Preteens and the strength of agreement
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Has anyone run into the problem of preteens having difficulty assessing the difference between "strongly (dis)agree" and "(dis)agree"? We received word from our interviewer debriefings that this was a problem but are unsure of how serious the problem is. Your experiences and/or references would be greatly appreciated.=20

To limit postings on the listserv, please reply directly to me and I'll post a summary email later this week.=20

Thanks so much for your help.=20

Paul Guerino
Survey Methodologist
Federal Statistics Program
American Institutes for Research
1990 K St NW, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20006

(202) 403-6525

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
EARLY REGISTRATION DEADLINE APRIL 10th!
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Wed, 12 Apr 2006 12:00:51 -0400
Reply-To: Dave Howell <dahowell@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Dave Howell <dahowell@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
Subject: CSES Announcement: a new advance release of CSES Module 2 is now available

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Dear AAPORnet members,

It was suggested to me that the below announcement might be useful to post to the AAPOR list. Data from the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES) is a public good. CSES datasets are available for download at no cost and without embargo from the CSES website (www.cses.org) for anyone who wishes to make use of them. The current release of our second module includes data from 32 election studies in 30 countries. Please let us know if you have any questions.

Best wishes,
-Dave

David Howell
Director of Studies
American National Election Studies (ANES) and
Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES)

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

Sent: Tuesday, April 11, 2006 9:56 AM
To: CSES User Community
Subject: CSES Announcement: a new advance release of CSES Module 2 is now available

Dear CSES User Community,

A new version of CSES Module 2 is now available for download. This version (April 10, 2006) is the fourth advance release, and the last version prior to the full release that is scheduled for sometime in 2007.

This version includes six new election studies: Canada 2004, Great Britain 2005 (1st), Japan 2004, Netherlands 2002, Philippines 2004, and Portugal 2005. The release contains 32 election studies in all.

In addition to adding the new studies, many improvements were made to the documentation and data for countries that appeared in the last advance release. All previous errata have been applied to the new release.

To download the new file, go to the CSES website (www.cses.org) and select "Data Center" to the left on the main page. After that, register if you have not done so already. Then click on the "CSES Module 2: 2001-2006" link for either the United States site or the European mirror site - whichever location is nearest to you. The next page that comes up contains a link to download the dataset to your local computer. If you have questions, please email us at "cses@umich.edu".

We would like to thank our collaborators, user community, Planning Committee, hosts, and funding organizations for their continued support of the CSES project!

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Wed, 12 Apr 2006 12:57:14 -0400
Reply-To: "DeBell, Matthew" <MDeBell@AIR.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "DeBell, Matthew" <MDeBell@AIR.ORG>
Subject: National Household Education Surveys Program training announcement
Comments: To: AAPOR List <aapornet@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Please forward this announcement to colleagues and graduate students who might be interested an opportunity for free training in the use of survey data on educational activities. =20

=20

NHES Training Announcement

=20

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) is sponsoring a 3-day advanced studies seminar on the use of the National Household Education Surveys Program (NHES) datasets. NHES is a series of surveys that provides descriptive data on the educational activities of the U.S. population, from early childhood to adult education, and offers policymakers, researchers, and educators a variety of statistics on topics including homeschooling, school choice, child care, and adult education. These data are collected through telephone interviews with individual parents, youth, and adults.

=20

The overall goal of the seminar is to provide participants with an opportunity to use NHES data in substantive research. For more information about NHES, visit the survey website (<http://nces.ed.gov/nhes>).

=20

When: July 12-14, 2006

Where: Washington, D.C.

Cost: Free. Travel, hotel, and per diem expenses are paid by the U.S. Department of Education. =20

Application deadline: May 30. =20

=20

For more information about the training, and to apply, see=20

<http://nces.ed.gov/whatsnew/conferences/confinfo.asp?confid=3D120>=20

=20

Information on other NCES workshops and trainings is available at <http://nces.ed.gov/whatsnew/conferences/> .

=20

=20

--

Matthew DeBell, Ph.D.

Research Analyst

Federal Statistics Program

American Institutes for Research

1990 K St, NW, Suite 500

Washington, DC 20006

202-403-6503

mdbell@air.org=20

=20

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Wed, 12 Apr 2006 20:27:56 -0700
Reply-To: Rita Langteau <rlangteau@MN.RR.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Rita Langteau <rlangteau@MN.RR.COM>
Subject: Montreal ROOMMATE wanted

I am looking for an AAPOR roommate (female) who is interested in sharing expenses. (Non-smoker, please.) I have a double room booked at the Marriot Chateau Champlain from Wednesday, May 17 through Sunday, May 21. Please contact me directly at: lang0647@umn.edu

Thanks!

Rita Langteau

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Thu, 13 Apr 2006 10:41:02 -0400
Reply-To: Colleen Porter <CPORTER@DENTAL.UFL.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Colleen Porter <CPORTER@DENTAL.UFL.EDU>
Subject: Surveys about breast self-exam among women of Asian heritage
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
Content-disposition: inline

Folks:

A colleague asked me if I knew of any surveys targetted to Asian American women regarding breast self-exams, or even a source of data that could be sliced to provide information on Asian women (which I appreciate is not the same thing as a survey designed to be culturally competent among women of Asian descent).

Here in Florida we are strong on Hispanics and Haitians, but Asians are a weak point--I would appreciate any input.

Many thanks,
Colleen

PLEASE NOTE NEW CONTACT INFO
Colleen K. Porter
Research Program Manager (Pain Lab)
University of Florida College of Dentistry

Community Dentistry and Behavioral Science
1329 SW 16th St. (1329 Bldg.), Ste. 5180
PO Box 103628
Gainesville, Florida 32610-3628
(352) 273-5979, phone
(352) 273-5985, fax
cporter@dental.ufl.edu

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Thu, 13 Apr 2006 10:58:21 -0500
Reply-To: Michael Richarme <mrichar@DECISIONANALYST.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Michael Richarme <mrichar@DECISIONANALYST.COM>
Subject: Research in Latin America
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=UTF-8
Content-transfer-encoding: base64

R29vZCBtb3JuaW5nLCBhbGwsDQogDQpJIHdvdWxkIGJIIGludGVyZXN0ZWQgaW4gbGVhcm5pbmVmcg
b2YgYW55IHJlY29tbWVuZGF0aW9ucyBvciBzb3VyY2VzIGZvcjBjb25kdWN0aW5nIHJlc2VhcmNo
IGluIExhdGluIEFtZXJpY2EuDQogDQpJIGRpZCBmaW5kIGVzIGZvcjBjb25kdWN0aW5nIHJlc2VhcmNo
aGUgc3ViamVjdCwgaGVsZCB0aGlzIGNvbWluZyBkdW5lIDYtNyBhdCB0aGUgSG90ZWwgSW50ZXJD
b250aW5lbnRhbCBpbiBNaWftaS4NCiANCiRoYW5rcyBpbiBhZHZhbmNlIGZvcjB5b3VyIGludGVy
ZXN0IGFuZCBzdXBwb3J0LiAgSSBsb29rIGZvcndhcmQgdG8gc2VlaW5nIG1hbnkgb2YgeW91IGlu
IE1vbnRyZWVzLg0KIA0KTWljaGFibCBSaWN0YXJtZQ0KIA0K

Date: Thu, 13 Apr 2006 12:36:13 -0400
Reply-To: skull@pipa.org
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Steven Kull <skull@PIPA.ORG>
Subject: Re: Research in Latin America
Comments: To: Michael Richarme <mrichar@DECISIONANALYST.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <09CBE43D04122244956DA0463E25FB2D02C3E152@daimail2.daihome.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

If you are interested in seeing what recent studies have been conducted in Latin America you may want to look on the WorldPublicOpinion.org site at this address.

<http://www.worldpublicopinion.org/pipa/articles/brlatinamericara/index.php?n id=&id=&lb=brla>

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Michael Richarme
Sent: Thursday, April 13, 2006 11:58 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Research in Latin America

Good morning, all,

I would be interested in learning of any recommendations or sources for conducting research in Latin America.

I did find a CASRO conference on the subject, held this coming June 6-7 at the Hotel InterContinental in Miami.

Thanks in advance for your interest and support. I look forward to seeing many of you in Montreal.

Michael Richarme

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

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

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

=====
Date: Thu, 13 Apr 2006 10:38:43 -0600

Reply-To: Ron Riley <ron@CHANNELM2.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Ron Riley <ron@CHANNELM2.COM>

Subject: Re: Research in Latin America

Comments: To: Michael Richarme <mrichar@DECISIONANALYST.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu

In-Reply-To: <09CBE43D04122244956DA0463E25FB2D02C3E152@daimail2.daihome.com>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Ms. Astrid Velasquez
Nodo Research
Mexico City
011.5255.5254.4010, x107

Qual and quantitative. They know the cultures cold and create rich, contextual study designs. Excellent strategic thinkers. Nice people, too.

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

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

Sent: Thursday, April 13, 2006 9:58 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Research in Latin America

Good morning, all,

I would be interested in learning of any recommendations or sources for conducting research in Latin America.

I did find a CASRO conference on the subject, held this coming June 6-7 at

the Hotel InterContinental in Miami.

Thanks in advance for your interest and support. I look forward to seeing many of you in Montreal.

Michael Richarme

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com
=====

Date: Thu, 13 Apr 2006 13:08:32 -0400
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Subject: Re: Research in Latin America
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <[050b01c65f18\\$62136590\\$6601a8c0@steve](mailto:050b01c65f18$62136590$6601a8c0@steve)>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Steven Kull wrote:

>If you are interested in seeing what recent studies have been conducted in
>Latin America you may want to look on the WorldPublicOpinion.org site at
>this address.
>
><http://www.worldpublicopinion.org/pipa/articles/brlatinamericara/index.php?n>
>[id=&id=&lb=brla](http://www.worldpublicopinion.org/pipa/articles/brlatinamericara/index.php?n)

Maybe you missed my query from last week. I'd be grateful for a comment.

Doug

At 10:56 AM -0400 4/5/06, Doug Henwood wrote:

>A PIPA survey that was released in January is getting renewed
>attention because it found low approval for free-market capitalism
>in France - lower than in China. That inspired me to take a look at
>some of the details.

>According to the release:

>> A new poll of 20 countries from around the world finds a
>>striking global consensus that the free market economic system is
>>best, but that governments should also do more to regulate large
>>companies. In all but one country polled, a majority or plurality
>>agreed with the statement that "the free enterprise system and free
>>market economy is the best system on which to base the future of
>>the world." On average, 61% agreed while 28% disagreed. The poll of

>>20,791 individuals was conducted by the international polling firm
>>GlobeScan and analyzed in conjunction with the Program on
>>International Policy Attitudes (PIPA) of the University of Maryland.
>> Ironically, the country that showed the highest level of support
>>for the free enterprise system was China, with 74% agreeing that it
>>is the best system. Others that were nearly as enthusiastic were
>>the Philippines (73%), the US (71%), and India (70%).

>
>But a look at the methodology
><http://65.109.167.118/pipa/pdf/jan06/FreeMarkets_Jan06_quaire.pdf>
>shows that in China, India, and the Philippines, the survey was
>restricted to urban areas. That's ludicrous in countries that are
>predominantly to heavily rural - the sample for India, for example,
>covers 5% of the population. And in China, the poll was done by
>phone, which almost certainly rules out coverage of the poor and
>working class.

>
>Can we take the results of a poll like this seriously?

>
>
>--

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

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

>
>producer, Behind the News
>Thursdays, 5-6 PM, WBAI, New York 99.5 FM
><<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Radio.html>>
>podcast: <<http://shout.lbo-talk.org/lbo/RadioArchive/2005/dircaster.php>>

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Thu, 13 Apr 2006 15:53:08 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Canada- Public Opinion Research Industry Responds to Federal
Accountability Act

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

TORONTO, April 11 /CNW/ - The Marketing Research and Intelligence Association (MRIA) responded today to the Government of Canada's Federal Accountability Act, as it relates to procurement of public opinion research.

"We fully endorse the government's initiative to strengthen and enhance its procurement process," said Nik Nanos, MRIA President. "Our industry has worked with the federal government for many years to improve procurement rules for public opinion research. The result has been better value for Canadians and a better process for our industry."

SNIP

Changes introduced by the Government in recent years to increase the transparency of the research procurement process have reflected the recommendations of MRIA and its predecessor Associations. These enhancements have included a requirement that all Government survey projects be registered with MRIA's Canadian Survey Registration System. The System tracks registered research projects being conducted in Canada and allows members of the public, through a toll-free number (1-800-554-9996), to verify their legitimacy. Other changes have included a revamp of the government's contracting tools to allow for more flexibility and transparency.

"These changes have gone a long way in opening up competition for government research projects to a broader scope of companies," Mr. Nanos said.

Market and survey research provides an essential tool in the development of new programs, services, and policies for the benefit of Canadians, and in measuring satisfaction levels of government programs.

SNIP

--=20

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

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Thu, 13 Apr 2006 17:03:47 -0400
Reply-To: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>
Subject: Re: Research in Latin America
Comments: To: Michael Richarme <mrichar@DECISIONANALYST.COM>
Comments: cc: JORGE GARCIA-GONZALEZ <jorgegg@jggconsulting.com>, Jorge Garcia Gonzalez <info@jggconsulting.com>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <09CBE43D04122244956DA0463E25FB2D02C3E152@daimail2.daihome.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1; format=flowed;
x-avg-checked=avg-ok-4AC23BA7
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

You might want to contact:

Jorge Garc=EDa-Gonz=Ellez & Ass.
Marketing Performance Improvement
Av. Pueyrred=F3n 2449 - Piso 11
C1119ACH Buenos Aires
Argentina
Tel. + 54 11 4421 8876
e-mail: jorgegg@jggconsulting.com
www.jggconsulting.com

At 11:58 AM 4/13/2006, you wrote:

>Good morning, all,
>
>I would be interested in learning of any=20
>recommendations or sources for conducting research in Latin America.
>
>I did find a CASRO conference on the subject,=20
>held this coming June 6-7 at the Hotel InterContinental in Miami.
>
>Thanks in advance for your interest and=20
>support. I look forward to seeing many of you in Montreal.
>
>Michael Richarme
>

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Thu, 13 Apr 2006 18:15:33 -0400

Reply-To: Nancy Belden <nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nancy Belden <nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM>
Subject: Memorial at AAPOR Conference
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

AAPOR Members:

I hope you will be able to join me at a gathering to remember our recently departed friends, to be held Friday evening, before dinner, during the AAPOR Annual Conference. Currently the names of members of our organization and field who have died since last spring and whom I am aware of include these:

Lester Robert Frankel
Steve Salmore
Paul Perry
Joe Belden
Leo Bogart

If you know of someone else who should be included, please let me know. Also if you would like to plan to say a few words about any of these, drop me an email or give me a call. Finally, any images of these folks that you can send electronically would be great. Thank you and I am looking forward to seeing you all. -- Nancy

Nancy Belden
Past President, American Association for Public Opinion Research
1320 19th Street NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
202.822.6090

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapor.net.html> .
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapor.net-request@asu.edu
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Fri, 14 Apr 2006 08:39:04 -0400
Reply-To: Richard Clark <clark@CVIOG.UGA.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Richard Clark <clark@CVIOG.UGA.EDU>
Subject: Southern Association for Public Opinion Research (SAPOR)
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Comments: cc: Kelly Foster <kfoster@cviog.uga.edu>, helton@rti.org
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

A call for papers:

From: Helton, Melissa
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2006 4:51 PM
To: Helton, Melissa
Subject: Southern Association for Public Opinion Research (SAPOR)

/ /*/Southern Association for Public Opinion Research/*

/25^th Annual Conference///

October 5 & 6, 2006

University Club

North Carolina State University

Raleigh, North Carolina

*Proposals for papers or presentations are invited in all areas of opinion and survey research, including public opinion, international opinion research, electoral behavior, the media, political communication, market research and consumer behavior, group differences in attitudes, evaluation research, applied sampling, questionnaire design, survey methodology, focus groups, web-based surveys, computer-assisted interviewing, field-based studies, and alternative approaches to public opinion research. Graduate student participation is welcome. *

* *

Depending on the topics submitted there will be up to five sessions. Please contact the Conference Chair to indicate your willingness to serve as a discussant for one of these sessions. */We are also seeking topics of interest (as well as volunteers) for one or two roundtable discussions. Please contact the Conference Chair with your ideas and potential panelists. These roundtables offer a less formal venue in which to discuss current issues in public opinion research./**/*

* *

Please submit via e-mail or regular mail your proposal or abstract of no more than 300 words by June 30, 2006 to SAPOR Conference Committee Chair:

* *

Melissa Helton

RTI International

3040 Cornwallis Rd

*PO Box** 12194***

*Research Triangle Park**, NC 27709***

E-mail: helton@rti.org

Phone: 919-541-7168

* *

Make sure that proposal includes the name, mailing address, telephone number, and e-mail address of the principal author.

We hope to see you in October.

Melissa Helton
Survey Director
RTI International
3040 Cornwallis Rd.
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709
919-541-7168

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <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: Fri, 14 Apr 2006 10:22:32 -0500
Reply-To: ALLAN L MCCUTCHEON <amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: ALLAN L MCCUTCHEON <amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU>
Subject: Marriott AAPOR Rooms Sold Out
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Hi All,

I just spoke with the Marriott reservations, and was informed that the AAPOR/WAPOR room block is sold out, except for the night of May 18.

Best,
Allan McCutcheon

--
Donald O. Clifton Chair of Survey Science
Director, UNL-Gallup Research Center
Survey Research and Methodology Graduate Program

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <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: Fri, 14 Apr 2006 11:35:10 -0400
Reply-To: Nancy Belden <nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nancy Belden <nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM>
Subject: Joe Waksberg
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Thank you to the many of you who have reminded me that Joe Waksberg should be added to the list of friends we have lost this year. I am sure several of you will have fond and interesting remembrances to tell about during our memorial on Friday evening at AAPOR conference.

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, registration, and preliminary program: <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: Fri, 14 Apr 2006 12:45:30 -0400
Reply-To: Nancy Welchel <nlwelch@GW.FIS.NCSU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nancy Welchel <nlwelch@GW.FIS.NCSU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Marriott AAPOR Rooms Sold Out
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

In-Reply-To: <Pine.A41.4.02.10604141019550.277960-100000@unlunix.unl.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Allan (and others),

These darn hotel rooms just always get us, don't they? The various folks I need to talk with to straighten this out (Missy Johnson at AMP and our contact at the Marriott) are out of the office for the holiday, and won't be back in until Monday. However, from my conversation a few minutes ago with the reservations people at the Marriott it appears that the hotel's numbers are wrong (i.e., they are saying that the number of rooms in our block is lower than it should be [at least according to the most recent information I have...]).

I suggest everyone remain calm, enjoy the weekend, and we'll get this straightened out ASAP next week. Either AMP or I will post something at that time, presumably informing those of you needing reservations to go ahead and call the Marriott.

Hope to see you all in Montreal (well, not all of you - - that would be chaos!!!).

Nancy Whelchel (aka Pollyanna Prozac), Conference Operations Chair

Nancy Whelchel, Ph.D.
Assistant Director for Survey Research
University Planning and Analysis
Box 7002
NCSU
Raleigh, NC 27695-7002
919-515-4184
Nancy_Whelchel@ncsu.edu

>>> ALLAN L MCCUTCHEON <amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU> 4/14/2006 11:22 AM
>>>

Hi All,

I just spoke with the Marriott reservations, and was informed that the AAPOR/WAPOR room block is sold out, except for the night of May 18.

Best,
Allan McCutcheon

--
Donald O. Clifton Chair of Survey Science
Director, UNL-Gallup Research Center
Survey Research and Methodology Graduate Program

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:

<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, registration, and preliminary program: <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: Fri, 14 Apr 2006 16:32:50 -0400

Reply-To: Claire Durand <Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Claire Durand <Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA>

Subject: Quebec chronicle no. 3

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Quebec chronicle no. 3.

Hi everybody, It is a wonderful day in Montreal (16 Celsius and=20 sunny). Today, I will tell you about interesting activities in Montreal=20 (please note for those who have problems finding a room that I have a few=20 suggestions below) but before, I have to clarify two things.

First, in my last chronicle, I spoke about a French Canadian called=20 Toussaint Charbonneau, who was in the Lewis and Clark expedition. I was=20 reminded by a reader that he played a minor role as an interpreter. It is=20 his wife, an Indian woman called Sacajawea, who led the expedition. True...

