

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 LOG0711"

Date: Thu, 1 Nov 2007 09:30:37 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: NASA to reveal disputed air safety research
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

(A much better updated story featuring yesterday's hearings - I highly recommend it)

NASA to reveal disputed air safety research

<http://www.cnn.com/2007/TRAVEL/10/31/air.safety.secrets.ap/index.html>

or

<http://tinyurl.com/yws8dn>

WASHINGTON (AP) -- Abandoning its secrecy claims, NASA promised Congress on Wednesday it will reveal results of an unprecedented federal aviation survey which found that aircraft near collisions, runway interference and other safety problems occur far more often than previously recognized.

SNIP

Lawmakers from both sides were harshly critical. Rep. Bart Gordon, D-Tennessee, chairman of the House Science and Technology Committee, said NASA's reasons for withholding the research were "both troubling and unconvincing."

"This appears to a mess of NASA's own causing," said Rep. James Sensenbrenner, R-Wisconsin, the top Republican on the committee's oversight and investigations panel. "You've dug yourself in a hole. I can't say you're not digging yourself deeper from what I've heard at this hearing."

SNIP

In an odd twist, Griffin raised doubts about the reliability of his own agency's research by telling lawmakers that NASA does not consider the survey's methodology or data to have been sufficiently verified.

Griffin confirmed NASA's research project showed many types of safety incidents occurring more frequently than were reported by other U.S. government monitoring programs. But he cautioned that the data was never

validated and warned, "There may be reason to question the validity of the methodology."

"We did not manage that project well," he told Congress. "We will fix it and we will try not to do it again."

"What I'm hearing you say is, we've just thrown \$11 million down a rathole," said Rep. Ben Chandler, D-Kentucky.

"I hope that is not the case, and I believe we should be able to get much that is useful from this data," Griffin said. "But there will be cause to question it from knowledgeable aviation experts."

Experts who worked on the study say it adhered to the highest survey industry standards. The research was "state of the art," said Jon Krosnick, a Stanford University professor who helped create the survey questions. Disputing Griffin, Krosnick told Congress that aviation experts from NASA, the Federal Aviation Administration and other groups reviewed the research plans and said further scrutiny would not have been helpful.

"These peer review processes rarely yielded significant changes in the survey process," Krosnick said.

NASA's former head of the research project, Robert Dodd, told lawmakers the survey was based on "outstanding science," extensively tested and ready for meaningful analysis. Dodd said NASA's earlier explanations for withholding the information were "without merit."

"I don't believe that the ... data contained any information that could compare with the image of a crashed air carrier airplane or would increase passengers' fear of flying," Dodd said.

SNIP

The survey project, called the National Aviation Operations Monitoring Service, was launched after a White House commission in the late 1990s called for government efforts to significantly reduce fatal aircraft accidents.

Copyright 2007 The Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

--

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

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

Date: Thu, 1 Nov 2007 11:39:47 -0500
Reply-To: "Smith, David W" <SmithD2@UTHSCSA.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Smith, David W" <SmithD2@UTHSCSA.EDU>
Subject: Re: NASA
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
In-Reply-To: <AAPORNET%200710312100008160.C601@LISTS.ASU.EDU>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

A survey of pilots may overestimate the number of incidents, of any type, that involve two or more planes or multiple witnesses, since each of several witnesses can report the same incident.

If each plane had exactly one pilot and two planes have a near miss, then both pilots would report the event. A census of all pilots would result in exactly twice as many reported incidents as actual incidents.

A properly weighted survey of pilots would yield exactly the same result, subject to sampling variation.

Since commercial planes have several people in each cockpit, two or three in most cases, as I understand it, the same incident can be reported by four to six sampled witnesses from the involved aircraft. Other pilots might also witness an incident, increasing the apparent number of events.

I have no information about whether such over-reporting has occurred and been incorporated in the estimates that have not been released. It is too late to design the interview to adjust for this kind of over-reporting, eg, by asking how many others the respondent knows witnessed an incident, but it may still be possible to correct rates or means by using some common sense regarding the probable numbers of witnesses to specific incidents.

A very high estimate may be nothing more than a tempest in a teapot that is due to poor design, poor analysis, and an unwarranted, politically motivated response on the part of NASA staff and administrators. This hypothesis requires secondary analysis of the data to test it.