Second, I don=92t want you to think that Montreal is a homogenous French=20 Canadian city. It is not the case and it has never been. There is Montreal=20 and the ROQ (Rest of Quebec) which is much more homogenous. Montreal has=20 always been a place of trade where people from Europe and America met. It=20 has been for long the metropolis of Canada. Besides, it is the most=20 multicultural city in Canada. Oups.. When I said that in my chronicles of=20 2001, I got emails from my friends from ROC (rest of Canada) saying : No,=20 no, the most multicultural city in Canada is Toronto. It is a contest up=20 here : Who has got the most ethnics (not Indians though..) in his=20 city... Well, it is true that Toronto is quantitatively the most=20 multiethnic city, it has the largest proportion of people from the most=20 different ethnic backgrounds BUT Toronto has only one lingua franca and we=20 have two.. So that we even double some of our ethnic communities (Black=20 French from Haiti and Africa and Black English from West Indies and Africa,=20

Jewish French from North Africa and Jewish English from Eastern Europe, etc.). So let's settle for this : Toronto is the most multiethnic and Montreal is the most multicultural.

However, Montreal is not only interesting culturally but also geographically. Hence, this chronicle. Of course, may I remind you, you come to a conference to attend the sessions... (I assure you that I am not paid by the organizers to say that...). But, you may have some time left... in the morning, at lunch, at night,... to do something. Montreal is on an island. In the middle of it, almost downtown, there is a beautiful mountain, and around the island, there is the magnificent St-Lawrence river and many little islands. This chronicle is about activities and perhaps the first thing to do is start with an activity that almost any one can do easily : take a walk...

Where can you take a walk?

First, you can take a walk starting under your hotel. Because, your hotel is linked to the Montreal souterrain or RESO., i.e., underground Montreal. This is 30 kilometers of corridors (Oups, kilometers? I can not translate that into miles, it is prohibited up here - like for Celsius..., but it is easy to translate : Remember our response rates a few years ago, 60%?, miles are 60% of kilometers so that 30 km equal 18 miles, end of parenthesis). These corridors bring you through hundreds of boutiques, restaurants, universities, metro stations, art galleries, etc. And once in a while, you see the sun come thru... Here is the map : Your hotel is at Bonaventure. Everything blue on the map is part of underground Montreal. So this is an easy accessible walk if the weather is bad.

**Please note that if you are still looking for lodging, on that map, you will see that around the next metro station to the left, there are two little inns (Auberge) and two bed and breakfasts. You may try those. You will get addresses and all that either on Canada411 or on Bonjourquebec.com. The places are : Le petit prince, La maison d'a cote, La petite auberge les bons matins, Auberge du centre-ville. (I do not know them so I can not refer. But they should be rather pretty in that area). You may also look for Plateau Mont-Royal area but any B&B downtown is reachable by metro. I know there are also some on St-Hubert street (around 1,500 - 2500 or something like that) that are near the metro and very pretty normally.

Let's go back to the walks now...

My favorites, the places where I go for a walk to see nature and the city at the same time are the following.

A) the Mountain : the park on the mountain was inaugurated in 1876. It was designed by Frederick Law Olmsted, the same who designed Central Park in New-York. See :

You see the mountain from your hotel. You can just walk to get there if you don't have that much time, ask the taxi driver to bring you to look up on the eastern side. From there, you will see stairs that go up the mountain. There is a little path that goes around the mountain. You see Montreal from up there all around till you get to the Chalet, almost on the top with a beautiful esplanade in front of it. Early in the morning, there are people doing their tai-chi up there.

b) the Cite du Havre: If your room is on the southern side of your hotel, you see Habitat 67, a very special lodging complex that was built in 1967 for the Universal exposition. East of this complex, there is a beautiful park surrounded by the St-Lawrence river. Not far, quiet, etc.

c) The old port and old Montreal. It is always pleasant to just walk around these areas. Nothing more to say.

What about more active activities?

You can rent bicycles and roller skates in the old port. The bicycle route is more than 60 kilometers long. The part along the Lachine canal is truly beautiful (and very busy however on a sunny Sunday). I have put a list of references on bicycle in the depot.

You can also go on one of the boat rides starting from the old port (at Quai de l'horloge i.e., where the clock is). Some go to the Lachine rapids. It is sport!

Not far from your hotel, you can rent a kayak or an electric boat. You can even get kayak lessons. Those are the real kayaks (not the burn on top type). They will ask 10\$ an hour to rent a kayak, 25\$ an hour to rent an electric boat and 25\$ for a kayak lesson (2 hours) if you are at least three people. Just write at (Web site: <http://www.h2oadventures.com/eng/gg/>) and tell them that you are at AAPOR or Wapor conference.

If you have some more time or if you come back at some point, there is a beautiful park southeast of Montreal in the St-Lawrence River. The park (Parc des Iles de Boucherville) is made of a few islands. It is full of

deers, herons, ducks, etc. (Web site: There, you will find a place where=20
=20
you can rent bicycles, kayaks, canoes, rabasca) and go around. It is=20
really =93magnifique=94.

Best,

Next time, what some of you are waiting for, I know : La bouffe, eating...

Claire Durand

Link for AAPOR Montreal Conference:

=
<<https://www.webdepot.umontreal.ca/Usagers/durandc/MonDepotPublic>>[https://w=](https://www.webdepot.umontreal.ca/Usagers/durandc/MonDepotPublic)
ww.webdepot.umontreal.ca/Usagers/durandc/MonDepotPublic=20

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, registration, and preliminary program: <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: Mon, 17 Apr 2006 08:48:34 -0500
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: Job Opportunity
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Comments: cc: Cyndy Myers <MYERSC1@WESTAT.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

WESTAT

An Employee-Owned Research Corporation

=20

=20

CAREER OPPORTUNITY

=20

=20

=20

=20

RESEARCH SURVEY DESIGNER

(Job Code AA/RS/6811)

=20

Westat is an employee-owned research corporation located in Rockville, MD. Our diverse staff of more than 1,800 professionals provides survey research and related services to agencies of the U.S. Government and to a broad range of institutional and business clients.=20

=20

We are seeking a survey research professional with experience in survey instrument design, development of telephone interviewer training programs, and documentation of survey procedures and related materials for a continuing national study of health care use and expenditures. Applicants should have a master's degree, preferably in a social science discipline, and a minimum of 3 to 5 years of related experience. Must have strong writing and interpersonal skills, be detail oriented, well organized, and have a team approach to work.

=20

For immediate consideration, please send your cover letter, resume, and salary history, indicating the Westat Job Code (AA/RS/6811), by one of the following methods to:

=20

WESTAT

Attn: Resume System

Job Code AA/RS/6811

1650 Research Boulevard

Rockville, MD 20850-3195

Fax: (888) 201-1452

Email: resume@westat.com

=20

Equal Opportunity Employer

WESTAT

www.westat.com

=20

=20

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <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: Mon, 17 Apr 2006 10:04:03 -0400
Reply-To: Dave Howell <dahowell@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Dave Howell <dahowell@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
Subject: ANES Announcement: 2006 ANES Pilot Study
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Time is running out. The time to act is now.

The deadline for proposing questions for the 2006 ANES Pilot Study is fast approaching.

Submit early - you'll be better off!

The American National Election Studies will conduct a pilot study survey in November, 2006, to test new questions.

We are pleased to invite all scholars who have innovative and energizing ideas to propose them for testing in this survey.

Things to know about the Pilot Study:

- If you want particular questions to be asked in future ANES surveys, now is the time to offer evidence of how the questions perform in real surveys. The Pilot Study is an ideal way to gather such evidence.
- The Pilot Study respondents were all interviewed previously, for the 2004 ANES. Thus, all respondents have answered many more questions, which give you powerful tools to evaluate new questions.
- The interviews will last about 45 minutes, and almost all of this time will be available for administering new questions. =20
- The interviews will be conducted by telephone.
- You can submit a proposal through the ANES Online Commons (go to

www.electionstudies.org). The firm deadline for submitting proposals for the Pilot Study is June 15, 2006.

- Proposals received earlier will receive greater attention from ANES users and are likely to be advantaged in the review process as a result. For more information on how we will evaluate and choose amongst proposals, please visit the ANES Online Commons.

- Decisions about which questions are placed on the Pilot Study will be announced in August, 2006.

- Proposals from across the social sciences are welcomed.=20

Visit the ANES Online Commons at:
www.electionstudies.org

Sincerely,
Jon A. Krosnick and Arthur Lupia
Principal Investigators
American National Election Studies

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <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: Mon, 17 Apr 2006 10:11:04 -0400
Reply-To: Claire Durand <Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Claire Durand <Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA>
Subject: links- chronicles
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Hi,
I realize that some of the links to web sites in my chronicles do not=20 appear, most probably because of aapornet filters. So I have put copies of=20 the chronicles on the web depot (first link below) so that you can access=20 the links if you are interested.

Best.

Claire Durand

Link for AAPOR Montreal Conference:

=
<<https://www.webdepot.umontreal.ca/Usagers/durandc/MonDepotPublic>><https://www.webdepot.umontreal.ca/Usagers/durandc/MonDepotPublic>=20

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, registration, and preliminary program: <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, 18 Apr 2006 12:31:10 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Loaded & biased questions
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

The Numbers Guy=20
About 1/2 way down

http://online.wsj.com/public/article/SB114485422875624000-vi6JvzfEB6Kw_EwkpUjGHu1LgnM_20060517.html?mod=3Dtff_main_tff_top

Or
<http://tinyurl.com/rs8pa>

As Congress debates whether to pass new laws specifically outlawing online gambling, a recent poll appears to show that the public is strongly against the legislative effort: Almost 80% of Americans oppose a ban, according to the survey.

The poll was conducted by well-known polling firm Zogby International on behalf of an online gambling trade group. As I've written in the past, such sponsored research warrants extra scrutiny from readers, though the fact that the poll was commissioned by a special-interest group isn't by itself a reason to dismiss it.

Still, in this case, it appears that the sponsor of the poll influenced the way it was conducted, particularly in the way the questions were phrased. Here's one question: "Many gambling experts believe that Internet gambling will continue no matter what the government does to try to stop it. Do you agree or disagree that the federal government should allocate government resources and spend taxpayer money trying to stop adult Americans from gambling online?" Some 77% of respondents disagreed.

Here's another question: "More than 80% of Americans believe that gambling is a question of personal choice that should not be interfered

with by the government. Do you agree or disagree that the federal government should stop adult Americans from gambling with licensed and regulated online sports books and casinos based in other countries?" You probably won't be surprised to learn that after being told that most Americans don't want the government to interfere, some 71% of the respondents to this question signaled they, too, were against a government ban.

SNIP

Polling experts disagreed when I showed them the poll. Cliff Zukin, president of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, a professional association of pollsters, told me the questions are "loaded and biased." Prof. Zukin added that if any of his students at Rutgers University wrote such questions, "I would fail them."

SNIP

It's not unusual for pollsters to conduct polls for hire. Many pollsters make their reputations with political polling, and make their money with sponsored polling. Still, Zogby's poll didn't meet certain standards set by the polling professional association headed by Prof. Zukin, which say, among other things, that pollsters should ask unbiased questions.

SNIP

--=20

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

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Tue, 18 Apr 2006 09:58:06 -0700
Reply-To: Trent Buskirk <tbuskirk@ASU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Trent Buskirk <tbuskirk@ASU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Loaded & biased questions
Comments: To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Well said! This would be a great example of a "leading" question for use in my own survey research methods courses!

Trent D. Buskirk, Ph.D.

Assistant Research Professor of Statistics
CRESMET

Arizona State University
P.O. Box 875612
Tempe, AZ 85287
voice: 480-727-8569
fax: 480-965-5993

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2006 9:31 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Loaded & biased questions

The Numbers Guy=20
About 1/2 way down

http://online.wsj.com/public/article/SB114485422875624000-vi6JvzfEB6Kw_EwkpUjGHu1LgnM_20060517.html?mod=3Dtff_main_tff_top
Or
<http://tinyurl.com/rs8pa>

As Congress debates whether to pass new laws specifically outlawing online gambling, a recent poll appears to show that the public is strongly against the legislative effort: Almost 80% of Americans oppose a ban, according to the survey.

The poll was conducted by well-known polling firm Zogby International on behalf of an online gambling trade group. As I've written in the past, such sponsored research warrants extra scrutiny from readers, though the fact that the poll was commissioned by a special-interest group isn't by itself a reason to dismiss it.

Still, in this case, it appears that the sponsor of the poll influenced the way it was conducted, particularly in the way the questions were phrased. Here's one question: "Many gambling experts believe that Internet gambling will continue no matter what the government does to try to stop it. Do you agree or disagree that the federal government should allocate government resources and spend taxpayer money trying to stop adult Americans from gambling online?" Some 77% of respondents disagreed.

Here's another question: "More than 80% of Americans believe that gambling is a question of personal choice that should not be interfered with by the government. Do you agree or disagree that the federal government should stop adult Americans from gambling with licensed and regulated online sports books and casinos based in other countries?" You probably won't be surprised to learn that after being told that most Americans don't want the government to interfere, some 71% of the respondents to this question signaled they, too, were against a government ban.

SNIP

Polling experts disagreed when I showed them the poll. Cliff Zukin,

president of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, a professional association of pollsters, told me the questions are "loaded and biased." Prof. Zukin added that if any of his students at Rutgers University wrote such questions, "I would fail them."

SNIP

It's not unusual for pollsters to conduct polls for hire. Many pollsters make their reputations with political polling, and make their money with sponsored polling. Still, Zogby's poll didn't meet certain standards set by the polling professional association headed by Prof. Zukin, which say, among other things, that pollsters should ask unbiased questions.

SNIP

--=20

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

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
<http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Tue, 18 Apr 2006 12:31:22 -0500
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Subject: Re: Loaded & biased questions
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To:
<3248A9B21DD5574785FE5E2C8E521684456C66@exchange.local.artscience.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I read the full story. Regarding the writer's assertion that "Polling experts disagreed when I showed them the poll", there was no disagreement among other pollsters in that story. The Zogby questions are clearly biased.

Nick

Leo Simonetta wrote:

>The Numbers Guy

>About 1/2 way down

>

>http://online.wsj.com/public/article/SB114485422875624000-vi6JvzfEB6Kw_E

>wkpUjGHu1LgnM_20060517.html?mod=tff_main_tff_top

>Or

><http://tinyurl.com/rs8pa>

>

>As Congress debates whether to pass new laws specifically outlawing

>online gambling, a recent poll appears to show that the public is

>strongly against the legislative effort: Almost 80% of Americans oppose

>a ban, according to the survey.

>

>The poll was conducted by well-known polling firm Zogby International on

>behalf of an online gambling trade group. As I've written in the past,

>such sponsored research warrants extra scrutiny from readers, though the

>fact that the poll was commissioned by a special-interest group isn't by

>itself a reason to dismiss it.

>

>Still, in this case, it appears that the sponsor of the poll influenced

>the way it was conducted, particularly in the way the questions were

>phrased. Here's one question: "Many gambling experts believe that

>Internet gambling will continue no matter what the government does to

>try to stop it. Do you agree or disagree that the federal government

>should allocate government resources and spend taxpayer money trying to

>stop adult Americans from gambling online?" Some 77% of respondents

>disagreed.

>

>Here's another question: "More than 80% of Americans believe that

>gambling is a question of personal choice that should not be interfered

>with by the government. Do you agree or disagree that the federal

>government should stop adult Americans from gambling with licensed and

>regulated online sports books and casinos based in other countries?" You

>probably won't be surprised to learn that after being told that most

>Americans don't want the government to interfere, some 71% of the

>respondents to this question signaled they, too, were against a

>government ban.

>

>SNIP

>

>Polling experts disagreed when I showed them the poll. Cliff Zukin,

>president of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, a

>professional association of pollsters, told me the questions are "loaded

>and biased." Prof. Zukin added that if any of his students at Rutgers

>University wrote such questions, "I would fail them."

>

>

>SNIP

>

>It's not unusual for pollsters to conduct polls for hire. Many pollsters

>make their reputations with political polling, and make their money with

>sponsored polling. Still, Zogby's poll didn't meet certain standards set

>by the polling professional association headed by Prof. Zukin, which
>say, among other things, that pollsters should ask unbiased questions.

>
>SNIP
>
>
>
>

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Tue, 18 Apr 2006 14:36:45 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Re: Loaded & biased questions
Comments: To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Mea culpa - I snipped foolishly

The "Polling experts disagreed when I showed them the poll" reference indicates disagreeing with a statement by a Zogby spokesperson holding that the questions were not biased "The gambling questions "were fair and balanced, and gave the respondent appropriate choices," Fritz Wenzel, spokesman for Zogby International, told me in an email." =20

It was not meant to indicate (as far as I can tell) that there was any disagreement among outside polling experts.

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

> -----Original Message-----
> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Nick Panagakis
> Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2006 1:31 PM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: Re: Loaded & biased questions
>=20

> I read the full story. Regarding the writer's assertion that=20
> "Polling experts disagreed when I showed them the poll",=20
> there was no disagreement among other pollsters in that=20
> story. The Zogby questions are clearly biased.
>=20

> Nick

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
=====

Date: Tue, 18 Apr 2006 14:37:32 -0400
Reply-To: "Guerino, Paul" <PGuerino@AIR.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Guerino, Paul" <PGuerino@AIR.ORG>
Subject: Re: Preteens and the strength of agreement
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Thank you to everyone who helped! In the end, we have decided to change the response options from:=20

Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

to:=20

Definitely True
Mostly True
Mostly False=20
Definitely False

We felt the true-false continuum was much more appropriate for preteens (who have probably been receiving true-false questions since first grade).=20

As promised, a review of the responses follows.=20

----- RESPONSES TO THE ORIGINAL QUESTION -----

---Response 1---

I think sometimes young children and older people have trouble with a 4 point scale (or 5 points) with strongly agree and agree, etc. What I do in those cases is break it up into two questions.

1. Do you agree or disagree
2. THEN do you strongly (whatever) or (whatever). It also sometimes helps to have a modifier so you have strongly or mildly.

I like the 2-tiered approach. Many kids will get it right away and immediately give you the full response, others need to be walked through it the entire time. Whenever I have the choice I put in strongly and mildly.

That seems to help them understand what strongly means by setting the

contrast. Let me know if this works for you!

---Response 2---

There is an emerging field of literature on surveying children and adolescents. One finding is that, so called vague quantifiers (often, very, etc) are difficult for younger children.

---Response 3---

The longitudinal study I work on has been using a big yes, little yes, little no, big no scale with kids 10 and up. It started in the mid-80s, so the technique has been around at least that long. Here are the instructions the interviewer gives:

Please look at Card A, which is the red card. Please think of "BIG YES!" as definitely true for you, "little yes" as mostly true for you, "little no" as mostly not true for you, and "BIG NO!" as definitely not true for you.

And the responses on the show card look like this:

- 1 =3D YES! (definitely true)
- 2 =3D yes (mostly true)
- 3 =3D no (mostly not true)
- 4 =3D NO! (definitely not true)

We don't ask kids under 10 to make these distinctions, we just stick to yes/no questions with that age group.

---Response 4---

About the question below, I haven't noticed a trend like that. It may be happening but maybe they're not asking a question. It makes sense developmentally though. Teenagers answer questions on a more emotional level than adults. I wonder if that's why they aren't really making the distinction between the answer choices. They do not insert logic very well when they're solving a social / emotional problem. They are developmentally unable to do this until they are 21 - 23 (girls), and 23 - 25 (boys), when their myelin sheath is fully developed. They feel their emotions something like 2 x as strongly as an adult (much more than that when they're actually experiencing an emotional shift), and much more frequently. They have something like 16 major emotional shifts per day, whereas an adult may have one every week. I went to a conference about this awhile back and remembered these numbers because I thought it was so interesting. It's something we all know on some level, but it would be interesting to know what the questions are about. I would guess that the topics they feel more passionately about are the ones that would have more of an extreme answer (strongly agree or disagree).

---Response 5---

The other thought I might add is that kids that age may be more likely to perceive the middle ground as indecisive; at that age and for the subsequent 6 to 10 years they're at the height of their personal dogmatism. You might capture that by crosstabbing their answers with a

confidence measure.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Guerino, Paul

Sent: Monday, April 10, 2006 3:48 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Preteens and the strength of agreement

Has anyone run into the problem of preteens having difficulty assessing the difference between "strongly (dis)agree" and "(dis)agree"? We received word from our interviewer debriefings that this was a problem but are unsure of how serious the problem is. Your experiences and/or references would be greatly appreciated.=20

To limit postings on the listserv, please reply directly to me and I'll post a summary email later this week.=20

Thanks so much for your help.=20

Paul Guerino
Survey Methodologist
Federal Statistics Program
American Institutes for Research
1990 K St NW, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 403-6525

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:

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

EARLY REGISTRATION DEADLINE APRIL 10th!

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

Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:

aapornet-request@asu.edu

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Tue, 18 Apr 2006 12:19:13 -0700

Reply-To: Beth Uyenco Shatto <bethu@MICROSOFT.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Beth Uyenco Shatto <bethu@MICROSOFT.COM>

Subject: How to improve teen response rates

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

=20

I'm trying to uncover as much relevant literature available on how to improve response rates from teens particularly for on-line surveys. Would appreciate recommendations for how best to identify best practices or any papers on this issue.

Thanks!

Beth Uyenco

Director, Research MSN

77 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, IL 60601

=20

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Tue, 18 Apr 2006 13:19:55 -0700
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>
Subject: Re: Preteens and the strength of agreement
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
In-Reply-To: <957C8A78DD5B6D42B7D33DBAB78CDC2F3AC4CF@dc2ex01.air.org>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

We just pre-tested a pre-teen online survey using the following scales, and the results showed reasonable distinctions. We tried to put the language into regular kid-speak.

How much do you like the xxx listed below?

- A favorite
- Like it very much
- It's OK
- Don't really like it
- Don't like it at all

When you want XXX, who decides if you can have it?)

- Just me
- Just my parents
- Both me and my parents

[we haven't tried this one below...but it's in the next version]

- Are XXX cool?
- Very cool
- Kind of cool
- Not cool

hope these help,

Leora

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

On Tue, 18 Apr 2006, Guerino, Paul wrote:

> Date: Tue, 18 Apr 2006 14:37:32 -0400
> From: "Guerino, Paul" <PGuerino@AIR.ORG>
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: Re: [AAPORNET] Preteens and the strength of agreement
>
> Thank you to everyone who helped! In the end, we have decided to change
> the response options from:
>
> Strongly Agree
> Agree
> Disagree
> Strongly Disagree
>
> to:
>
> Definitely True
> Mostly True
> Mostly False
> Definitely False
>
> We felt the true-false continuum was much more appropriate for preteens
> (who have probably been receiving true-false questions since first
> grade).
>
> As promised, a review of the responses follows.
>
> ----- RESPONSES TO THE ORIGINAL QUESTION -----
>
> ---Response 1---
> I think sometimes young children and older people have trouble with a 4
> point scale (or 5 points) with strongly agree and agree, etc. What I do
> in those cases is break it up into two questions.
>
> 1. Do you agree or disagree
> 2. THEN do you strongly (whatever) or (whatever). It also sometimes
> helps to have a modifier so you have strongly or mildly.
>
> I like the 2-tiered approach. Many kids will get it right away and
> immediately give you the full response, others need to be walked through
> it the entire time. Whenever I have the choice I put in strongly and
> mildly.
> That seems to help them understand what strongly means by setting the
> contrast. Let me know if this works for you!

>
>
> ---Response 2---
> There is an emerging field of literature on surveying children and
> adolescents. One finding is that, so called vague quantifiers (often,
> very, etc) are difficult for younger children.
>
> ---Response 3---
> The longitudinal study I work on has been using a big yes, little yes,
> little no, big no scale with kids 10 and up. It started in the mid-80s,
> so the technique has been around at least that long. Here are the
> instructions the interviewer gives:
>
> Please look at Card A, which is the red card. Please think of "BIG YES!"
> as definitely true for you, "little yes" as mostly true for you, "little
> no" as mostly not true for you, and "BIG NO!" as definitely not true for
> you.
>
> And the responses on the show card look like this:
>
> 1 = YES! (definitely true)
> 2 = yes (mostly true)
> 3 = no (mostly not true)
> 4 = NO! (definitely not true)
>
> We don't ask kids under 10 to make these distinctions, we just stick to
> yes/no questions with that age group.
>
> ---Response 4---
> About the question below, I haven't noticed a trend like that. It may
> be happening but maybe they're not asking a question. It makes sense
> developmentally though. Teenagers answer questions on a more emotional
> level than adults. I wonder if that's why they aren't really making the
> distinction between the answer choices. They do not insert logic very
> well when they're solving a social / emotional problem. They are
> developmentally unable to do this until they are 21 - 23 (girls), and 23
> - 25 (boys), when their myelin sheath is fully developed. They feel
> their emotions something like 2 x as strongly as an adult (much more
> than that when they're actually experiencing an emotional shift), and
> much more frequently. They have something like 16 major emotional
> shifts per day, whereas an adult may have one every week. I went to a
> conference about this awhile back and remembered these numbers because I
> thought it was so interesting. It's something we all know on some
> level, but it would be interesting to know what the questions are about.
> I would guess that the topics they feel more passionately about are the
> ones that would have more of an extreme answer (strongly agree or
> disagree).
>
> ---Response 5---
> The other thought I might add is that kids that age may be more likely
> to perceive the middle ground as indecisive; at that age and for the
> subsequent 6 to 10 years they're at the height of their personal
> dogmatism. You might capture that by crosstabbing their answers with a
> confidence measure.

>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Guerino, Paul
> Sent: Monday, April 10, 2006 3:48 PM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: Preteens and the strength of agreement

>
> Has anyone run into the problem of preteens having difficulty assessing
> the difference between "strongly (dis)agree" and "(dis)agree"? We
> received word from our interviewer debriefings that this was a problem
> but are unsure of how serious the problem is. Your experiences and/or
> references would be greatly appreciated.

>
> To limit postings on the listserv, please reply directly to me and I'll
> post a summary email later this week.

>
> Thanks so much for your help.

>
> _____
> Paul Guerino
> Survey Methodologist
> Federal Statistics Program
> American Institutes for Research
> 1990 K St NW, Suite 500
> Washington, DC 20006
> (202) 403-6525

> -----
> Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
> <http://www.aapor.org/>
> EARLY REGISTRATION DEADLINE APRIL 10th!
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:
> aapornet-request@asu.edu
> AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

> -----
> Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
> <http://www.aapor.org/>
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Wed, 19 Apr 2006 09:15:23 -0500
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: Faculty Survey Project

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Faculty Survey Project

=20

A team of researchers based at George Mason University's School of Public Policy needs a random national sample of university professors for an internet poll. We already have a survey and an internet polling vendor. We would like to hire someone to provide a random sample of professors at the seven major Carnegie classifications (BA, MA, and PhD, omitting community colleges and specialty institutions such as schools of theology and design). We would need to have 4-5K names, with emails, departments, and the names of their institutions. Our need is relatively immediate. We would be interested in bids from experienced firms that have a proven record in similar projects.

=20

If interested, please contact Dr. Jeremy Mayer, at GMU at
jmayer4@gmu.edu

=20

=20

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

=====

Date: Wed, 19 Apr 2006 11:04:17 -0400
Reply-To: Jonathan Brill <brillje@UMDNJ.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jonathan Brill <brillje@UMDNJ.EDU>
Subject: Re: Surveys about breast self-exam among women of Asian heritage
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu, Colleen Porter <CPORTER@DENTAL.UFL.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
Content-disposition: inline

Colleen:

I would certainly start with the large-scale longitudinal NIH funded national health surveys which typically include health services utilization, disease history, and health behavior/practices data as well as a wide array of demographic characteristics measures (such as race, ethnicity, and/or nativity). These include, but certainly are not

limited to, the HRS (Health and Retirement Study) and NHIS (National Health Interview Survey). Data sets are in the public domain, so anyone can get free (or virtually free) access for secondary analytical use.

Also, ORANJ BOWL(sm) - - "Ongoing Research on Aging in New Jersey: Bettering Opportunities for Wellness in Life" - - a longitudinal research panel and data repository research program of the New Jersey Institute for Successful Aging and which will begin data collection among 10,000 RDD/probability sampled New Jersey residents age 50 to 74 early this summer, will be a relevant source of such information. Data on health services utilization (including mamography), complementary & alternative medicine practices, disease history, functional capacity, physical & mental health, health & health-related lifestyle measures, dietary practices, and numerous demographic characteristic measures will be included as part of the "core" annual assessment interview.

Like the NIH funded longitudinal studies, ORANJ BOWL(sm) will make its core data sets available to the public for a nominal fee (to cover staff time to produce it with documentation and shipping). However, unlike these other studies, ORANJ BOWL(sm) offers researchers access to the sample for follow-up investigations as a panel. That is, investigators may design custom studies selecting sample population subsample segments of interest and receive their custom measure data matched to the "core interview" data for their subsample. Based on the most recent US Census data, an estimated 225 older adult Asian women can be expected to participate in the ORANJ BOWL(sm) research program during its first year of operations and, certainly, this number should expand over time.

If you are interested in further information about ORANJ BOWL(sm), please contact me directly. (The name "ORANJ BOWL"(sm) and its service mark are registered with the US Office of Patents & Licensing.)

Regards,
Jonathan

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm)
Associate Director, Database & Panel Research
NEW JERSEY INSTITUTE FOR SUCCESSFUL AGING
School of Osteopathic Medicine
University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey
42 East Laurel Road, UDP Suite 2300
Stratford, New Jersey 08084
Telephone (direct): 856.566-6727
Fax (research group): 856.566-6874
E-mail: brillje@umdnj.edu

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email communication may contain private, confidential, or legally privileged information intended for the sole use of the designated and/or duly authorized recipient(s). If you are not the intended recipient or have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by email and permanently delete all copies of this email including all attachments without reading them. If you are the intended recipient, secure the contents in a manner that

conforms to all applicable state and/or federal requirements related to privacy and confidentiality of such information.

>>> Colleen Porter <CPORTER@DENTAL.UFL.EDU> 04/13/06 10:41 AM >>>
Folks:

A colleague asked me if I knew of any surveys targetted to Asian American women regarding breast self-exams, or even a source of data that could be sliced to provide information on Asian women (which I appreciate is not the same thing as a survey designed to be culturally competent among women of Asian descent).

Here in Florida we are strong on Hispanics and Haitians, but Asians are a weak point--I would appreciate any input.

Many thanks,
Colleen

PLEASE NOTE NEW CONTACT INFO

Colleen K. Porter
Research Program Manager (Pain Lab)
University of Florida College of Dentistry
Community Dentistry and Behavioral Science
1329 SW 16th St. (1329 Bldg.), Ste. 5180
PO Box 103628
Gainesville, Florida 32610-3628
(352) 273-5979, phone
(352) 273-5985, fax
cporter@dental.ufl.edu

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:

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

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

Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:

aapornet-request@asu.edu

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

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

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Wed, 19 Apr 2006 11:23:45 -0700

Reply-To: "Berry, Sandy" <berry@RAND.ORG>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Berry, Sandy" <berry@RAND.ORG>

Subject: People kinder in the South?

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Do you know of any findings that respondents in the South, for example, tended to rate satisfaction items higher (on average) using graduated scales than respondents in another regions of the US? Or any findings that they tend to rate public services in general higher than people in other areas -- or differently at all? We have a researcher here with survey responses from teachers in CA, GA and PA, and he finds that GA teachers responses are more positive across a wide range of topics. It's possible that this genuinely reflects greater teacher satisfaction with the education system in GA, but it could also be a more global effect. We'd like to confirm or rule out the alternative hypothesis. Anyone know of any research on this question?

Sandra H. Berry 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, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

=====
Date: Wed, 19 Apr 2006 14:35:25 -0400
Reply-To: Colleen Porter <CPORTER@DENTAL.UFL.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Colleen Porter <CPORTER@DENTAL.UFL.EDU>
Subject: Re: Preteens and the strength of agreement
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
Content-disposition: inline

Interesting discussion-some great ideas!

The usage and meaning of the word "cool" is interesting--and

controversial.

A few years ago, I was concerned when monitoring interviews at one of the survey labs collecting our data, because several of the (undergraduate student) interviewers were using "cool" as a form of feedback.

I was shocked, because to my generation, "cool" is a positive thing, and therefore not appropriate for feedback which should be neutral.

They tried to convince me that "cool" was totally neutral, much the same as "uh-huh."

So I dunno about that one. Of course those college students are almost a generation ahead of today's pre-teens, so perhaps the usage has shifted again.

Colleen, whose own preteen currently overuses the word "random"

PLEASE NOTE NEW CONTACT INFO

Colleen K. Porter
Research Program Manager (Pain Lab)
University of Florida College of Dentistry
Community Dentistry and Behavioral Science
1329 SW 16th St. (1329 Bldg.), Ste. 5180
PO Box 103628
Gainesville, Florida 32610-3628
(352) 273-5979, phone
(352) 273-5985, fax
cporter@dental.ufl.edu

>>> Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM> 04/18/06 4:19 PM >>>

We just pre-tested a pre-teen online survey using the following scales,
and the results showed reasonable distinctions. We tried to put the language into regular kid-speak.

[...]

[we haven't tried this one below...but it's in the next version]

Are XXX cool?

Very cool

Kind of cool

Not cool

hope these help,
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, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com
=====

Date: Wed, 19 Apr 2006 11:55:58 -0700
Reply-To: Ken Pick <kpick@GMI-MR.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Ken Pick <kpick@GMI-MR.COM>
Subject: Re: Preteens and the strength of agreement
Comments: To: Colleen Porter <CPORTER@DENTAL.UFL.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I agree - cool is very neutral. Sick, Stupid and Wicked are now the positive cools ;)

Best,=20
Ken

--
Kenneth M. Pick <kpick@gmi-mr.com>
Director, Partnership Research (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

Come See GMI at AAPOR - May 18-21 in Montreal, Canada.=20

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Colleen Porter
Sent: Wednesday, April 19, 2006 11:35 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Preteens and the strength of agreement

Interesting discussion-some great ideas!

The usage and meaning of the word "cool" is interesting--and=20
controversial. =20

A few years ago, I was concerned when monitoring interviews=20
at one of the survey labs collecting our data, because several of=20
the (undergraduate student) interviewers were using "cool" as
a form of feedback. =20

I was shocked, because to my generation, "cool" is a positive thing, and therefore not appropriate for feedback which should be neutral. =20

They tried to convince me that "cool" was totally neutral, much the same as "uh-huh." =20

So I dunno about that one. Of course those college students are almost a generation ahead of today's pre-teens, so perhaps the usage has shifted again. =20

Colleen, whose own preteen currently overuses the word "random"

PLEASE NOTE NEW CONTACT INFO

Colleen K. Porter
Research Program Manager (Pain Lab)
University of Florida College of Dentistry
Community Dentistry and Behavioral Science
1329 SW 16th St. (1329 Bldg.), Ste. 5180
PO Box 103628
Gainesville, Florida 32610-3628
(352) 273-5979, phone
(352) 273-5985, fax
cporter@dental.ufl.edu

>>> Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM> 04/18/06 4:19 PM >>>

We just pre-tested a pre-teen online survey using the following scales, and the results showed reasonable distinctions. We tried to put the language into regular kid-speak.

[...]

[we haven't tried this one below...but it's in the next version]

Are XXX cool?

Very cool

Kind of cool

Not cool

hope these help,

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=20

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:

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

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

Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:

aapornet-request@asu.edu

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

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

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

=====
Date: Wed, 19 Apr 2006 12:20:21 -0700

Reply-To: ellis.godard@csun.edu

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Ellis Godard <ellis.godard@CSUN.EDU>

Subject: Re: People kinder in the South?

Comments: To: "Berry, Sandy" <berry@RAND.ORG>, AAPORNET@asu.edu

In-Reply-To: <AA1C32562864E34A9D228EBBCB95BDBA08FE77@smmail8.rand.org>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Having grown up in Georgia, where all my relatives still live (and where many of my ancestors have for nearly 200 years), I can attest =

(anecdotally)

to a general sense of pollyana. It isn't necessarily naievete, as it's

perhaps a function of somewhat superficial politeness. But I reckon =

folks

there tend to talk more about the bright side of the road, and the =

half-full

part of the glass. That doesn't mean, in this case, that GA teachers are

necessarily concealing dissatisfaction comparable to CA and PA - but =

your

researcher may want to assess the extent to which they differe in

evaluations of other things, unrelated to the study and uncorrelated =

with

geographic demographics.

Second, it may be a reverse of "rising expectations": If schools in PA =

have

gotten better (and better-funded?), teachers there might be more =

critical,

having seen some improvement and wanting more. GA schools, being near =

the

bottom, may generate greater satisfaction because folks either don't =

know

better, or don't recognize the deficiencies, or are focused on the =

successes

with what they do have.

Lastly, the word "kinder" isn't quite right. Folks down South might

smilingly tolerate a bigot, mysoginist, or public nuisance, which is

arguably less kind to others impacted. I'm inclined instead to say that

Georgians are "nicer", and am reminded of several jokes based on the =

premise

that "Well, isn't that nice" conveys instead something vulgar, =
derogatory,
and dismissive.

-eg

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

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

> Sent: Wednesday, April 19, 2006 11:24 AM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: People kinder in the South?

>=20

>=20

> Do you know of any findings that respondents in the South,=20

> for example, tend to rate satisfaction items higher (on=20

> average) using graduated scales than respondents in another=20

> regions of the US? Or any findings that they tend to rate=20

> public services in general higher than people in other areas=20

> -- or differently at all? We have a researcher here with=20

> survey responses from teachers in CA, GA and PA, and he finds=20

> that GA teachers responses are more positive across a wide=20

> range of topics. It's possible that this genuinely reflects=20

> greater teacher satisfaction with the education system in GA,=20

> but it could also be a more global effect. We'd like to=20

> confirm or rule out the alternative hypothesis. Anyone know=20

> of any research on this question?=20

>=20

> Sandra H. Berry 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

>=20

>=20

>=20

>=20

> -----

>=20

> This email message is for the sole use of the intended=20

> recipient(s) and may contain privileged information. Any=20

> unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is=20

> prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please=20

> contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of=20

> the original message.

>=20

> -----

> Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:=20

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

> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .=20

> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:=20

> aapornet-request@asu.edu AAPOR e-voting problems? write:=20

> aapor-info@goamp.com

>=20

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com
=====

Date: Wed, 19 Apr 2006 14:05:36 -0600
Reply-To: Annette Totten <AnnetteTotten@BOISESTATE.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Annette Totten <AnnetteTotten@BOISESTATE.EDU>
Subject: are clinicians generally satisfied or dissatisfied with
continuing education?

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable
Content-disposition: inline

I have worked with data on patient/health care consumer satisfaction and =
as I am sure most of you already know, the majority of people report =
being satisfied. Given this we often talk about a variety of ways to =
handle this (e.g. focusing on the high satisfied, giving a broader range =
of response options, asking yes/no questions, etc.). From what I have =
seen, this is also a characteristic of most data collected concerning =
customer satisfaction.

I am currently working on a set of projects about clinician continuing =
education and satisfaction with processes at their institutions. In =
planning the items and the analyses I have mentioned that satisfaction =
responses are often skewed in this way and based some suggestions on the =
construction of satisfaction items to be included in the evaluation on =
this assumption. My co-investigators are concerned that clinicians may be =
different--so I am looking for literature on 1. patterns of satisfaction =
with education, continuing education, or training; and/or 1. patterns of =
satisfaction among clinicians (not job satisfaction as that is a whole =
different animal). In order to justify or toss the assumption that we =
should be concerned about skewed responses in this project.

Does anyone have any data, suggested articles, or expert opinion on the =
subject?