Regards,

David Smith

David W. Smith, Ph.D., M.P.H.
Biostatistics Division
San Antonio Campus

University of Texas School of Public Health
smithd2@uthscsa.edu
(210) 562-5512

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

Subject: Response to NASA alleged suppression of survey data on airline safety
From: Jibum Kim <kim-jibum@NORC.ORG>
Reply-To: Jibum Kim <kim-jibum@NORC.ORG>
Date: Tue, 23 Oct 2007 13:10:27 -0700
Content-Type: text/plain

According to AP:

"among other results, the pilots reported at least twice as many bird strikes, near mid-air collisions and runway incursions as other government monitoring systems show, according to a person familiar with the results who was not authorized to discuss them publicly."

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

Date: Thu, 1 Nov 2007 13:21:52 -0400
Reply-To: Mark Pierzchala <MPierzchala@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark Pierzchala <MPierzchala@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM>
Subject: Re: NASA
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

November 1, 2007

I don't know exactly what data were collected, but if they were able to get date, time, and location of the event, then they would be able to eliminate duplication.

Mark Pierzchala
Senior Fellow, Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu]On Behalf Of Smith, David W
Sent: Thursday, November 01, 2007 12:40 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: NASA

A survey of pilots may overestimate the number of incidents, of any type, that involve two or more planes or multiple witnesses, since each of several witnesses can report the same incident.

If each plane had exactly one pilot and two planes have a near miss, then both pilots would report the event. A census of all pilots would result in exactly twice as many reported incidents as actual incidents.

A properly weighted survey of pilots would yield exactly the same result, subject to sampling variation.

Since commercial planes have several people in each cockpit, two or three in most cases, as I understand it, the same incident can be reported by four to six sampled witnesses from the involved aircraft. Other pilots might also witness an incident, increasing the apparent number of events.

I have no information about whether such over-reporting has occurred and been incorporated in the estimates that have not been released. It is too late to design the interview to adjust for this kind of over-reporting, eg, by asking how many others the respondent knows witnessed an incident, but it may still be possible to correct rates or means by using some common sense regarding the probable numbers of witnesses to specific incidents.

A very high estimate may be nothing more than a tempest in a teapot that is due to poor design, poor analysis, and an unwarranted, politically motivated response on the part of NASA staff and administrators. This hypothesis requires secondary analysis of the data to test it.

Regards,

David Smith

David W. Smith, Ph.D., M.P.H.
Biostatistics Division
San Antonio Campus
University of Texas School of Public Health
smithd2@uthscsa.edu
(210) 562-5512

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

Subject: Response to NASA alleged suppression of survey data on airline safety
From: Jibum Kim <kim-jibum@NORC.ORG>
Reply-To: Jibum Kim <kim-jibum@NORC.ORG>
Date: Tue, 23 Oct 2007 13:10:27 -0700
Content-Type: text/plain

According to AP:

"among other results, the pilots reported at least twice as many bird

strikes, near mid-air collisions and runway incursions as other government monitoring systems show, according to a person familiar with the results

who was not authorized to discuss them publicly."

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

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

=====
Date: Thu, 1 Nov 2007 11:29:46 -0700
Reply-To: Jon Krosnick <krosnick@STANFORD.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jon Krosnick <krosnick@STANFORD.EDU>
Subject: Re: NASA
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

All:

David is exactly right on this.

I talked about this issue yesterday during my testimony before the House Committee on Science and Technology yesterday. Some interesting fireworks. You can watch the video of it:

http://www.science.house.gov/publications/hearings_markup_details.aspx?NewsID=2022

Not sure if anything good will come of this, but we'll see ...