Thank you,
Annette Totten

Annette M. Totten, PhD
Center for the Study of Aging
Boise State University
208-426-5899
annettetotten@boisestate.edu
<http://aging.boisestate.edu>

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com
=====

Date: Wed, 19 Apr 2006 23:18:00 -0500
Reply-To: "Norval D. Glenn" <ndglenn@MAIL.LA.UTEXAS.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Norval D. Glenn" <ndglenn@MAIL.LA.UTEXAS.EDU>
Subject: Re: People kinder in the South?
Comments: To: Ellis Godard <ellis.godard@CSUN.EDU>
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <[000701c663e6\\$4e56d820\\$6701a8c0@Mobel](mailto:000701c663e6$4e56d820$6701a8c0@Mobel)>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII; format=flowed

The message about people in the South having a more positive outlook arrived just a few days after a student of mine who has spent different portions of her life in different parts of the country compared people in the Midwest to people down here in Texas and said "They aren't as happy up there as we are down here." So that motivated me to go to the General Social Survey data and waste my evening doing an analysis with the "Happy" variable as the dependent variable and the Census Divisions, entered as dummy variables, as the independent variable. I entered race, educational level, marital status (all as sets of dummy variables) and subjective relative economic status (a five point ordinal scale that I treated as interval) as control variables. The happiness variable is a three point scale, varying from "very happy" to "not to happy," which I treated as an interval variable. I reversed the codes of the happiness variable so that "3" equals "very happy" and "1" equals "not too happy." The partial regression coefficients (with New England the reference category set at .000) are as follows:

Census Division	Unstandardized Regression
Coefficient	Significance
(two-tailed)	
New England	.000

Middle Atlantic	-.061
.000	
East North Central	-.015
ns	
West North Central	.021
ns	
South Atlantic	,030
.05	

East South Central .001	.059	
West South Central ns	.017	
Mountan ns	-.007	
Pacific -.023		ns

Thus, the Middle Atlantic division (New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania) comes out as the least happy and the East South Central division (Alabama, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Kentucky) seem to be the happiest. The South Atlantic, which includes Georgia, seems to be the second happiest. Sorry to say that, contrary to my student's impression, my division, the West South Central, doesn't fare all that well.

Whether these differences reflect real differences in happiness or just in a norm that one should put up a cheerful front is a question that I can't answer.

Norval Glenn
Stiles Professor
University of Texas at Austin

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

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

=====
Date: Wed, 19 Apr 2006 23:27:17 -0500
Reply-To: "Norval D. Glenn" <ndglenn@MAIL.LA.UTEXAS.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Norval D. Glenn" <ndglenn@MAIL.LA.UTEXAS.EDU>
Subject: Re: People kinder in the South?
Comments: To: Ellis Godard <ellis.godard@CSUN.EDU>
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <[000701c663e6\\$4e56d820\\$6701a8c0@Mobel](mailto:000701c663e6$4e56d820$6701a8c0@Mobel)>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII; format=flowed

The message about people in the South having a more positive outlook

arrived just a few days after a student of mine who has spent different portions of her life in different parts of the country compared people in the Midwest to people down here in Texas and said "They aren't as happy up there as we are down here." So that motivated me to go to the General Social Survey data and waste my evening doing an analysis with the "Happy" variable as the dependent variable and the Census Divisions, entered as dummy variables, as the independent variable. I entered race, educational level, marital status (all as sets of dummy variables) and subjective relative economic status (a five point ordinal scale that I treated as interval) as control variables. The happiness variable is a three point scale, varying from "very happy" to "not too happy," which I treated as an interval variable. I reversed the codes of the happiness variable so that "3" equals "very happy" and "1" equals "not too happy." The partial regression coefficients (with New England the reference category set at .000) are as follows:

Census Division	Unstandardized Regression Coefficient	Significance
(two-tailed)		
New England	.000	---
Middle Atlantic	-.061	.000
East North Central	-.015	ns
West North Central	.021	ns
South Atlantic	.030	.05
East South Central	.059	.001
West South Central	.017	ns
Mountain	-.007	ns
Pacific	-.023	ns

Thus, the Middle Atlantic division (New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania) comes out as the least happy and the East South Central division (Alabama, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Kentucky) seem to be the happiest. The South Atlantic, which includes Georgia, seems to be the second happiest. Sorry to say that, contrary to my student's impression, my division, the West South Central, doesn't fare all that well.

Whether these differences reflect real differences in happiness or just in a norm that one should put up a cheerful front is a question that I can't answer.

Norval Glenn
Stiles Professor
University of Texas at Austin

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

On Wed, 19 Apr 2006, Ellis Godard wrote:

> Having grown up in Georgia, where all my relatives still live (and where
> many of my ancestors have for nearly 200 years), I can attest (anecdotally)
> to a general sense of pollyana. It isn't necessarily naievete, as it's
> perhaps a function of somewhat superficial politeness. But I reckon folks
> there tend to talk more about the bright side of the road, and the half-full
> part of the glass. That doesn't mean, in this case, that GA teachers are
> necessarily concealing dissatisfaction comparable to CA and PA - but your
> researcher may want to assess the extent to which they differe in
> evaluations of other things, unrelated to the study and uncorrelated with
> geographic demographics.
>
> Second, it may be a reverse of "rising expectations": If schools in PA have
> gotten better (and better-funded?), teachers there might be more critical,
> having seen some improvement and wanting more. GA schools, being near the
> bottom, may generate greater satisfaction because folks either don't know
> better, or don't recognize the deficiencies, or are focused on the successes
> with what they do have.
>
> Lastly, the word "kinder" isn't quite right. Folks down South might
> smilingly tolerate a bigot, mysoginist, or public nuisance, which is
> arguably less kind to others impacted. I'm inclined instead to say that
> Georgians are "nicer", and am reminded of several jokes based on the premise
> that "Well, isn't that nice" conveys instead something vulgar, derogatory,
> and dismissive.

>
> -eg
>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Berry, Sandy
>> Sent: Wednesday, April 19, 2006 11:24 AM
>> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>> Subject: People kinder in the South?

>>
>> Do you know of any findings that respondents in the South,
>> for example, tend to rate satisfaction items higher (on

>> average) using graduated scales than respondents in another
>> regions of the US? Or any findings that they tend to rate
>> public services in general higher than people in other areas
>> -- or differently at all? We have a researcher here with
>> survey responses from teachers in CA, GA and PA, and he finds
>> that GA teachers responses are more positive across a wide
>> range of topics. It's possible that this genuinely reflects
>> greater teacher satisfaction with the education system in GA,
>> but it could also be a more global effect. We'd like to
>> confirm or rule out the alternative hypothesis. Anyone know
>> of any research on this question?

>>
>> Sandra H. Berry 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, registration, and preliminary program:
>> <http://www.aapor.org/>
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:
>> aapornet-request@asu.edu AAPOR e-voting problems? write:
>> aapor-info@goamp.com

>>
>
> -----
> Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
> <http://www.aapor.org/>
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
> AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

>

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Thu, 20 Apr 2006 12:30:15 +0000
Reply-To: "Caplan, James R CIV DMDC" <James.Caplan@OSD.PENTAGON.MIL>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Caplan, James R CIV DMDC" <James.Caplan@OSD.PENTAGON.MIL>
Subject: Response rate and letter length
Comments: To: "AAPORNET (aapornet@asu.edu)" <aapornet@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

Some of us recently attended a conference where Colm O'Muircheartaigh, I believe, mentioned a study documenting an inverse relationship between recruitment letter length and response rate. Anybody out there have references you can provide for this phenomenon?

Thanks,

Jim Caplan

Arlington, VA

Ref: James R. Caplan, Ph.D.

Chief, Survey Technology Branch

DMDC

1600 Wilson Blvd.

Arlington, VA 22209

Ph: 703-696-5848

Fax:703-696-5822

DNS: 426-5848

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <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: Thu, 20 Apr 2006 09:50:13 -0400
Reply-To: Hol294@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Hol294@AOL.COM

Subject: Continuous interviewing versus one point in time
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Would anyone have any thoughts/comments to share on the relative merits of continuous interviewing versus tracking surveys conducted at various set points in time? Any insights would be very much appreciated.

Holly Jarrell
New York, NY

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <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: Thu, 20 Apr 2006 10:34:25 -0400
Reply-To: Jonathan Brill <brillje@UMDNJ.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jonathan Brill <brillje@UMDNJ.EDU>
Subject: Collection of SSN and other friend/relative contact info
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
Content-disposition: inline

Dear Colleagues:

I am in a position of having to justify the need to ask each respondent for his or her Social Security Number and for contact information for a non-household informant who would know how to reach him/her should we be unable to reach him/her for follow-up interviews in our longitudinal research program. Our IRB is not opposed to this out of hand, but would like me to provide further evidence that such information collection is not inappropriate or extraordinarily rare in longitudinal survey research.

I would appreciate it if you can provide references to other studies in which an IRB has approved the collection of SSN and reference contact information.

Thanks!

Regards,
Jonathan

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.

General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm)
Associate Director, Database & Panel Research
NEW JERSEY INSTITUTE FOR SUCCESSFUL AGING
School of Osteopathic Medicine
University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey
42 East Laurel Road, UDP Suite 2300
Stratford, New Jersey 08084
Telephone (direct): 856.566-6727
Fax (research group): 856.566-6874
E-mail: brillje@umdnj.edu

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email communication may contain private, confidential, or legally privileged information intended for the sole use of the designated and/or duly authorized recipient(s). If you are not the intended recipient or have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by email and permanently delete all copies of this email including all attachments without reading them. If you are the intended recipient, secure the contents in a manner that conforms to all applicable state and/or federal requirements related to privacy and confidentiality of such information.

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <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: Thu, 20 Apr 2006 18:49:28 -0400
Reply-To: Ande271@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jeanne Anderson <Ande271@AOL.COM>
Subject: Re: Collection of SSN and other friend/relative contact info
Comments: To: brillje@UMDNJ.EDU, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Would the last four digits of the SSN be just as good? That tends to be less threatening.

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <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: Fri, 21 Apr 2006 03:32:29 -0700
Reply-To: Annette Jackle <aejack@ESSEX.AC.UK>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Annette Jackle <aejack@ESSEX.AC.UK>
Subject: Conference Registration: Methodology of Longitudinal Surveys (MOLS) Conference

On-line registration is now open for the Methodology of Longitudinal Surveys (MOLS) conference.

This is an international conference to be held at the University of Essex, Colchester UK on 12-14 July 2006. The scientific programme includes more than 70 presentations with presenters from more than 15 countries, as well as two associated short courses to be held at the same venue on the day before the conference. There is also a varied social programme including a barbeque reception and a conference dinner in Colchester's ancient Moot Hall.

Full details of the conference, the courses, and the registration form can be found on the conference website:
<http://www.iser.essex.ac.uk/ulsc/mols2006/>

Peter Lynn (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/>

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Fri, 21 Apr 2006 12:10:02 -0700
Reply-To: Charles DiSogra <charlesd@FIELD.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Charles DiSogra <charlesd@FIELD.COM>
Subject: Re: Collection of SSN and other friend/relative contact info
Comments: To: Jeanne Anderson <Ande271@AOL.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
Content-disposition: inline

However, the last 4 digits is the most commonly asked for by banks, etc. regarding account\$. I might balk at this request. Also, having SSN in you data file raises the bar on your security and access protocols/assurances .. SSN is like the third rail in the realm of confidentiality.

Charles

>>> Jeanne Anderson <Ande271@AOL.COM> 4/20/2006 3:49 PM >>>
Would the last four digits of the SSN be just as good? That tends to be

less threatening.

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
<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

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Fri, 21 Apr 2006 15:03:11 -0500
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: Job Opportunity No. 1
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Comments: cc: Donna Eisenhower <deisenho@health.nyc.gov>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

City of New York

Department of Health

125 Worth Street, Room 908

New York, NY 10013

=20

Civil Service Title: Survey Researcher II (City Research Scientist II)
Level: II

Salary: \$60,312 - \$73,859

Office Title: Division of Epidemiology, Survey Unit =20

Work Location: 125 Worth Street

Division/Work Unit: Epidemiological Services
No. of Positions: 1

Hours/Shift: Duration: 35 hours/week - Full Time

=20

JOB DESCRIPTION:

The Bureau of Epidemiology Services within the New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene is a multidisciplinary unit with the goal of combining cutting-edge epidemiologic research, research design, data collection and data analyses to support rapid turnaround policy recommendations. The unit will undertake study design, collection, and analysis which have broad Departmental applications and will also be available to provide epidemiologic consultation services with all categorical Departmental programs (including those responsible for infectious diseases, chronic diseases, community health, environmental/occupational health, and access to health care). Central to this surveillance effort is the Community Health Survey conducted annually with just under 10,000 randomly chosen New Yorkers to assess health risk factors citywide and by neighborhood and the Youth Risk Factor Survey conducted with over 8,000 public high school students in just under ninety high schools biannually.

=20

The City Research Scientist II will work with the Director of Surveys and the Assistant Commissioner of Health, to assure quality in survey design and implementation. This will involve a wide range of survey skills and general ability for project direction or substantial project support. Preference will be given to those with knowledge and skills in assisting with applied sampling, survey methodology, and data collection. Specific skills include sampling from lists, questionnaire design, procedures development, working with IRBs, monitoring contractors, and assisting other related departments and agencies with the same. It will also involve methodological analysis and research to reduce sources of sampling error, measurement error and response bias to assure quality, test new methods, and improve survey quality. There is also opportunity to participate in data analysis and report writing.

=20

QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS:

1. A doctorate degree from an accredited college or university with specialization in public health or survey research and one year of full-time experience in a survey research capacity in the appropriate field ; or
2. A master's degree from an accredited college or university with specialization in an appropriate field of social science, survey research or public health and three years of full-time experience in a survey research capacity ideally in health surveys; or
3. Education and/or experience which is equivalent to "1" or "2" above. However, all candidates must have a master's degree in an appropriate field of specialization and one year of full-time experience in a responsible survey research capacity as described in "2" above

=20

NOTE: NEW YORK CITY RESIDENCY IS REQUIRED

Respond only to email or regular mail with resume and cover letter to
(NO CALLS PLEASE):

Donna Eisenhower, Ph.D.

Director of Surveys

deisenho@health.nyc.gov

Department of Health and Mental Hygiene

125 Worth St Room 315, CN-6

New York, New York 10013

=20

=20

=20

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====

Date: Fri, 21 Apr 2006 15:05:44 -0500

Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>

Subject: Job Opportunity No. 2

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Comments: cc: Donna Eisenhower <deisenho@health.nyc.gov>

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

City of New York

Department of Health

125 Worth Street, Room 908

New York, NY 10013

=20

Civil Service Title: Survey Researcher I (City Research Scientist I)

Level: I

Salary: \$ 53,000 - 60,000

Office Title: Division of Epidemiology =20

Work Location: 125 Worth Street

Division/Work Unit: Survey Unit, Epidemiological Services, Survey Unit
No. of Positions: 1

Hours/Shift: Duration: 35 hours/week - Full Time

=20

JOB DESCRIPTION:

The Bureau of Epidemiology Services within the New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene is a multidisciplinary unit with the goal of combining cutting-edge epidemiologic research, research design, data collection and data analyses to support rapid turnaround policy recommendations. The unit will undertake analyses which have broad Departmental applications and will also be available to provide epidemiologic consultation services with all categorical Departmental programs (including those responsible for infectious diseases, chronic diseases, community health, environmental/occupational health, and access to health care). Central to this effort is the Community Health Survey conducted annually with just under 10,000 randomly chosen New Yorkers to assess health risk factors citywide and by neighborhood.

=20

The City Research Scientist I will work under the direction of the Director of Surveys to assure quality in survey design and implementation. This will involve a wide range of skills in questionnaire development and testing, procedures development, training and monitoring interviewers, interpreting production reports, working with IRBs, monitoring contractors, and assisting other related departments and agencies with the same. It will also involve methodological analysis and research to assure quality, test new methods and questions, and improve survey operations. Potential for project director or assistant project director role.

=20

PREFERRED SKILLS:

Ability to design and test question items under direction, develop interviewer training and respondent materials, write IRB packages, monitor contractors and conduct basic data analysis. Computer skills including presentation software such as Microsoft Excel, Access and Powerpoint, geographical information systems, and willingness to learn a statistical package such as EpiInfo, SPSS, or SAS. =20

=20

QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS:

1. A doctorate degree from an accredited college or university with specialization in public health or survey research and one year of full-time experience in a survey research capacity in the appropriate field ; or2. A master's degree from an accredited college or university with specialization in an appropriate field of social science, survey research or public health and three years of full-time experience in a survey research capacity ideally in health surveys; or3. Education and/or experience which is equivalent to "1" or "2" above. However, all candidates must have a master's degree in an appropriate field of specialization and one year of full-time experience in a responsible survey research capacity as described in "2" above

CONTACT: Respond by email or regular mail (No phone calls please) Can also meet with you at AAPOR conference

Donna Eisenhower, Ph.D.

Director of Surveys, Epidemiology Services

deisenho@health.nyc.gov

125 Worth St Room 315 CN-6

New York, New York 10013

=20

=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>>=20

=20

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====

Date: Fri, 21 Apr 2006 16:25:22 -0400

Reply-To: "Rockwell, Richard" <richard.rockwell@UCONN.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Rockwell, Richard" <richard.rockwell@UCONN.EDU>
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l
YWx0aCBjYXJlLiAgSWYgdGhlcUgaXMgY255dGhpbmcaW4gdGhlIHdheSBvZiBjb2VvY21vbiB0
byBwYXJ0aWNpcGF0ZSBpbjB0aGUgc3VydmlV5LCBzdWN0IGFzIGl0cyBiZWluZyBhIHNjcmVlbnlu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g
DQoJU2VudDogVGh1IDQvMjAvMjAwNiA2OjQ5IFBNIA0KCVRvOiBBQVBPUCk5FVEBhc3UuZWR1IA0K
CUNjOiANCgltIdWJqZWN0OiBSZTogQ29sbGVjdGlvbiBvZiBTU04gYW5kIG90aGVyIGZyaWVuc29y
ZWxhdG12ZSBjb250YWN0IGluZm8NCgkNCgkNCg0KCVdvdWxkiHRoZSBsYXN0IGZvdXIgZGlnaXRz
IG9mIHRoZSBTU04gYmUganVzdCBhcyBnb29kPyAgVGhhdCB0ZW5kcyB0byAgYmUNCglsZXNzIHRo
cmVhdGVuaW5nLg0KCQ0KDQo=

Date: Sat, 22 Apr 2006 08:31:47 -0400
Reply-To: Gary Andres <Gary.Andres@DUTKOWORLDWIDE.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Gary Andres <Gary.Andres@DUTKOWORLDWIDE.COM>
Subject: FW: From Hotline on Automated Calling
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

This short piece on auto-dial polls was published in the Hotline this =
past week. I thought AAPORNET members would find it interesting.