Best,

Jon

>Date: Thu, 1 Nov 2007 11:39:47 -0500
>Reply-To: "Smith, David W" <SmithD2@UTHSCSA.EDU>
>Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
>From: "Smith, David W" <SmithD2@UTHSCSA.EDU>
>Subject: Re: NASA
>Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
>List-Help: <<https://lists.asu.edu/cgi-bin/wa?LIST=AAPORNET>>,>

> <mailto:LISTSERV@LISTS.ASU.EDU?body=INFO%20AAPORNET>
>List-Unsubscribe: <mailto:AAPORNET-unsubscribe-request@LISTS.ASU.EDU>
>List-Subscribe: <mailto:AAPORNET-subscribe-request@LISTS.ASU.EDU>
>List-Owner: <mailto:AAPORNET-request@LISTS.ASU.EDU>
>List-Archive: <https://lists.asu.edu/cgi-bin/wa?LIST=AAPORNET>

>
>A survey of pilots may overestimate the number of incidents, of any
>type, that involve two or more planes or multiple witnesses, since each
>of several witnesses can report the same incident.

>
>If each plane had exactly one pilot and two planes have a near miss,
>then both pilots would report the event. A census of all pilots would
>result in exactly twice as many reported incidents as actual incidents.

>
>A properly weighted survey of pilots would yield exactly the same
>result, subject to sampling variation.

>
>Since commercial planes have several people in each cockpit, two or
>three in most cases, as I understand it, the same incident can be
>reported by four to six sampled witnesses from the involved aircraft.
>Other pilots might also witness an incident, increasing the apparent
>number of events.

>
>I have no information about whether such over-reporting has occurred and
>been incorporated in the estimates that have not been released. It is
>too late to design the interview to adjust for this kind of
>over-reporting, eg, by asking how many others the respondent knows
>witnessed an incident, but it may still be possible to correct rates or
>means by using some common sense regarding the probable numbers of
>witnesses to specific incidents.

>
>A very high estimate may be nothing more than a tempest in a teapot that
>is due to poor design, poor analysis, and an unwarranted, politically
>motivated response on the part of NASA staff and administrators. This
>hypothesis requires secondary analysis of the data to test it.

>
>Regards,

>
>David Smith

>
>David W. Smith, Ph.D., M.P.H.

>Biostatistics Division

>San Antonio Campus

>University of Texas School of Public Health

>smithd2@uthscsa.edu

>(210) 562-5512

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

>
>Subject: Response to NASA alleged suppression of survey data on airline
>safety

>From: Jibum Kim <kim-jibum@NORC.ORG>

>Reply-To: Jibum Kim <kim-jibum@NORC.ORG>

>Date: Tue, 23 Oct 2007 13:10:27 -0700

>Content-Type: text/plain

>

>According to AP:

>

>"among other results, the pilots reported at least twice as many bird

>strikes, near mid-air collisions and runway incursions as other

>government

>monitoring systems show, according to a person familiar with the results

>

>who was not authorized to discuss them publicly."

>

>-----

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

>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====

Date: Thu, 1 Nov 2007 16:13:36 -0400

Reply-To: Yasamin Miller <yd17@CORNELL.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Yasamin Miller <yd17@CORNELL.EDU>

Subject: CISER Director job opportunity

Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Please forward this job posting to your colleagues who may be interested. Thank you, Yasamin

+++++

The Cornell Institute for Social and Economic Research (CISER) provides research support services to social science researchers at Cornell University. Programs are tailored to the needs of faculty, research staff, and graduate students. Reporting to the Vice Provost for the Social Sciences, the CISER Director provides strategic leadership for all aspects of the operation. The Director will be responsible for managing operations, including the Cornell Census Research Data Center (RDC), the Cornell Restricted Access Data Center (CRADC), computing systems support, data archive services, data analysis software workshops and consulting services, and administrative services. The Director determines the overall organizational structure for CISER operations, and ensures that CISER's resources continue to anticipate users' needs. The director is also responsible for sustaining relationships with appropriate external academic and research communities.

Full position description and qualification requirements at

<http://www.ciser.cornell.edu/pub/jobs/job_posting_director.shtml><http://www.c>

iser.cornell.edu/pub/jobs/job_posting_director.shtml

Please apply online at

<<http://www.ohr.cornell.edu/jobs/>><http://www.ohr.cornell.edu/jobs/> - job posting number 07630, under the Faculty and Non-Faculty Instruction, Research & Extension Positions. Review of applications will begin on December 1, 2007. The position will remain open until filled.