=20
It is no secret that The Hotline does not exactly embrace auto-dial =
polls. While we acknowledge their existence, we do not treat them in the =
same manner as traditional telephone polls. But we think you should make =
the decision for yourself. In our continuing quest to learn more about =
pollsters and their methodology, Rasmussen Reports' Scott Rasmussen is =
in the hot seat this week, giving us a candid look at his auto-dial =
polls and what makes them work.=20

Rasmussen stumbled into the world of polls after a successful =
career in broadcasting. He truly had "no intention of ever doing this," =
but what started out as a favor to some friends, grew into the firm we =
see today. Armed with the training of the late polling expert/political =
writer Everett Carl Ladd, Rasmussen started with traditional telephone =

polls. When the cost became too great, he began to experiment with auto = systems in the mid-90s. After some "trial by fire," he established = Rasmussen Reports (RR) in it's current form in '01. Rasmussen describes = his firm as a publishing firm. It's funded through subscriptions, = advertisers, and sponsors, but never conducts polls for political = candidates, unlike its counterpart, SurveyUSA.=20

Rasmussen describes itself as very similar to other polling firms. = After evaluating the need for a particular poll, the survey is designed. = While the Rasmussen Index survey, a tracking poll, involves a standard = bank of 30 questions, most automated surveys involve 10 to 20 questions. = Since the poll questions are prerecorded, this does slightly limit what = types of questions can be asked. This does not mean that a message = cannot be tested. Most recently, Rasmussen conducted a poll on PA state = Treas. Bob Casey Jr.'s (D) abortion stance. To test a message issue like = this Rasmussen treats it as an informed ballot question, often using = split samples. They can also ask open-ended questions and later = transcribe the recorded responses if a project requires it, although = that is rare.=20

Once the survey is designed, the questions are digitally recorded = and fed to a calling program that determines question order, branching = options, and other factors. Over the years Rasmussen has tested a range = of voices and determined a midwestern female, 30-40 years old proves to = be the most successful. Providing respondents with this pre-recorded = voice provides a level of stability that is not guaranteed with live = callers. A tracking poll respondent today will hear the exact same thing = that another respondent heard when he began in 10/01.=20

Calls are placed using RDD and respondents are put through = screeners to ensure they are who they claim to be. First a caller hears = an intro, explaining what the call is. They are also given a chance to = be added to a Do Not Call List. The first screener is asking if the = respondent is over 18. After a few survey questions, this is presented = again to the respondent in a different manner, ensuring consistency and = allowing Rasmussen to weed out those who are too young. Approx. only 4-5 = out of 1K would be disqualified.=20

Screening for likely voters is a slightly different process. = Rasmussen explains that he doesn't like to use the term "likely voters" = at this point "because no one has a real handle on who a likely voter = will be" right now. "The term 'high propensity' voters is more accurate. = In the past, I used to use the phrase 'high propensity' voter and other = terms, but nobody knew what I was talking about. It is simply easier to = go with what has become the industry standard." Currently, Rasmussen = asks how often a respondent votes in a general election -- all or most = of the time makes the cut. As Election Day becomes closer, he adds = questions about voter interest and specific voting intention.=20

Survey questions to be asked on a given night can be submitted as = late as mid-afternoon on the day of the survey. Typically, calls are = placed from 5 pm to 9 pm local time during the week. Saturday calls are = made from 11 am to 6 pm local time and Sunday calls from 1 pm to 9 pm = local time. The calls are completed by one of Rasmussen's partners who = specializes in data collection systems -- DialTek being just one. = Rasmussen then takes the raw data and weights by party ID based on prior = turnout, prior polls and prior exit polls. Rasmussen admits that they = "don't claim to have the perfect answer" on weighting. While "party ID = of the overall population is fairly stable, intensity and turnout can =

impact the actual turnout." In 7/06, Rasmussen will revisit all state = polls conducted this year to compare party ID and evaluate if the = weighting needs to be recalculated. Once a poll is completed, results = are posted on the RR website, along with analysis. Toplines are = available to paid-subscribers (premium membership is available to \$349 = for the '06 cycle).=20

Despite all of this background, auto-dailers still have skeptics = (like us). To those to say there is no way to know who is really = answering the phone, Rasmussen says it is "a much smaller issue than = those who raise it would like to believe." Responses are checked and = those that look off (answered the same responses for every question, = failed the screening test, etc) are simply deleted. Compared to operated = assisted polling, auto-dails eliminate the consistency and pronunciation = issues. Auto-dial polls also offers a rapid turnaround time and are more = cost effective, allowing for a larger sample. While RR's state polls are = conducted in one night, Rasmussen does not see that as a disadvantage in = a competitive race, noting that a better sense of the race is offered = from looking at the whole flow of the race, not just one poll (hence the = RR three poll rolling average highlighted on the website).=20

There are some noticeable differences in RR's polls compared to = telephone polls. RR's polls tend to have a lower undecided number. = Rasmussen adds that his polls are most likely to get a higher = unfavorable number and attributes these differences to voter comfort = with a digital voice as opposed to a live caller. This is also true when = challengers appear to get more support than incumbents. This disappears = as it gets closer to the election. RR's policy is also not to list third = party candidates until very late in the cycle. They also do not release = response rates.=20

RR's final '04 national poll was a half-point off on Pres. Bush's = result and two-tenths off on John Kerry's, among the closest predictors = of the actual results. With the average cost for a statewide poll at \$3K = and \$5K for a national poll, robo-polls certainly offer an alternative = to the more expensive traditional telephone polls. Rasmussen: "The world = is better when you have lots of pollsters out there." If increasing = options is his goal, then Rasmussen has certainly accomplished that. Now = when it comes to operated assisted polls or robo-polls, that's up for = debate.=20

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

=====
Date: Sun, 23 Apr 2006 14:59:43 -0400
Reply-To: Claire Durand <Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Claire Durand <Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA>
Subject: Chronique La Bouffe
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1; format=flowed

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

>Hi everybody,

>

>I do not have much time since I want to be in time to hand out my papers=20

>but... I wrote this chronicle about restaurants since, if you want to go=20

>to the best ones, you may have to make reservations pretty soon.

>

>Recently, one of the most well known US paper (was it the New York Times=20

>or the NewYorker, I do not remember) =93declared=94 that Montreal has=

>become a=20

>better place for restaurants than Paris. We are very fond of that. You=20

>may have understood that we like to compare ourselves to Paris =96 perhaps=

=20

>we still want our revenge from the fact that they let us down during the=20

>British attack (in 1759!). Besides, there is no doubt in Montrealers=92=20

>minds =96 French, English, others alike =96 that, when it comes to culture=

>and=20

>food, we are the best in North America. Of course, we know that we are not=

=20

>the best in a number of other things but we don=92t speak about that....

>

>Eating and restaurants have become a favorite topic of conversation here=20

>(together with politics, weather and our hockey team, starting the series=

=20

>against the Hurricanes from North Carolina). Indeed, I think it has=20

>improved since the last Aapor conference up here. There are of course many=

=20

>restaurants who serve classic French cuisine and we also have lots of good=

=20

>ethnic restaurants but Quebec cuisine is becoming a cuisine of its own=20

>based on French cuisine, inspired by traditional Quebec cuisine, with a=20

>touch of imaginative, original attempts at new compositions, etc. I do not=

=20

>feel comfortable giving you a list of restaurants because it looks=20

>limited. Please, remember that you can easily explore and find very good=20

>places.

>

>(Please, note that I have put a list of the restaurants with addresses and=

=20

>phone numbers in a file on my depot =96 first link below).

>

>THE restaurant, the one that everybody speaks of, is called Toqu=E9. You=

=20

>can go there by underground Montreal from your hotel. The chef, Normand=20

>Laprise, has also trained a number of young chefs who opened their own=20

>restaurants : Area, Le Chou, Les ch=E8vres, Au pied de cochon.

>I have been at Toque (an experience) and at Au pied de cochon. I have to=

=20

>tell you that Au pied de cochon is quite special. It looks more like a=20

>crowded bar than like a fancy restaurant. This is the place you want to=20

>go if you like to have big quantities and good food. It is famous for its=

=20

>=93Poutine au foie gras=94. I told you about Poutine in my 2001=

chronicles.=20

>It is a typical French Canadian dish, invented in the Fifties, made of=20

>French fries, cheese curds and sauce. The chef at Au pied de cochon adds=

=20

>Foie gras to it. Supposed to be very good but I still have never tasted=20

>poutine in my life, so I don't know. Perhaps I will try it before the=20

>conference, just to know...

>

>Another interesting place that I discovered recently is Bistro Isakaya.=20

>Very good Japanese, not expensive with acceptable quantities. I have been=

=20

>there at lunch time. Really recommended. To go on with Asiatic food,=20

>there are a number of Thai restaurants, my favorite being Chao Phraya on=20

>Laurier Street. Other good Asiatic restaurants are : Soy, B=F4, La Colombe.

>

>Some of the classic places referred to me by friends are:

>Restaurant L'Armorican : Best tartare in town, Julienne potatoes=20

>extremely good, choice of imported beer.

>

>Le Grain de sel : French cuisine: Not a culinary experience but you are=20

>sure to get a choice of good food, well prepared and good service.

>

>L=92Express : on St-Denis street, very good French cuisine. Bistro type.

>

>Ouzeri : Very good Greek restaurant on St-Denis st.

>

>Yoyo : I have heard very good critiques of that place saying it was as=20

>good as Toque!

>

>Le Pullman : Young chef, imaginative. Wine bistro.

>

>=93Special places=94 i.e., those that no guide will tell you about:

>Le Paradis des Amis : French West Indian gastronomy : Excellent et=20

>very convivial.

>

>Lafayette Hot Dog : Greek restaurant. Excellent pizza, Montreal smoked=20

>meat, very good fish and calamars.

>Resto-Bar Krausmann : Opens at lunch time only, very good marinated pattes=

=20

>de cochon (pig legs?) But the French fries are not very good.

>

>You will also find some recommendations of restaurants in my 2001=20

>chronicles. Besides, you can find lots of very good restaurants in=20

>Montreal. Areas where you would go for a walk and just decide to =93try=94=

a=20

>restaurant are:

>- Old Montreal - by foot from your hotel; you will find mainly classic=20

>French cuisine (but beware of Place Jacques Cartier, a tourist trap)

>- the Chinese district (by foot from your hotel), around La Gaucheti=E8re=

=20

>and Clark. For Dim Sun, one of the best is La Maison Kam Fung on St-Urbain.

>- Plateau Mont-Royal, the most fashionable district in Montreal : go to=20

>metro Mont-Royal and try a restaurant on Mont-Royal or St-Denis=20

>street. Duluth st (I listed a few restaurants on that street) and Laurier=

=20
>st. (a bit snobish but good classic French cuisine) are also in that area;=
=20
>All these streets have many restaurants.
>- Crescent street downtown, not far from your hotel (I do not know the=20
>places, a bit jet set, English speaking); this is a good place to go for a=
=20
>drink also.
>- the gay district (around Ste-Catherine Street, east of St-Denis street)
>- St-Laurent street, north of Sherbrooke (the jet set place in town, more=
=20
>ethnic cuisine than in other=20
>areas);=20
>
>
>Finally, the web site about Montreal these days is supposed to be the=20
>following: <<http://www.madeinmtl.com>><http://www.madeinmtl.com>) . You will=
=20
>find lots of info, lists of restaurants, everything you can think of.
>
>Au plaisir,
>Best,
>
>Next chronicle after the deadline...
>
>Claire Durand
>
>Link for AAPOR Montreal Conference:
>
>=20
><<https://www.webdepot.umontreal.ca/Usagers/durandc/MonDepotPublic>>[https://w=](https://www.webdepot.umontreal.ca/Usagers/durandc/MonDepotPublic)
=20
>
>
>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

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <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: Mon, 24 Apr 2006 09:09:31 -0500
Reply-To: "Neidorf, Shawn M." <sneido1@UIC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Neidorf, Shawn M." <sneido1@UIC.EDU>
Subject: Please share your thoughts...
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

Good morning,

My name is Shawn Neidorf, and I am a doctoral student at the University of Illinois at Chicago. (I'm in the Sociology department and also in an interdepartmental concentration in survey methodology.) I am hoping to get some advice regarding a survey I plan to use to collect dissertation data. Presently, I am writing a paper for an Internet Surveys class (taught by Tim Johnson of the UIC Survey Research Lab) regarding how I would contend with certain issues related to that effort. I am posting to AAPORnet to solicit your advice. (I am not writing a methodological article for publication from this, just a class paper. I may, of course, employ the advice in the actual design and distribution of the survey.)

Some background...

My dissertation will look at several classes of workers in a particular industry in the US and their career paths in an effort to test a model that I hope will largely explain their career successes and failures (e.g. pay, prestige, position, etc.). Predictors include social capital/social networks, human capital and some ideas taken from Rosenbaum's tournament mobility model.

To collect data for my dissertation, I am planning to use a Web-based questionnaire for a national sample of people in this industry. I will have a sampling frame with the name of each person, his or her employer, the work mailing address, work e-mail and work telephone number. I would ideally like to have at least 1,200 completed surveys. My intention is to send a letter on UIC letterhead, hand signed, to sample members (possibly in replicates), letting them know about the survey. That would be followed by an e-mail invitation to take part, once the survey is launched, probably with a clickable, unique URL for each case to avoid having to use passwords but to guard against "ballot stuffing." I would follow up with non-responders by e-mail and telephone.

On the plus side, this is a highly educated population, fluent in English (spoken and written) and computer literate. All will have Internet access through work and most probably have home computers with Internet access. (I likely will suggest in the cover letter that the survey not be completed at work, as I cannot guarantee that the employer isn't monitoring computer usage.) The survey also deals with a topic of high salience for the population.

On the negative side, the survey will be long. Very long, especially by Internet survey standards. This is because I need to gather information about each job the person has held over the course of his or her career. (Operationalizing "job" is another challenge: What constitutes a job change, especially if one's duties change in some way, but one still works for the same employer. How much change does it take for it to be a job change?) The more times one has switched jobs (likely correlated to some extent with career length), the longer the survey is. I also need

information from everyone about his or her family of origin, family of destination and changes in one's social network over time. (I'm borrowing heavily from the GSS for such questions.)

I wrote a draft of most of the survey for another course, and it came to 150 questions, though not everyone would answer each one. This draft dealt only with one's first employer, to keep it simple for a class on questionnaire design. A few of my friends in the industry "took" the class version of the questionnaire to test it, which was a paper-and-pencil design, and it took them about a half hour. However, most of these people have careers no longer than a dozen years. (Incidentally, I would not do this as a paper-and-pencil design in real life because of extremely complicated skip patterns and high costs for a graduate student.)

So, in summary, I have a long questionnaire that will be administered by a relatively new mode that literature suggests does not lend itself well to long surveys. The survey will be administered to a population for which the topic is extremely salient, but to a population that is very busy. On the somewhat reassuring side, a less complicated, but long, telephone survey done with a similar sampling frame yielded a 69.5% "gross response rate" (completes divided by sample size). It was a 50-minute telephone interview conducted in the early 1990s.

What I have to figure out—and what I would very much appreciate advice on—is:

1. How do I increase my chances for a high unit response rate to a long survey distributed electronically? (I should note that I won't likely be able to offer traditional cash or non-token gift incentives, though I could possibly do a charitable donation offer or an offer to share information resulting from the survey to respondents, which, in light of high salience, might be useful.)
2. How do I minimize satisficing?
3. How do I minimize item non-response/breakoffs?
4. How do I minimize the impact of the length as a burden to the respondents?
5. What else should I be worried about?

I have downloaded and read every POQ article that contains the key words or phrases "salience," "length," "respondent burden" or "mode effect." I've also read up on item nonresponse and Internet surveys more generally and perused a foot-high stack of survey methodology texts. What I'm hoping to find is the additional knowledge people have stored in their heads that hasn't found its way into publication yet.

I apologize for the length of this note and thank you, in advance, for any assistance you can provide.

Yours truly,

Shawn Neidorf
sneidol@uic.edu
708-261-9156

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Mon, 24 Apr 2006 09:27:40 -0700
Reply-To: "Matthew A. Vile" <matthew.vile@GOODWILL.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Matthew A. Vile" <matthew.vile@GOODWILL.ORG>
Subject: Familiarity Scales: General and Best Practices
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I'm looking for some guidance on familiarity scales within an on-line survey format. Specifically, I'm getting some push-back from my administration regarding my choice to use a 5-point scale with only the end points labeled (i.e.)

I have heard of it
2
3
4
Very Familiar

They would like to see (at least) the scale mid point labeled neutral or something that denoted halfway but I've been having a hard time deciding on a descriptive string. (Please Note: this question is the follow-up in a branching format that asks the respondent to select those areas with which they, had some experience with; as such, the appropriate negative label would be heard of it. I had to do this to make the branching work.)

Is the scale I've chosen above commonly accepted? If you had to label the scale mid-point, what descriptor would you use?

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Mon, 24 Apr 2006 14:33:20 -0400
Reply-To: Keith Neuman <Keith.Neuman@ENVIRONICS.CA>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Keith Neuman <Keith.Neuman@ENVIRONICS.CA>
Subject: Re: Familiarity Scales: General and Best Practices
Comments: To: "Matthew A. Vile" <matthew.vile@GOODWILL.ORG>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

The best solution I would recommend would be to use a four point scale, labeling the points as "not at all familiar", "not very familiar", "somewhat familiar" and "very familiar"

This provides a clearly delineated scale that I've found works well in web and telephone applications. I would agree there is no obvious mid-point for such a scale, so no reason to force one.

Keith Neuman, Ph.D.
Environics Research Group

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Matthew A. Vile
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2006 12:28 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Familiarity Scales: General and Best Practices

I'm looking for some guidance on familiarity scales within an on-line=20 survey format. Specifically, I'm getting some push-back from my=20 administration regarding my choice to use a 5-point scale with only the=20 end points labeled (i.e.)

I have heard of it

2
3
4

Very Familiar

They would like to see (at least) the scale mid point labeled "neutral" or=20

something that denoted "halfway," but I've been having a hard time=20 deciding on a descriptive string. (Please Note: this question is the=20 follow-up in a branching format that asks the respondent to select those

areas with which they, "had some experience with..."; as such, the=20 appropriate negative label would be "heard of it." I had to do this to=20 make the branching work.)

Is the scale I've chosen above commonly accepted? If you had to label the=20 scale mid-point, what descriptor would you use?

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
<http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Mon, 24 Apr 2006 11:56:16 -0700
Reply-To: Steve Johnson <stevej@nsdssurvey.org>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Steve Johnson <stevej@NSDSSURVEY.ORG>
Organization: Northwest Survey & Data Services
Subject: Re: Familiarity Scales: General and Best Practices
Comments: To: Keith Neuman <Keith.Neuman@ENVIRONICS.CA>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; format=flowed; charset=iso-8859-1; reply-type=original
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I would be tempted to use the four point scale: "not at all familiar", "somewhat familiar", "familiar" and "very familiar." I think "not very" and "somewhat" are not that clear and are surely not equal interval with the end points of the scale. I suspect if you were to test it against a numeric scale that people would code things they had seen or heard only once or twice as either "somewhat" or "not very" without much distinction.

Best

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

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

From: "Keith Neuman" <Keith.Neuman@ENVIRONICS.CA>
To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2006 11:33 AM
Subject: Re: Familiarity Scales: General and Best Practices

The best solution I would recommend would be to use a four point scale, labeling the points as "not at all familiar", "not very familiar", "somewhat familiar" and "very familiar"

This provides a clearly delineated scale that I've found works well in web and telephone applications. I would agree there is no obvious mid-point for such a scale, so no reason to force one.

Keith Neuman, Ph.D.
Environics Research Group

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Matthew A. Vile
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2006 12:28 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Familiarity Scales: General and Best Practices

I'm looking for some guidance on familiarity scales within an on-line survey format. Specifically, I'm getting some push-back from my administration regarding my choice to use a 5-point scale with only the end points labeled (i.e.)

I have heard of it

2

3
4
Very Familiar

They would like to see (at least) the scale mid point labeled "neutral" or something that denoted "halfway," but I've been having a hard time deciding on a descriptive string. (Please Note: this question is the follow-up in a branching format that asks the respondent to select those

areas with which they, "had some experience with..."; as such, the appropriate negative label would be "heard of it." I had to do this to make the branching work.)

Is the scale I've chosen above commonly accepted? If you had to label the scale mid-point, what descriptor would you use?

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
<http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
<http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Mon, 24 Apr 2006 12:49:05 -0700
Reply-To: Charles DiSogra <charlesd@FIELD.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Charles DiSogra <charlesd@FIELD.COM>
Subject: Re: Familiarity Scales: General and Best Practices
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable
Content-disposition: inline

I see your dilemma*how can someone be "not at all familiar" if they just =
claimed to have had some experience with something. Hmm. Delving into =
the nuances of the word "familiar" might be intellectually interesting but =
impractical for resolving this quandary. Also, measurement folks really =
love variability and 5 points has that nice extra point appeal over four =

but begs for a neutral center. A numeric range with only the end points = anchored is not an uncommon technique, especially for those who really = like wider scales, namely the eight- or ten-point aficionados*however, in = such cases I find it difficult to qualitatively interpret, say, someone's = 6 from someone else's 7 (I knew a guy who always picked 7s because it was = his lucky number!*ahh, science). =20

The most neutral "familiar" I can think of is, well, "familiar". So that = leaves us with defining discreet levels greater than or less than = familiar. I might suggest "not very familiar" (to solve the original = dilemma), "a little familiar", "familiar" (for neutral), "very familiar", = and "extremely familiar" (if it is a skill you are talking about you might = want the top labeled as "expertly familiar"*or something else more = appropriate for the set of items). Although "a little familiar" sounds a = little bit wooshy to nail down, the appearance of it in a scaled set of = choices helps to define it for the respondent by the order in which it = appears in the scale. Hope this helps, a little bit, somewhat, a lot.

Charles DiSogra

Charles A. DiSogra, DrPH, MPH
Vice President and Senior Research Director
Field Research Corporation
222 Sutter Street, Suite 700
San Francisco, CA 94108-4458

tel: 415.392.5763

email: charlesd at field dot com
fax:415.434.2541
<http://www.field.com/>

>>> "Matthew A. Vile" <matthew.vile@GOODWILL.ORG> 4/24/2006 9:27 AM >>>
I'm looking for some guidance on familiarity scales within an on-line=20
survey format. Specifically, I'm getting some push-back from my=20
administration regarding my choice to use a 5-point scale with only the=20
end points labeled (i.e.)

I have heard of it

2
3
4

Very Familiar

They would like to see (at least) the scale mid point labeled "neutral" = or=20
something that denoted "halfway," but I've been having a hard time=20
deciding on a descriptive string. (Please Note: this question is the=20
follow-up in a branching format that asks the respondent to select = those=20
areas with which they, "had some experience with*"; as such, the=20
appropriate negative label would be "heard of it." I had to do this to=20
make the branching work.)

Is the scale I've chosen above commonly accepted? If you had to label =
the=20
scale mid-point, what descriptor would you use?

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
g/=20
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Mon, 24 Apr 2006 16:19:41 -0700
Reply-To: Jennifer Franz <jdfranz@JDFRANZ.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jennifer Franz <jdfranz@JDFRANZ.COM>
Subject: Response Rates by Mode
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=Windows-1252
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

Awhile back, I posted an inquiry to the list about response rates by mode by ethnic group, as follows:

A client has asked if there is any literature on response rates for various ethnic groups by mode (i.e., differences among ethnicities by telephone, mail, Internet, and so forth). Can anyone point me in the right direction?

I'm sure this has to be out there somewhere, and I'd love to avoid having to do the literature search myself if someone can help.

Judging by the response, I would say this topic is a strong candidate for further study. I received a total of eight responses, five of which simply requested that I post the results to the list. One sent data he is unable to share, one recommended Survey Methodology by Groves et al. (Wiley), and one sent the following link (at least I think it's a link):

[http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q="+response+rates+for+various+ethnic+group
s&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&hl=en&btnG=Search](http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=)

It would thus seem there is more interest than information. Sorry I couldn't find more - but this may provide someone with an interesting research topic.

Jennifer

Jennifer D. Franz, Ph.D.

President

JD Franz Research, Inc.

(916) 440-8777 Phone

(916) 440-8787 Fax

(916) 296-3400 Mobile

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Tue, 25 Apr 2006 09:24:57 -0400

Reply-To: Jeanette Janota <JJANOTA@ASHA.ORG>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Jeanette Janota <JJANOTA@ASHA.ORG>

Subject: Re: Familiarity Scales: General and Best Practices

Comments: To: "Matthew A. Vile" <matthew.vile@GOODWILL.ORG>, AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

In asking members of a professional organization about their familiarity with a sponsored program, we've used the following scale:

1. Have never heard of it.
2. Have heard of it, but don't know much about it.
3. Know pretty much about it.
4. Know a lot about it.

Don't know if that suits your situation, but it worked for us.

Jeanette O. Janota, PhD

Senior Research Associate/Statistician

American Speech-Language-Hearing Association

10801 Rockville Pike

Rockville, MD 20852

=20

Telephone: 301-897-5700, ext. 4175

Fax: 301-468-9742

Email: jjanota@asha.org

Professional Web site: <http://professional.asha.org>

Consumer Web site: www.asha.org

What's your special interest? With 16 divisions, ASHA offers a lot of options! Visit the Special Interest Divisions Web Pages to find out more: <http://www.asha.org/about/membership-certification/divs/>

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Matthew A. Vile

Sent: Monday, April 24, 2006 12:28 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Familiarity Scales: General and Best Practices

I'm looking for some guidance on familiarity scales within an on-line=20 survey format. Specifically, I'm getting some push-back from my=20 administration regarding my choice to use a 5-point scale with only the=20 end points labeled (i.e.)

I have heard of it

2
3
4

Very Familiar

They would like to see (at least) the scale mid point labeled "neutral" or=20

something that denoted "halfway," but I've been having a hard time=20 deciding on a descriptive string. (Please Note: this question is the=20 follow-up in a branching format that asks the respondent to select those

areas with which they, "had some experience with..."; as such, the=20 appropriate negative label would be "heard of it." I had to do this to=20 make the branching work.)

Is the scale I've chosen above commonly accepted? If you had to label the=20 scale mid-point, what descriptor would you use?

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
<http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

=====
Date: Tue, 25 Apr 2006 11:33:09 -0400
Reply-To: Colleen Porter <cporter@DENTAL.UFL.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Colleen Porter <cporter@DENTAL.UFL.EDU>
Subject: Re: Familiarity Scales: General and Best Practices
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
Content-disposition: inline

Also in an evaluation of a program sponsored by a professional

organization (among a target population of medical/dental residents and faculty), we also used a 4-point scale on a self-administered survey.

Not familiar (never heard of it)

Slightly familiar

Somewhat familiar

Very familiar (taken classes or used it in other situations)

A lot of you will cringe at the vagueness of "slightly" vs. "somewhat," but we felt that we had firmly anchored the ends of the scale, and hoped that the interim points would be perceived as equidistant between the two endpoints.

[Of course our "very" explanation, while working well with our particular respondents from academic institutions, wouldn't have had so much meaning or relevance in a general population survey.]

Colleen

PLEASE NOTE NEW CONTACT INFO

Colleen K. Porter

Research Program Manager (Pain Lab)

University of Florida College of Dentistry

Community Dentistry and Behavioral Science

cporter@dental.ufl.edu

>>> Jeanette Janota <JJANOTA@ASHA.ORG> 04/25/06 9:24 AM >>>

In asking members of a professional organization about their familiarity with a sponsored program, we've used the following scale:

1. Have never heard of it.
2. Have heard of it, but don't know much about it.
3. Know pretty much about it.
4. Know a lot about it.

Don't know if that suits your situation, but it worked for us.

Jeanette O. Janota, PhD

Senior Research Associate/Statistician

American Speech-Language-Hearing Association

10801 Rockville Pike

Rockville, MD 20852

Telephone: 301-897-5700, ext. 4175

Fax: 301-468-9742

Email: jjanota@asha.org

Professional Web site: <http://professional.asha.org>

Consumer Web site: www.asha.org

What's your special interest? With 16 divisions, ASHA offers a lot of options! Visit the Special Interest Divisions Web Pages to find out more: <http://www.asha.org/about/membership-certification/divs/>

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Matthew A. Vile
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2006 12:28 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Familiarity Scales: General and Best Practices

I'm looking for some guidance on familiarity scales within an on-line survey format. Specifically, I'm getting some push-back from my administration regarding my choice to use a 5-point scale with only the end points labeled (i.e.)

I have heard of it
2
3
4
Very Familiar

They would like to see (at least) the scale mid point labeled "neutral" or something that denoted "halfway," but I've been having a hard time deciding on a descriptive string. (Please Note: this question is the follow-up in a branching format that asks the respondent to select those

areas with which they, "had some experience with..."; as such, the appropriate negative label would be "heard of it." I had to do this to make the branching work.)

Is the scale I've chosen above commonly accepted? If you had to label the scale mid-point, what descriptor would you use?

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
<http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
<http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

=====
Date: Tue, 25 Apr 2006 15:05:08 -0400

Reply-To: Nancy Belden <nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nancy Belden <nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM>
Subject: AAPOR election results
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Dear AAPOR Members:

I am pleased to announce the winners of the AAPOR elections to Council. Please see below. A number of the positions were decided by a very few votes. Many of you told me that deciding how to vote was hard this year because of the high quality of all the nominees, so I want to express gratitude on behalf of AAPOR generally to all who allowed us to put their names forth as candidates.

Forty one percent of the members participated in this inaugural year of voting electronically - about 100 more than in the past. Positive comments out ran negative by 40:1, and by moving to the e-mail format, we reduced our costs of holding the election from about \$10 per member to \$2.

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

PRESIDENT-ELECT/VP Nancy Mathiowetz

CONFERENCE CHAIR, ASSOCIATE Frank Newport

STANDARDS, ASSOCIATE Charlotte Steeh

COUNCILOR AT LARGE Mark Schulman

SECRETARY/TREASURER, ASSOCIATE Dawn Nelson

MEMBERSHIP/CHAPTER RELATIONS, ASSOCIATE Carl Ramirez

PUBLICATIONS/INFORMATION, ASSOCIATE Mark Blumenthal

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com
=====

Date: Tue, 25 Apr 2006 13:49:43 -0700
Reply-To: Karen Segar <ksegar@U.WASHINGTON.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Karen Segar <ksegar@U.WASHINGTON.EDU>
Subject: exit polling talk in Seattle
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII; format=flowed

Forwarded from the University of Washington Center for Statistics and the
Social Sciences:

----- Forwarded message -----
Date: Sun, 23 Apr 2006 20:11:02 -0700 (Pacific Standard Time)
From: Katherine Stovel <stovel@u.washington.edu>
Reply-To: CSSS Seminar List <csss-seminar@u.washington.edu>
To: csss-seminar@u.washington.edu
Cc: socevents@u.washington.edu, econdept@u.washington.edu
Subject: [Csss-seminar] CSSS Seminar 04/26/06

This Week's Seminar:
Matt Barreto
Department of Political Science, UW
"Controversies in Exit Polling:
Implementing a racially stratified homogenous precinct approach"

Time: 12:30 - 1:30pm on Wednesday, 04/26/06 (followed by coffee)

Abstract: In 2004, Voter News Service (VNS) exit polling was scrapped due to
problems in 2000 and Edison-Mitofsky Research was chosen to implement a new,
and more accurate National Exit Poll (NEP) in 2004. Exit poll results from
Edison-Mitofsky showed John Kerry ahead in Ohio, Florida, and New Mexico - all
states which he lost to Bush in 2004. In addition to the overall exit poll

results being skewed, comparative vote results for subgroups, such as Latino voters, also appeared to be wrong. The National Exit Poll (NEP) reported on November 2, 2004 that Bush won 45 percent of the Latino vote, a 10-point gain from 2000. In contrast, an exit poll of only Latino voters conducted by the William C. Velasquez Institute reported that Bush won only 32 percent of the Latino vote.

What explains such discrepancies? One possibility is the methodology used to select the precincts where exit poll interviews are conducted is faulty. Ideally, the respondents in the exit poll survey will be accurate representatives of the entire city or state in which the election is being held. However, if the exit poll interviews respondents that are too conservative or too liberal, too young or too old, too poor or too rich, or too White, it could skew the overall results by a wide margin, even after weights are employed. Existing exit polls are often unreliable because the members of the demographic subgroups interviewed for the poll are not necessarily representative of all members of their demographic subgroup.

Specifically, we pose two important methodological questions pertaining to the science behind exit polls: (1) what is the most accurate sampling technique for polling racial and ethnic voters in a diverse setting, and (2) how should exit polls account for early and absentee votes not cast on Election Day? To answer these questions, we implemented an alternative sampling exit poll in the city of Los Angeles during the 2005 mayoral election and compared our results to the exit poll implemented by the Los Angeles Times and then compared both to the actual election results. In short, the different methodologies accounted for different results suggesting new approaches to exit polling are welcome.

The CSSS seminar series is centered around intellectual exchange and interaction, and the audience is encouraged to ask questions during presentations. The goal is a seminar that looks less like a lecture and more like a spirited discussion of issues raised in a relatively brief presentation of a statistical issue or a research project.

All seminars will be held at 12:30 on Wednesdays in Savery 209, and this quarter we will aim to conclude by 1:30. Coffee and treats will be provided after the seminar; attendees are also welcome to bring their lunch.

The complete schedule for this quarter's seminar can be found at www.csss.washington.edu/Seminars

To request disability accommodations, contact the Office of the ADA Coordinator ten days in advance of the event. 543-6450 (voice) 685-3885 (FAX) 543-6452 (TDD) access@u.washington.edu

*** Note *** To be removed from this mailing list, please send an email to listproc@u.washington.edu with the following line in the body of your email: `unsubscribe csss-seminar <your userid>`

If you have difficulties with the mailing list, please email
stovel@u.washington.edu

Csss-seminar mailing list
Csss-seminar@u.washington.edu
<http://mailman1.u.washington.edu/mailman/listinfo/sss-seminar>

Karen Segar
Data Manager
Seattle Social Development Group
University of Washington
ksegar@u.washington.edu

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapor.net.html> .
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapor.net-request@asu.edu
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Tue, 25 Apr 2006 17:58:12 -0400
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Subject: Re: exit polling talk in Seattle
Comments: To: Karen Segar <ksegar@U.WASHINGTON.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <Pine.LNX.4.64.0604251345190.29395@homer22.u.washington.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Some of the statements in the announcement of the talk in Seattle about exit polls is just plain wrong. First of all, all state differences between the 2004 exit polls and the final results of the election were within sampling error. There were no mistakes in announcing winners by Edison/Mitofsky or any of the six NEP members.

Second, the Hispanic vote was 44% for Bush in the national exit poll. It was 40% when summing across all the state exit polls. The 40% was probably an understatement as voters were not asked if they were Hispanic in states with low incidence.

The Valasquez institute exit poll omitted some states and great parts of the states they were in. One cannot represent all Hispanic voters by sampling only in places with high concentrations of Hispanics, which is what Valasquez did. That does not represent all Hispanic voters. The Hispanics who do not live in these concentrated areas do not vote like those that do live in the types of areas sampled by Valasquez.

Lastly, exit polls are not the best way to measure characteristics of minority voters. The sampling error for an exit poll is much larger

than it is for most other characteristics.

We stand by our Hispanic vote estimates, which were the same as the LA Times national exit poll's.

We are open to hearing about better sample selection methods. Surely someone is not suggesting we do what the Valasquez institute did?

warren mitofsky

>This Week's Seminar:

> Matt Barreto
> Department of Political Science, UW
> "Controversies in Exit Polling:
> Implementing a racially stratified homogenous precinct approach"

>Time: 12:30 - 1:30pm on Wednesday, 04/26/06 (followed by coffee)

>Abstract: In 2004, Voter News Service (VNS) exit polling was
>scrapped due to problems in 2000 and Edison-Mitofsky Research was
>chosen to implement a new, and more accurate National Exit Poll
>(NEP) in 2004. Exit poll results from Edison-Mitofsky showed John
>Kerry ahead in Ohio, Florida, and New Mexico - all states which he
>lost to Bush in 2004. In addition to the overall exit poll results
>being skewed, comparative vote results for subgroups, such as Latino
>voters, also appeared to be wrong. The National Exit Poll (NEP)
>reported on November 2, 2004 that Bush won 45 percent of the Latino
>vote, a 10-point gain from 2000. In contrast, an exit poll of only
>Latino voters conducted by the William C. Velasquez Institute
>reported that Bush won only 32 percent of the Latino vote.

>What explains such discrepancies? One possibility is the methodology
>used to select the precincts where exit poll interviews are
>conducted is faulty. Ideally, the respondents in the exit poll
>survey will be accurate representatives of the entire city or state
>in which the election is being held. However, if the exit poll
>interviews respondents that are too conservative or too liberal, too
>young or too old, too poor or too rich, or too White, it could skew
>the overall results by a wide margin, even after weights are
>employed. Existing exit polls are often unreliable because the
>members of the demographic subgroups interviewed for the poll are
>not necessarily representative of all members of their demographic subgroup.

>Specifically, we pose two important methodological questions
>pertaining to the science behind exit polls: (1) what is the most
>accurate sampling technique for polling racial and ethnic voters in
>a diverse setting, and (2) how should exit polls account for early
>and absentee votes not cast on Election Day? To answer these
>questions, we implemented an alternative sampling exit poll in the
>city of Los Angeles during the 2005 mayoral election and compared
>our results to the exit poll implemented by the Los Angeles Times
>and then compared both to the actual election results. In short, the
>different methodologies accounted for different results suggesting
>new approaches to exit polling are welcome.

>

>

>The CSSS seminar series is centered around intellectual exchange and
>interaction, and the audience is encouraged to ask questions during
>presentations. The goal is a seminar that looks less like a lecture
>and more like a spirited discussion of issues raised in a relatively
>brief presentation of a statistical issue or a research project.

>

>All seminars will be held at 12:30 on Wednesdays in Savery 209, and
>this quarter we will aim to conclude by 1:30. Coffee and treats
>will be provided after the seminar; attendees are also welcome to
>bring their lunch.

>

>The complete schedule for this quarter's seminar can be found at
>www.csss.washington.edu/Seminars

>

>To request disability accommodations, contact the Office of the ADA
>Coordinator ten days in advance of the event. 543-6450 (voice)
>685-3885 (FAX) 543-6452 (TDD) access@u.washington.edu

>

>*** Note *** To be removed from this mailing list, please send an email to
>listproc@u.washington.edu with the following line in the body of your
>email: unsubscribe csss-seminar <your userid>

>

>If you have difficulties with the mailing list, please email
>stovel@u.washington.edu

>

>

>

>

>

>Ccsss-seminar mailing list
>Ccsss-seminar@u.washington.edu
><http://mailman1.u.washington.edu/mailman/listinfo/csss-seminar>

>

>

>Karen Segar
>Data Manager
>Seattle Social Development Group
>University of Washington
>ksegar@u.washington.edu

>

>

>Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
>Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

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

212 980-3031
212 980-3107 Fax

www.mitofskyinternational.com
mitofsky@mindspring.com

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com
=====

Date: Tue, 25 Apr 2006 15:29:04 -0700
Reply-To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>
Subject: Re: exit polling talk in Seattle
Comments: To: Karen Segar <ksegar@U.WASHINGTON.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <Pine.LNX.4.64.0604251345190.29395@homer22.u.washington.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

This UW discussion looks very interesting. Wish I was in Seattle. The point below that most attracts my interest relates to weighting. It has always seemed to me that weighting a sample to achieve appropriately representative demographics (whether ethnicity, age, gender or anything else) is one of the more dangerous types of post hoc analysis. Shouldn't one assume that if one begins with a representative frame, and then a particularly high proportion of any segment opts out (declines participation--though of course that's not the only possible reason for an outcome demographic imbalance) those who do participate from that particular segment are likely to be especially different from those who defer? Particularly when dealing with ethnic minority weighting, shouldn't the initial assumption be that participants are likely to be of a different socio-economic strata and educational background than non-participants and thus non-representative in their views? This isn't a new idea and I'm sure some of you have looked at this and can shoot me down with studies if I'm off base, but my main point is that, unless you have demonstrated specific evidence that the group whose results you are going to give more power to is not-unrepresentative, then weighting has the potential to make the generalized results farther from the truth than letting sleeping dogs lie. As the saying goes in medicine, "above all do no harm."

Marc

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

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

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

Sent: Tuesday, April 25, 2006 12:50 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: exit polling talk in Seattle

Forwarded from the University of Washington Center for Statistics and
the
Social Sciences:

----- Forwarded message -----

Date: Sun, 23 Apr 2006 20:11:02 -0700 (Pacific Standard Time)

From: Katherine Stovel <stovel@u.washington.edu>

Reply-To: CSSS Seminar List <csss-seminar@u.washington.edu>

To: csss-seminar@u.washington.edu

Cc: socevents@u.washington.edu, econdept@u.washington.edu

Subject: [Ccss-seminar] CSSS Seminar 04/26/06

This Week's Seminar:

Matt Barreto

Department of Political Science, UW

"Controversies in Exit Polling:

Implementing a racially stratified homogenous precinct approach"

Time: 12:30 - 1:30pm on Wednesday, 04/26/06 (followed by coffee)

Abstract: In 2004, Voter News Service (VNS) exit polling was scrapped due to problems in 2000 and Edison-Mitofsky Research was chosen to implement a new, and more accurate National Exit Poll (NEP) in 2004. Exit poll results from Edison-Mitofsky showed John Kerry ahead in Ohio, Florida, and New Mexico - all states which he lost to Bush in 2004. In addition to the overall exit poll results being skewed, comparative vote results for subgroups, such as Latino voters, also appeared to be wrong. The National Exit Poll (NEP) reported on November 2, 2004 that Bush won 45 percent of the Latino vote, a 10-point gain from 2000. In contrast, an exit poll of only Latino voters conducted by the William C. Velasquez Institute reported that Bush won only 32 percent of the Latino vote.

What explains such discrepancies? One possibility is the methodology used to select the precincts where exit poll interviews are conducted is faulty.

Ideally, the respondents in the exit poll survey will be accurate representatives of the entire city or state in which the election is

being held. However, if the exit poll interviews respondents that are too conservative or too liberal, too young or too old, too poor or too rich, or too White, it could skew the overall results by a wide margin, even after weights are employed. Existing exit polls are often unreliable because the members of the demographic subgroups interviewed for the poll are not necessarily representative of all members of their demographic subgroup.