Yasamin Miller, Director
Survey Research Institute - SRI
391 Pine Tree Road, Rm. 118
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14850
* yd17@cornell.edu
(607-255-0148
fax: 607-255-7118
www.sri.cornell.edu

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

Date: Thu, 1 Nov 2007 15:58:57 -0500
Reply-To: Jeanie Harper <JHarper@GOAMP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jeanie Harper <JHarper@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: AAPOR Job Posting
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

=20

Opinion Research Corporation is looking for a highly motivated, technology sophisticated individual to join the ORC's Technology Market Insights practice. The Technology Market Insights (TMI) practice focuses exclusively on providing actionable and timely insight to high technology firms. The professionals that make up this practice possess specific industry expertise across a spectrum of issues that comprise modern technology and computing, and are recognized experts in the field of market data analysis. TMI provides exceptional insight across such information technology sectors a mobile computing (devices, smartphones, etc.), unified communications, personal and enterprise security solutions, hosted web services, operating systems, hardware adoption, network infrastructure, collaboration platforms and many more.

*

Experience Requirements:

- *5 years of primary market research experience
- * 1 to 2 years conducting primary research for the information technology sector
- * Must be able to work with clients to design/develop research studies
- * Must be able to write research reports summarizing conclusions, implications, recommendations, etc.
- * Must have a technical and functional knowledge of information technologies
- * An early adopter of information technology is a plus
- * Must be able to think strategically
- * Must have excellent communication skills (written and verbal)
- * Must have experience working directly with clients/executives
- * Must have strong knowledge of research methodologies
- * Must have strong analytical skills
- * Knowledge of descriptive statistics a plus
- * Knowledge of hypothesis testing a plus
- * Knowledge of correlations a plus
- * Knowledge of regression a plus
- * Knowledge of ANOVA a plus
- * Expert level proficiency in SPSS
- * Expert level proficiency using Excel data analysis tools

=20

*Must have a bachelors degree in business, marketing, market research or statistics

*A masters degree is preferred

=20

All interested candidates should submit a cover letter and resume, including salary requirements to: Attn: Human Resources,

hrres@opinionresearch.com or fax to: 609-419-1904.

=20

Jeanie Harper

Administrative Assistant, AAPOR

P.O. Box 14263, Lenexa, KS 66285

18000 W. 105th St., Olathe, KS 66061

Phone: (913) 895-4601

Fax: (913) 895-4652=20

=20

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Date: Thu, 1 Nov 2007 20:09:55 -0400

Reply-To: Colleen Porter <colleen_porter@COX.NET>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Colleen Porter <colleen_porter@COX.NET>

Subject: Re: NASA

Comments: To: Jon Krosnick <krosnick@STANFORD.EDU>

Comments: cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

In-Reply-To: <200711011851.1A1IldFe027588@lists.asu.edu>

Mime-Version: 1.0 (Apple Message framework v752.2)

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII; delp=yes; format=flowed

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Jon, thanks so much for sending this out; I would have been sorry to miss it.

I know that sometimes people worry they will come across as arrogant or "tooting their own horn" if they send out something about their own accomplishments, but really, I think most of us enjoy seeing people we have met, and whose work we respect, making a difference or being recognized.

So please, folks, if you are too shy to send it out yourself, ask a student or colleague:)

And I agree, David's analysis was spot-on.

Colleen Porter
Gainesville, FL

On Nov 1, 2007, at 2:29 PM, Jon Krosnick wrote:

> ----- Information from the mail header

> -----

> Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
> Poster: Jon Krosnick <krosnick@STANFORD.EDU>
> Subject: Re: NASA

> -----

> -----

>

> All:

>

> David is exactly right on this.

>

> I talked about this issue yesterday during my testimony before the
> House Committee on Science and Technology yesterday. Some
> interesting fireworks. You can watch the video of it:

>

> [http://www.science.house.gov/publications/
> hearings_markup_details.aspx?NewsID=2022](http://www.science.house.gov/publications/hearings_markup_details.aspx?NewsID=2022)

>

> Not sure if anything good will come of this, but we'll see ...