Specifically, we pose two important methodological questions pertaining to the science behind exit polls: (1) what is the most accurate sampling technique for polling racial and ethnic voters in a diverse setting, and (2) how should exit polls account for early and absentee votes not cast on Election Day? To answer these questions, we implemented an alternative sampling exit poll in the city of Los Angeles during the 2005 mayoral election and compared our results to the exit poll implemented by the Los Angeles Times and then compared both to the actual election results. In short, the different methodologies accounted for different results suggesting new approaches to exit polling are welcome.

The CSSS seminar series is centered around intellectual exchange and interaction, and the audience is encouraged to ask questions during presentations. The goal is a seminar that looks less like a lecture and more like a spirited discussion of issues raised in a relatively brief presentation of a statistical issue or a research project.

All seminars will be held at 12:30 on Wednesdays in Savery 209, and this quarter we will aim to conclude by 1:30. Coffee and treats will be provided after the seminar; attendees are also welcome to bring their lunch.

The complete schedule for this quarter's seminar can be found at www.csss.washington.edu/Seminars

To request disability accommodations, contact the Office of the ADA Coordinator ten days in advance of the event. 543-6450 (voice) 685-3885 (FAX) 543-6452 (TDD) access@u.washington.edu

*** Note *** To be removed from this mailing list, please send an email

to
listproc@u.washington.edu with the following line in the body of your
email: unsubscribe csss-seminar <your userid>

If you have difficulties with the mailing list, please email
stovel@u.washington.edu

Csss-seminar mailing list
Csss-seminar@u.washington.edu
<http://mailman1.u.washington.edu/mailman/listinfo/csss-seminar>

Karen Segar
Data Manager
Seattle Social Development Group
University of Washington
ksegar@u.washington.edu

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
<http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Tue, 25 Apr 2006 19:19:42 -0400
Reply-To: Mark Lindeman <lindeman@BARD.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark Lindeman <lindeman@BARD.EDU>
Subject: Re: exit polling talk in Seattle
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <006201c668b7\$a8bd7410\$2201a8c0@RetroPoll>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Marc,

I don't claim to be a non-response god, but I think it's obvious that
weighting for non-response has the potential to yield actually
worse results. I don't think the maxim "above all do no harm"
actually applies in the manner you use it here. If I'm not much
mistaken, doctors often use medical techniques that sometimes do

more harm than good.

Surely these considerations encourage caution in interpreting exit poll "results." (Someone of my acquaintance wrote just this morning that "John Kerry won the exit polls by several million votes." Groan.)

Mark Lindeman
Bard College

At 06:29 PM 4/25/2006, Marc Sapir wrote in part:

>This UW discussion looks very interesting. Wish I was in Seattle. The
>point below that most attracts my interest relates to weighting. It has
>always seemed to me that weighting a sample to achieve appropriately
>representative demographics (whether ethnicity, age, gender or anything
>else) is one of the more dangerous types of post hoc analysis.
>[...large snip...]
>but my main point is that, unless you
>have demonstrated specific evidence that the group whose results you are
>going to give more power to is not-unrepresentative, then weighting has
>the potential to make the generalized results farther from the truth
>than letting sleeping dogs lie. As the saying goes in medicine, "above
>all do no harm."

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Tue, 25 Apr 2006 19:54:47 -0400
Reply-To: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>
Subject: Re: exit polling talk in Seattle
Comments: To: mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <OF18BB009D.685E36BF-ON0425715B.0080D798@qc.cuny.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Hi Warren, et al:

The real issue, it seems to me, with exit polls is the fact that one has a certain amount of weighing and a very clustered samples, but not necessarily to reflect the various minority groups, as you indicate.

I have not seen any candid discussion or analysis of design effects in exit polls, but only what one could see as discussion of whether or not they were close or not close to the vote totals, and whether there was any non-sampling errors.

The problem remains with respect to the issue of not being able to know what the methodology was and to be able to review it independently.

As to using some of the methods from so-called "homogeneous precinct analysis," if the exit polls did not include some areas that included some very high concentrations of Hispanics, then they might be biased since the voting patterns may be and I have found in my own work are different for Hispanics living in predominantly non-Hispanic areas do vote differently than do those in the Hispanic areas. Unlike blacks a large fraction of Hispanics eventually can "blend in." David Halle, Richard Gedeon and I have a chapter in New York and Los Angeles: Politics, Economics and Society, A Comparative Analysis (University of CA, 2003)

At the same time, it is also the case that except for Puerto Ricans, Hispanics are non-citizens when they enter the US and many are not citizens. Nonetheless, in an analysis that I did using typical "racial bloc voting" techniques of the Ferrer election found that Ferrer had overwhelmingly won the Hispanic vote. This despite early press accounts that he did not do all that well. However, the media in NYC decided not to hire Warren or any of his colleagues during the mayoral election, so we have no other measure.

Some very poorly designed exit polls released the day after the election seemed to indicate the Ferrer did not do all that well among Hispanics.

My analysis is on-line in one of my Gotham Gazette Demographic Monthly Columns and can be accessed here:

<http://www.gothamgazette.com/article/Demographics/20051222/5/1688>

Hispanics and the Ferrer Candidacy (December, 2005) After the defeat of the first major mayoral candidate of Hispanic descent, commentators speculated this spelled the end of ethnic politics. Andrew Beveridge looks at recently released data to explain that the commentators got it all wrong. A profile of the Hispanic New York voter.

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

From: AAPORNET@asu.edu [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM
Sent: Tuesday, April 25, 2006 5:58 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: exit polling talk in Seattle

Some of the statements in the announcement of the talk in Seattle about exit polls is just plain wrong. First of all, all state differences between the 2004 exit polls and the final results of the election were within sampling error. There were no mistakes in announcing winners by Edison/Mitofsky or any of the six NEP members.

Second, the Hispanic vote was 44% for Bush in the national exit poll. It was 40% when summing across all the state exit polls. The 40% was probably an understatement as voters were not asked if they were Hispanic in states with low incidence.

The Valasquez institute exit poll omitted some states and great parts of the states they were in. One cannot represent all Hispanic voters by sampling only in places with high concentrations of Hispanics, which is what

Valasquez did. That does not represent all Hispanic voters. The Hispanics who do not live in these concentrated areas do not vote like those that do live in the types of areas sampled by Valasquez.

Lastly, exit polls are not the best way to measure characteristics of minority voters. The sampling error for an exit poll is much larger than it is for most other characteristics.

We stand by our Hispanic vote estimates, which were the same as the LA Times national exit poll's.

We are open to hearing about better sample selection methods. Surely someone is not suggesting we do what the Valasquez institute did?
warren mitofsky

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
<http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

=====
Date: Wed, 26 Apr 2006 08:38:41 +0100
Reply-To: "Moon, Nick" <nick.moon@GFK.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Moon, Nick" <nick.moon@GFK.COM>
Subject: Re: exit polling talk in Seattle
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"

Andrew Beveridge wrote:

"I have not seen any candid discussion or analysis of design effects in exit polls"

Colm O'Muircheartaigh and I did some work on design effects on the exit polls at a British general election, using two separate national exit polls carried out by NOP and MORI. I don't have the results to hand but the design effects were huge, and if taken at face value would produce sampling errors that made even a poll of 15,000 meaningless.

I think the problem is that the variation in distribution was so vast, and so unlike a normal distribution. At precinct level there were several cases where 100% of the votes cast were for one party, and several more where it was in excess of 90%, and this I think played havoc with the design effect

calculations

Please update your records with my new email
address shown at the top of this message.

Any views or opinions are solely those of the
author and do not necessarily represent those of
GfK NOP or any of its associated companies.

The information transmitted is intended only for
the person or entity to which it is addressed
and may contain confidential and/or privileged
material. If you are not the intended recipient of
this message, please do not read, copy, use or
disclose this communication and notify the
sender immediately. It should be noted that
any review, retransmission, dissemination or
other use of, or taking action in reliance
upon, this information by persons or entities
other than the intended recipient is prohibited.

Recipients are warned that GfK NOP cannot guarantee
that attachments or enclosures are secure or error-free
as information could be intercepted, corrupted,
or contain viruses

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <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, 26 Apr 2006 08:39:08 +0100
Reply-To: "Moon, Nick" <nick.moon@GFK.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Moon, Nick" <nick.moon@GFK.COM>
Subject: Re: exit polling talk in Seattle
Comments: To: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>,
AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"

Andrew Beveridge wrote:

"I have not seen any candid discussion or analysis of design effects in
exit polls"

Colm O'Muircheartaigh and I did some work on design effects on the exit

polls at a British general election, using two separate national exit polls carried out by NOP and MORI. I don't have the results to hand but the design effects were huge, and if taken at face value would produce sampling errors that made even a poll of 15,000 meaningless.

I think the problem is that the variation in distribution was so vast, and so unlike a normal distribution. At precinct level there were several cases where 100% of the votes cast were for one party, and several more where it was in excess of 90%, and this I think played havoc with the design effect calculations

Please update your records with my new email address shown at the top of this message.

Any views or opinions are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of GfK NOP or any of its associated companies.

The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, please do not read, copy, use or disclose this communication and notify the sender immediately. It should be noted that any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited.

Recipients are warned that GfK NOP cannot guarantee that attachments or enclosures are secure or error-free as information could be intercepted, corrupted, or contain viruses

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <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, 26 Apr 2006 06:56:24 -0400
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Subject: Re: exit polling talk in Seattle
Comments: To: Andrew.Beveridge@qc.cuny.edu, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <OF18BB009D.685E36BF-ON0425715B.0080D798@qc.cuny.edu>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

At 07:42 PM 4/25/2006, Andrew.Beveridge@qc.cuny.edu wrote:
>I have not seen any candid discussion or analysis of design effects in
>exit polls,

Andy,
See if this helps. From a study of design effect from the 2004
national exit poll:

We found that a majority of the 95% confidence intervals from the
replication variance method we computed fit well into the current
Methods Statement table. [This is the published sampling error that
accompanies archived data] That table, you may recall, had a design
effect of 2.25 (1.5 is the square root of that design effect;

The exceptions were the extremely clustered variables that had
significantly larger design effects producing sampling errors
approximately twice as large as those used in the table. Clustered
variables like income, race, and religion had larger replication
sampling errors than those in the Methods Statement. For race, the
design effect is about 15 and for religion it is about 6.

Opinion items tended to have smaller design effects than factual items.

The sampling errors on marginals of characteristics were somewhat
larger than those on characteristics cross tabulated by the
presidential vote.

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <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, 26 Apr 2006 08:05:38 -0400
Reply-To: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>
Subject: FW: exit polling talk in Seattle
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Dear All:

This is helpful. The Hispanic situation is especially interesting.
African Americans regardless of their income or social status tend to be
very highly segregated in the United States. Also their citizenship rate is
quite similar to that of white Americans. For Hispanics the situation is

quite different. The more highly segregated tend to live in areas (except Puerto Rican areas) where the citizenship rate is quite low for the voting age population (e.g. something on the order of 40 to 50%) .
Nonetheless there are many citizens there.

A large fraction of Hispanics consider themselves to be white and are treated as white by others, and when they move up economically they do not experience the same level of segregation as blacks. It would not be surprising if such Hispanics had different voting patterns than those who are living in quite highly segregated areas. This seems to be the finding of the Hispanic poll referenced in the Seattle discussion.

The question then is how segregated are Hispanic citizens in general, and to what extent are the various groups of Hispanics properly represented in conventional exit polls.

Warren's comments and those from Britain indicate that the design effects maybe so high for such sub-groups as to swamp the analysis. Homogeneous precinct analysis, which has its problems, is probably not that bad an approach to getting figures for the Hispanic population that is highly concentrated.

The real problem is to generalize to the whole population from either the conventional Exit polls that probably under-represent the highly concentrated Hispanics or from the targetted polls that most certainly are not fully representative of the Hispanic population.

Andy Beveridge

From: mitofsky@mindspring.com [mailto:mitofsky@mindspring.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 26, 2006 6:56 AM
To: Andrew Beveridge; AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: RE: exit polling talk in Seattle

At 07:42 PM 4/25/2006, Andrew.Beveridge@qc.cuny.edu wrote:

I have not seen any candid discussion or analysis of design effects in exit polls,

Andy,
See if this helps. From a study of design effect from the 2004 national exit poll:

We found that a majority of the 95% confidence intervals from the replication variance method we computed fit well into the current Methods Statement table. [This is the published sampling error that accompanies archived data] That table, you may recall, had a design effect of 2.25 (1.5 is the square root of that design effect;

The exceptions were the extremely clustered variables that had significantly larger design effects producing sampling errors approximately twice as large as those used in the table. Clustered variables like income, race, and religion had larger replication sampling errors than those in the Methods Statement. For race, the design effect is about 15 and for religion it is about 6.

Opinion items tended to have smaller design effects than factual items.

The sampling errors on marginals of characteristics were somewhat larger than those on characteristics cross tabulated by the presidential vote.

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
<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

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <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, 26 Apr 2006 09:37:04 -0400
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing
Subject: Re: exit polling talk in Seattle
Comments: To: "Moon, Nick" <nick.moon@GFK.COM>
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <B1510CD625091E43886C3AAA7EC171DD06D202CF@lud-exh-nt08.nop.nopworld.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

This is hardly surprising.

Most exit polls use samples of precincts, not of voters, and overall election results should be estimated based on a weighted average of precinct results, not of voters.

To the extent that precincts are internally homogeneous, total sampling error is dominated by the error between precincts. In the extreme case where everyone in each precinct votes the same way (no doubt the ideal situation in the minds of most incumbent politicians), the sampling error would be simply the error between precincts. In practical terms,

think of a sample size of 50 (precincts), not of 5,000 (voters), and a population frame in the thousands (precincts), not millions (voters).

From this perspective, one quickly understands the validity of Warren Mitofsky's caution about paying too much credence to the results of the Velasquez Institute poll. More generally, because variation between precincts is likely to be greater than within, one should exercise due caution before extending voter characteristics obtained from exit polls to the general population.

Jan Werner

Moon, Nick wrote:

> Andrew Beveridge wrote:

>

> "I have not seen any candid discussion or analysis of design effects in

> exit polls"

>

> Colm O'Muircheartaigh and I did some work on design effects on the exit

> polls at a British general election, using two separate national exit polls

> carried out by NOP and MORI. I don't have the results to hand but the design

> effects were huge, and if taken at face value would produce sampling errors

> that made even a poll of 15,000 meaningless.

>

> I think the problem is that the variation in distribution was so vast, and

> so unlike a normal distribution. At precinct level there were several cases

> where 100% of the votes cast were for one party, and several more where it

> was in excess of 90%, and this I think played havoc with the design effect

> calculations

>

>

> *****

> Please update your records with my new email

> address shown at the top of this message.

>

> *****

> Any views or opinions are solely those of the

> author and do not necessarily represent those of

> GfK NOP or any of its associated companies.

> *****

> The information transmitted is intended only for

> the person or entity to which it is addressed

> and may contain confidential and/or privileged

> material. If you are not the intended recipient of

> this message, please do not read, copy, use or

> disclose this communication and notify the

> sender immediately. It should be noted that

> any review, retransmission, dissemination or

> other use of, or taking action in reliance

> upon, this information by persons or entities

> other than the intended recipient is prohibited.

> *****

> Recipients are warned that GfK NOP cannot guarantee

> that attachments or enclosures are secure or error-free
> as information could be intercepted, corrupted,
> or contain viruses
> *****
>
>
> -----
> Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
> Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
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
>
>

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: 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, 26 Apr 2006 09:39:47 -0400
Reply-To: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>
Subject: exit polling talk in Seattle
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

This did not get through, at least to me.

Dear All:

This is helpful. The Hispanic situation is especially interesting. African Americans regardless of their income or social status tend to be very highly segregated in the United States. Also their citizenship rate is quite similar to that of white Americans. For Hispanics the situation is quite different. The more highly segregated tend to live in areas (except Puerto Rican areas) where the citizenship rate is quite low for the voting age population (e.g. something on the order of 40 to 50%) . Nonetheless there are many citizens there.

A large fraction of Hispanics consider themselves to be white and are treated as white by others, and when they move up economically they do not experience the same level of segregation as blacks. It would not be surprising if such Hispanics had different voting patterns than those who are living in quite highly segregated areas. This seems to be the finding of the Hispanic poll referenced in the Seattle discussion.

The question then is how segregated are Hispanic citizens in general, and to

what extent do the various groups of Hispanics properly represented in conventional exit polls.

Warren's comments and those from Britain indicate that the design effects maybe so high for such sub-groups as to swamp the analysis. Homogeneous precinct analysis, which has its problems, is probably not that bad an approach to getting figures for the Hispanic population that is highly concentrated.

The real problem is to generalize to the whole population from either the conventional Exit polls that probably under-represent the highly concentrated Hispanics or from the targeted polls that most certainly are not fully representative of the Hispanic population.

Andy Beveridge

From: mitofsky@mindspring.com [mailto:mitofsky@mindspring.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 26, 2006 6:56 AM
To: Andrew Beveridge; AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: RE: exit polling talk in Seattle

At 07:42 PM 4/25/2006, Andrew.Beveridge@qc.cuny.edu wrote:

I have not seen any candid discussion or analysis of design effects in exit polls,

Andy,
See if this helps. From a study of design effect from the 2004 national exit poll:

We found that a majority of the 95% confidence intervals from the replication variance method we computed fit well into the current Methods Statement table. [This is the published sampling error that accompanies archived data] That table, you may recall, had a design effect of 2.25 (1.5 is the square root of that design effect;

The exceptions were the extremely clustered variables that had significantly larger design effects producing sampling errors approximately twice as large as those used in the table. Clustered variables like income, race, and religion had larger replication sampling errors than those in the Methods Statement. For race, the design effect is about 15 and for religion it is about 6.

Opinion items tended to have smaller design effects than factual items.

The sampling errors on marginals of characteristics were somewhat larger than those on characteristics cross tabulated by the presidential vote.

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
<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

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <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, 26 Apr 2006 11:47:09 -0500
Reply-To: "Flores, Henry" <hflores@STMARYTX.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Flores, Henry" <hflores@STMARYTX.EDU>
Subject: Velasquez Institute Poll_Latino Sample
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

The Latino sample that was drawn for the Velasquez Institute's Poll was drawn from a probability and stratified sample that insured that the sample was drawn from precincts having varying degrees of Latino registered voter population densities. So the sample precincts had a range of LRVs from as low as 5% to as high as 95%. This was accomplished to insure that not all of the Latino precincts were homogeneous. The final sample was weighted by the total number of registered voters in all precincts. I was responsible for creating the sampling frame and drawing the sample itself. I also discussed my technique with many individuals including Warren Mitofsky when the discussions over the NEP and Velasquez Institute's results were made public. Essentially, we feel that in order to obtain an more accurate sample of a sub-population you need to make it a separate sample; making it a sub-sample of the larger sample sometimes does not allow the investigator the luxury of designing a frame that will allow one to draw a sample of the sub-population that gives an accurate picture of that sub-population because of the diverse nature of the sub-population and its tendency, in the case of Latinos, to be clustered in only certain parts of the country. The sampling methodology is available on the WCVI website.

=20

Henry Flores, Ph.D.

Dean,

Graduate School

St. Mary's University
1 Camino Santa Maria
San Antonio, TX 78228
210-436-3214

=20

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <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, 26 Apr 2006 16:46:47 -0400
Reply-To: Nancy Belden <nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nancy Belden <nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM>
Subject: Re: People kinder in the South?
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu, Sandra Berry <berry@rand.org>
In-Reply-To: <[000701c663e6\\$4e56d820\\$6701a8c0@Mobel](mailto:000701c663e6$4e56d820$6701a8c0@Mobel)>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Sandy, I am a firm believer that Southerners have a different culture that makes them sweeter, but that is another matter. What I really want to suggest here is that your researcher needs to look at the public school history and culture in the states, including what has gone down in recent years with regard to school reform, high stakes or any state testing, No Child Left Behind, etc. My rather extensive qualitative experience with these issues has suggested that state to state the experiences are very different. North Carolina for example entered into the state testing and setting of explicit academic standards before other states, and appears to have done a careful and good job of bringing teachers along after their initial resistance to change. Virginia on the other hand, right next door, did a terrible job in the beginning and believe me, teachers would tell you about it. Another example: In Kentucky, in the rural areas, teachers themselves (as well as members of the public) regard teachers' salaries as very generous, but ask that in DC or NYC and of course you get another answer.

Nancy Belden
Partner, Belden Russonello & Stewart
Past President, American Association for Public Opinion Research

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Ellis Godard
Sent: Wednesday, April 19, 2006 3:20 PM
Re: People kinder in the South?

Having grown up in Georgia, where all my relatives still live (and where many of my ancestors have for nearly 200 years), I can attest (anecdotally) to a general sense of pollyana. It isn't necessarily naievete, as it's perhaps a function of somewhat superficial politeness. But I reckon folks there tend to talk more about the bright side of the road, and the half-full part of the glass. That doesn't mean, in this case, that GA teachers are necessarily concealing dissatisfaction comparable to CA and PA - but your researcher may want to assess the extent to which they differ in evaluations of other things, unrelated to the study and uncorrelated with geographic demographics.

Second, it may be a reverse of "rising expectations": If schools in PA have gotten better (and better-funded?), teachers there might be more critical, having seen some improvement and wanting more. GA schools, being near the bottom, may generate greater satisfaction because folks either don't know better, or don't recognize the deficiencies, or are focused on the successes with what they do have.

Lastly, the word "kinder" isn't quite right. Folks down South might smilingly tolerate a bigot, mysoginist, or public nuisance, which is arguably less kind to others impacted. I'm inclined instead to say that Georgians are "nicer", and am reminded of several jokes based on the premise that "Well, isn't that nice" conveys instead something vulgar, derogatory, and dismissive.

-eg

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

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

> Sent: Wednesday, April 19, 2006 11:24 AM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: People kinder in the South?

>

>

> Do you know of any findings that respondents in the South,
> for example, tend to rate satisfaction items higher (on
> average) using graduated scales than respondents in another
> regions of the US? Or any findings that they tend to rate
> public services in general higher than people in other areas
> -- or differently at all? We have a researcher here with
> survey responses from teachers in CA, GA and PA, and he finds
> that GA teachers responses are more positive across a wide
> range of topics. It's possible that this genuinely reflects
> greater teacher satisfaction with the education system in GA,
> but it could also be a more global effect. We'd like to
> confirm or rule out the alternative hypothesis. Anyone know
> of any research on this question?

>

> Sandra H. Berry 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, registration, and preliminary program:
> <http://www.aapor.org/>
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:
> aapornet-request@asu.edu AAPOR e-voting problems? write:
> aapor-info@goamp.com
>

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
<http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <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: Thu, 27 Apr 2006 11:33:24 -0500
Reply-To: "Neidorf, Shawn M." <sneido1@UIC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Neidorf, Shawn M." <sneido1@UIC.EDU>
Subject: seeking advice
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

Good morning/afternoon,

Earlier this week, I sent a message seeking questionnaire-design advice

both for real-life use and for a paper I am writing for a class, but I fear that in trying to be clear and detailed, I sent far too long a message. I received a few responses, which I very much appreciate, but I'd like to get some more input.

I will conduct a Web-based survey, drawing the sample from a list. Initial recruitment will be by U.S. mail, with follow-ups by e-mail and telephone. All sample members are literate in English and very familiar with computers and the Internet. The survey deals with how to get ahead (or not) in the sample members' field, so it should have high salience. Unfortunately, the survey will be quite long.

What I have to figure out—and what I would very much appreciate advice on—is:

1. How do I increase my chances for a high unit response rate to a long survey distributed electronically? (I won't likely be able to offer traditional cash or non-token gift incentives, though I could possibly do a charitable donation offer or an offer to share information resulting from the survey to respondents.)
2. How do I minimize satisficing?
3. How do I minimize item non-response/breakoffs?
4. How do I minimize the impact of the length as a burden to the respondents?
5. What else should I be worried about?

I've spent a lot of time with the literature; what I'm hoping to find is the additional knowledge people have stored in their heads that hasn't found its way into publication yet.

If anyone else would like to weigh in over the next couple days, I'd really appreciate it.

Yours truly,

Shawn Neidorf, graduate student
UIC Department of Sociology/
Graduate Concentration in Survey Research Methodology
sneido1@uic.edu
708-261-9156

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Thu, 27 Apr 2006 14:27:41 -0400
Reply-To: Jonathan Brill <brillje@UMDNJ.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jonathan Brill <brillje@UMDNJ.EDU>
Subject: CATI facility operations
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
Content-disposition: inline

Dear Colleagues:

I would like to speak arrange a few short telephone conversationsl with folks who are knowledgeable about staff management issues/programs in university based CATI facilities. If you run such a CATI operation or can refer me to a colleague who does, please let me know. I want to talk about such issues to learn what standard practices are in a few areas in order to deal with questions being asked by our University's administration and bean counters.

Regards,
Jonathan

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm)
Associate Director, Database & Panel Research
NEW JERSEY INSTITUTE FOR SUCCESSFUL AGING
School of Osteopathic Medicine
University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey
42 East Laurel Road, UDP Suite 2300
Stratford, New Jersey 08084
Telephone (direct): 856.566-6727
Fax (research group): 856.566-6874
E-mail: brillje@umdnj.edu

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email communication may contain private, confidential, or legally privileged information intended for the sole use of the designated and/or duly authorized recipient(s). If you are not the intended recipient or have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by email and permanently delete all copies of this email including all attachments without reading them. If you are the intended recipient, secure the contents in a manner that conforms to all applicable state and/or federal requirements related to privacy and confidentiality of such information.

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Thu, 27 Apr 2006 13:04:53 -0700
Reply-To: John Fries <jfries@ANR.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: John Fries <jfries@ANR.COM>
Subject: The Truth About Voting in Last Election
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

All,

I have a client who is interested in asking registered voters about a

referendum that was voted on and passed during the last election in November. It occurred to both of us that, as I believe past research has shown, more respondents than should be likely to claim they a) voted in the last election and b) voted for this referendum that narrowly passed. In fact, there is some evidence that this tendency to join the winning team was already present just a few days after the election.

I was wondering if any of you who do political polling might have some thoughts about how to tease out the "truth" about who really did vote for this particular referendum and who did not. Our fear is that without some way of knowing this, we could not be very confident about what the rest of the survey tells us about each of these groups. =20

Initially we thought we might be able to get at this by asking some specific questions about what the referendum was about and maybe asking them why they voted for or against it. Those who indicate some knowledge about the referendum and provide a reason for their vote could then be analyzed separately. Of course this is imperfect in that many who voted probably did

so for legitimate, but perhaps not particularly well thought out reasons.=20 Therefore including only those who have such reasons may skew the analysis a whole different way=85which leads me to think maybe this is something that c= an not truly be untangled.

We have some actual voting data by county which would allow us to measure whether the proportion for and against in our survey is accurate. But if it is significantly "out of whack" (to use the official research term), the validity of the rest of the data would have to be called into serious question.=20

I welcome any thoughts or suggestions on how to deal with this issue...if it can be dealt with.

Thanks in advance.

John

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Thu, 27 Apr 2006 17:00:17 -0400
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Subject: Exit polling talk in Seattle-correction
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

My statement the other day about the 2004 exit polls had a misleading sentence. When I said "...differences between the 2004 exit polls and the final results of the election were within sampling error," I was referring only to the states that had the losing candidate in first place. There were four states like that: IA, NV, NM, OH. All the rest had the correct candidate ahead. In the four states the results were within sampling error. We use the 1 chance in 100 level to make calls, so that's what I was referring to.

The statement I made would lead you to believe the statement applied to all states, and that was wrong. A number were beyond sampling error. Those states had the right candidate winning. Just to be clear, there were no mistaken projections by Edison/Mitofsky or any member of NEP.
warren mitofsky

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

212 980-3031
212 980-3107 Fax

www.mitofskyinternational.com
mitofsky@mindspring.com

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapor.net.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Thu, 27 Apr 2006 15:32:41 -0700
Reply-To: ellis.godard@csun.edu
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Ellis Godard <ellis.godard@CSUN.EDU>
Subject: Re: The Truth About Voting in Last Election
Comments: To: John Fries <jfries@ANR.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Would it help to ask hypothetically would they vote in such an election, and would they support such a referendum, asking about the last election only secondarily?

-eg

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

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

> Sent: Thursday, April 27, 2006 1:05 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: The Truth About Voting in Last Election

>

>

> All,

>

> I have a client who is interested in asking registered voters
> about a referendum that was voted on and passed during the
> last election in November. It occurred to both of us that,
> as I believe past research has shown, more respondents than
> should are likely to claim they a) voted in the last election
> and b) voted for this referendum that narrowly passed. In
> fact, there is some evidence that this tendency to join the
> winning team was already present just a few days after the election.

>

> I was wondering if any of you who do political polling might
> have some thoughts about how to tease out the "truth" about
> who really did vote for this particular referendum and who
> did not. Our fear is that without some way of knowing this,
> we could not be very confident about what the rest of the
> survey tells us about each of these groups.

>

> Initially we thought we might be able to get at this by
> asking some specific questions about what the referendum was
> about and maybe asking them why they voted for or against it.
> Those who indicate some knowledge about the referendum and
> provide a reason for their vote could then be analyzed
> separately. Of course this is imperfect in that many who
> voted probably did so for legitimate, but perhaps not
> particularly well thought out reasons.
> Therefore including only those who have such reasons may skew
> the analysis a whole different way. which leads me to think
> maybe this is something that can not truly be untangled.

>

> We have some actual voting data by county which would allow
> us to measure whether the proportion for and against in our
> survey is accurate. But if it is significantly "out of
> whack" (to use the official research term), the validity of
> the rest of the data would have to be called into serious question.

>

> I welcome any thoughts or suggestions on how to deal with
> this issue...if it can be dealt with.

>

> Thanks in advance.

>

> John

>

> -----

> Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!

> Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:

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

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
=====

Date: Fri, 28 Apr 2006 07:28:59 +0100
Reply-To: Bob Worcester <Bob.Worcester@MORI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Bob Worcester <Bob.Worcester@MORI.COM>
Subject: Re: The Truth About Voting in Last Election
Comments: To: ellis.godard@csun.edu, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

In Britain, the preface, "Of course at the [general election/local election=
s/referendum], many people didn't get the chance to vote," before the votin=
g behaviour question, seems to bring the overclaiming down to closer to the=
actual result.

=20
Does anyone have the citation for the much quoted reports that while the 19=
60 Kennedy election was 50.1 majority, a week later it was 53%, a year late=
r 60% and after the assassination, two thirds recalled voting for John F. K=
ennedy? (or some such figures)

From: AAPORNET on behalf of Ellis Godard
Sent: Thu 27/04/2006 23:32
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: The Truth About Voting in Last Election

Would it help to ask hypothetically would they vote in such an election, and
would they support such a referndum, asking about the last election only
secondarily?

-eg

> -----Original Message-----
> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of John Fries
> Sent: Thursday, April 27, 2006 1:05 PM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: The Truth About Voting in Last Election
>
>
> All,

>
> I have a client who is interested in asking registered voters
> about a referendum that was voted on and passed during the
> last election in November. It occurred to both of us that,
> as I believe past research has shown, more respondents than
> should are likely to claim they a) voted in the last election
> and b) voted for this referendum that narrowly passed. In
> fact, there is some evidence that this tendency to join the
> winning team was already present just a few days after the election.

>
> I was wondering if any of you who do political polling might
> have some thoughts about how to tease out the "truth" about
> who really did vote for this particular referendum and who
> did not. Our fear is that without some way of knowing this,
> we could not be very confident about what the rest of the
> survey tells us about each of these groups.=20

>
> Initially we thought we might be able to get at this by
> asking some specific questions about what the referendum was
> about and maybe asking them why they voted for or against it.
> Those who indicate some knowledge about the referendum and
> provide a reason for their vote could then be analyzed
> separately. Of course this is imperfect in that many who
> voted probably did so for legitimate, but perhaps not
> particularly well thought out reasons.
> Therefore including only those who have such reasons may skew
> the analysis a whole different way. which leads me to think
> maybe this is something that can not truly be untangled.

>
> We have some actual voting data by county which would allow
> us to measure whether the proportion for and against in our
> survey is accurate. But if it is significantly "out of
> whack" (to use the official research term), the validity of
> the rest of the data would have to be called into serious question.

>
> I welcome any thoughts or suggestions on how to deal with
> this issue...if it can be dealt with.

>
> Thanks in advance.

>
> John

>
> -----
> Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
> Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
> <http://www.aapor.org/>
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>
> -----
> Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
> Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
> g/

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

This e-mail and all attachments it may contain 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 Ipsos MORI and its associated companies. If you are not the intended recipient, be advised that you have received this e-mail in error and that any use, dissemination, printing, forwarding or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. Please contact the sender if you have received this e-mail in error.

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 2006 07:21:56 -0400
Reply-To: lindeman@BARD.EDU
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark Lindeman <lindeman@BARD.EDU>
Subject: Re: The Truth About Voting in Last Election
Comments: To: Bob Worcester <Bob.Worcester@MORI.COM>
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 8bit

Quoting Bob Worcester <Bob.Worcester@MORI.COM>:

> In Britain, the preface, "Of course at the [general election/local
> elections/referendum], many people didn't get the chance to vote," before
the
> voting behaviour question, seems to bring the overclaiming down to closer to
> the actual result.

American overreporters may be made of sterner stuff, but the "new" American National Election Study question does reduce overreporting substantially compared with the old one (it is still considerable). The wording had been:

"In talking to people about the election we often find that a lot of people weren't able to vote because they weren't registered or they were sick or they just didn't have time. How about you, did you vote in the elections this November?" In the new version (all respondents in 2000, half-samples in both 2002 and

2004), the preamble is the same, then the q. continues: "Which of the following statements best describes you: One, I did not vote (in the election this November); Two, I thought about voting this time - but didn't; Three, I usually vote, but didn't this time; or Four, I am sure I voted?"

How does overreporting (of having voted) affect reported winning margins? There's a lot about this q. that either we don't know, or I couldn't find. In the ANES, there is usually little short-run (post-election wave) bandwagon effect in presidential races, rather more down-ticket (where I doubt it is best described as a bandwagon effect). Of course not all bandwagoning is due to overreporting. See Gerald Wright 1993 in AJPS, referencing earlier articles by Wright and Paul Gronke; Michael Martinez has a 2006 conference paper on the ANES stuff at <http://www.clas.ufl.edu/users/martinez/martinezspsa06.pdf>.

> Does anyone have the citation for the much quoted reports that while the 1960 Kennedy election was 50.1 majority, a week later it was 53%, a year later 60% and after the assassination, two thirds recalled voting for John F. Kennedy? > (or some such figures)

Partly. Per the Roper Center database, I found that NORC fielded a "Kennedy Assassination Survey" 11/26-12/3 of 1963, in which it asked, "In the 1960 election, did you prefer Nixon or Kennedy for President?" 65% said they "prefer[red]" Kennedy, 30% Nixon. The next question asked if the respondent had voted; I only have access to the topline results, so I can't say exactly what percentage actually indicated that they had voted for Kennedy.

That degree of false recall is actually rivalled, in the opposite direction, by Mike Dukakis in the 1993 General Social Survey. In 1988, Dukakis lost to George H. W. Bush by 7.7 points, but in the 1993 GSS, the margin was about 41 points (69 to 28). In general (I learned while writing my last conference paper, about the glut of self-reported Bush 2000 voters in the 2004 exit poll), mid-range U.S. presidential "bandwagon" effects are pretty much the rule, although Dukakis offers an extreme case.

But of course that is far from the original question about short-run bandwagon effects pertaining to a ballot issue. Umm, a real problem, I generally wouldn't expect it to be large, but surely it depends on the issue.

Mark Lindeman
Bard College

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Date: Fri, 28 Apr 2006 11:48:26 -0500
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: Job Opportunity
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Comments: cc: Rlemberg@mathematica-mpr.com
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Statistician: Position # 3128,3129

=20

Mathematica is seeking a statistician with knowledge and experience in survey sampling and biostatistical methodologies and experience/interest in any of the following: small area estimation, causal inference, hierarchical linear modeling, experimental (random assignment) and quasi-experimental design, and clinical trials and biostatistical analyses.=20

=20

As a leading public policy research organization in the United States with offices in Washington DC, Princeton NJ, and Cambridge MA. Mathematica's clients include federal and state government agencies, foundations, universities, professional associations, and businesses. Our projects are staffed with interdisciplinary teams made up of statisticians, survey design experts, survey researchers, and topic area specialists.

=20

Participation in the following activities:=20

- * sampling design development (including sample size determination and sample allocation) =20
- * sampling selection and sample preparation for data collection
- * computation and adjustment of sampling weights=20
- * imputation for missing data
- * developing estimation procedures for complex surveys
- * analysis of survey data

Qualifications:

Ph.D. in statistics, biostatistics, or an equivalent combination of education and experience=20

Background and experience in sample design and survey methodology or biostatistics

Strong oral and written communication skills

Knowledge and experience with statistical programming is desirable

Knowledge and/or experience in the areas of small area estimation, causal inference, hierarchical linear modeling, or experimental (random assignment) and quasi-experimental design is desirable

We offer our employees a stimulating, team-oriented work environment, a competitive salary, and a comprehensive benefits package as well as the advantages of employee ownership. We also provide generous paid time off and an on-site fitness center. Positions are available in Washington, DC and Princeton, NJ.

=20

Please visit our website

<http://www.mathematica-mpr.com/employment/statistician.asp> to submit a cover letter, resume, salary requirements, DC or NJ location preference, and contact information for three references.=20

=20

=20

=20

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

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

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

=====
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 2006 09:11:47 -0700

Reply-To: David Palmer <dpalmer1@BIGRED.UNL.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: David Palmer <dpalmer1@BIGRED.UNL.EDU>

Subject: American Idol voting

This is a question I think would be fun to look at. I wondered if anyone

has done a probablistic sample (or any kind of sample for that matter), to compare the weekly outcome of the American Idol voting to the general population/viewership's opinion. I know a lot of people who watch the show (including me), but never vote. I have to wonder if the results reflect how most viewers would vote or if they are due to ballot stuffing (by family/friends or otherwise), a difference of opinion between voters and non-voters, etc. and what implications these would have on results. Though the results of such a study would be lighthearted I think a serious analysis could prove newsworthy. Anyone out there that would be willing to perform such a study or that has relevant data already?

~David Palmer
University of Nebraska
Survey Research and Methodology Program
dpalmer1@bigred.unl.edu

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

=====
Date: Fri, 28 Apr 2006 21:11:28 +0100
Reply-To: "Moon, Nick" <nick.moon@GFK.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Moon, Nick" <nick.moon@GFK.COM>
Subject: Re: American Idol voting
Comments: To: David Palmer <dpalmer1@BIGRED.UNL.EDU>, AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"

not quite the same thing but on the original UK Pop Idol internet pollsters YouGov successfully predicted the outcome of the final. In research terms it wasn't that much of a coup as they weighted the claimed semi-final results to match the actual, but it does suggest that if there was ballot-stuffing it was in the same proportion as the "real" votes

-----Original Message-----
From: AAPORNET
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Sent: 28/04/2006 17:11
Subject: American Idol voting

This is a question I think would be fun to look at. I wondered if anyone has done a probablistic sample (or any kind of sample for that matter), to compare the weekly outcome of the American Idol voting to the general population/viewership's opinion. I know a lot of people who watch the show (including me), but never vote. I have to wonder if the results reflect how most viewers would vote or if they are due to ballot stuffing

(by family/friends or otherwise), a difference of opinion between voters and non-voters, etc. and what implications these would have on results.

Though the results of such a study would be lighthearted I think a serious analysis could prove newsworthy. Anyone out there that would be willing to perform such a study or that has relevant data already?

~David Palmer
University of Nebraska
Survey Research and Methodology Program
dpalmer1@bigred.unl.edu

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!
Conference info, registration, and preliminary program:
<http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu
AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com

Please update your records with my new email
address shown at the top of this message.

Any views or opinions are solely those of the
author and do not necessarily represent those of
GfK NOP or any of its associated companies.

The information transmitted is intended only for
the person or entity to which it is addressed
and may contain confidential and/or privileged
material. If you are not the intended recipient of
this message, please do not read, copy, use or
disclose this communication and notify the
sender immediately. It should be noted that
any review, retransmission, dissemination or
other use of, or taking action in reliance
upon, this information by persons or entities
other than the intended recipient is prohibited.

Recipients are warned that GfK NOP cannot guarantee
that attachments or enclosures are secure or error-free
as information could be intercepted, corrupted,
or contain viruses

Newsletter on website! Read about plans for Montreal!

Conference info, registration, and preliminary program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

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

AAPOR e-voting problems? write: aapor-info@goamp.com