>

> Best,

>

> Jon

>

>

>

>

>

>

>> Date: Thu, 1 Nov 2007 11:39:47 -0500

>> Reply-To: "Smith, David W" <SmithD2@UTHSCSA.EDU>

>> Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

>> From: "Smith, David W" <SmithD2@UTHSCSA.EDU>

>> Subject: Re: NASA

>> Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

>> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

>> List-Help: <<https://lists.asu.edu/cgi-bin/wa?LIST=AAPORNET>>,

>> <<mailto:LISTSERV@LISTS.ASU.EDU?body=INFO%20AAPORNET>>

>> List-Unsubscribe: <<mailto:AAPORNET-unsubscribe-request@LISTS.ASU.EDU>>

>> List-Subscribe: <<mailto:AAPORNET-subscribe-request@LISTS.ASU.EDU>>

>> List-Owner: <<mailto:AAPORNET-request@LISTS.ASU.EDU>>

>> List-Archive: <<https://lists.asu.edu/cgi-bin/wa?LIST=AAPORNET>>

>>

>> A survey of pilots may overestimate the number of incidents, of any
>> type, that involve two or more planes or multiple witnesses, since
>> each

>> of several witnesses can report the same incident.

>>

>> If each plane had exactly one pilot and two planes have a near miss,
>> then both pilots would report the event. A census of all pilots would
>> result in exactly twice as many reported incidents as actual
>> incidents.

>>

>> A properly weighted survey of pilots would yield exactly the same
>> result, subject to sampling variation.
>>
>> Since commercial planes have several people in each cockpit, two or
>> three in most cases, as I understand it, the same incident can be
>> reported by four to six sampled witnesses from the involved aircraft.
>> Other pilots might also witness an incident, increasing the apparent
>> number of events.
>>
>> I have no information about whether such over-reporting has
>> occurred and
>> been incorporated in the estimates that have not been released. It is
>> too late to design the interview to adjust for this kind of
>> over-reporting, eg, by asking how many others the respondent knows
>> witnessed an incident, but it may still be possible to correct
>> rates or
>> means by using some common sense regarding the probable numbers of
>> witnesses to specific incidents.
>>
>> A very high estimate may be nothing more than a tempest in a
>> teapot that
>> is due to poor design, poor analysis, and an unwarranted, politically
>> motivated response on the part of NASA staff and administrators. This
>> hypothesis requires secondary analysis of the data to test it.
>>

>> Regards,

>> David Smith

>> David W. Smith, Ph.D., M.P.H.
>> Biostatistics Division
>> San Antonio Campus
>> University of Texas School of Public Health
>> smithd2@uthscsa.edu
>> (210) 562-5512
>>
>>

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

>> Subject: Response to NASA alleged suppression of survey data on
>> airline
>> safety
>> From: Jibum Kim <kim-jibum@NORC.ORG>
>> Reply-To: Jibum Kim <kim-jibum@NORC.ORG>
>> Date: Tue, 23 Oct 2007 13:10:27 -0700
>> Content-Type: text/plain
>>

>> According to AP:
>>

>> "among other results, the pilots reported at least twice as many bird
>> strikes, near mid-air collisions and runway incursions as other
>> government
>> monitoring systems show, according to a person familiar with the
>> results

>>
>> who was not authorized to discuss them publicly."
>>
>> -----
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-
>> request@asu.edu

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

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

Date: Thu, 1 Nov 2007 17:37:35 -0700
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>
Subject: Re: NASA
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <8F009C89-B301-4507-BDF0-959F1535D2F5@cox.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Jon,

So are we to understand then that someone saw the unadjusted number of incidents, compared it to previous studies with different methodology and then decided that the NAOMS must be the one that's flawed or too scary?

-leora

Leora Lawton
TechSociety Research

> ----- Information from the mail header
> -----
> Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
> Poster: Jon Krosnick <krosnick@STANFORD.EDU>
> Subject: Re: NASA
> -----
> -----
>
> All:
>
> David is exactly right on this.
>

> I talked about this issue yesterday during my testimony before the
> House Committee on Science and Technology yesterday. Some
> interesting fireworks. You can watch the video of it:

> [http://www.science.house.gov/publications/
> hearings_markups_details.aspx?NewsID=2022](http://www.science.house.gov/publications/hearings_markups_details.aspx?NewsID=2022)

> Not sure if anything good will come of this, but we'll see ...

> Best,

> Jon

>> Date: Thu, 1 Nov 2007 11:39:47 -0500
>> Reply-To: "Smith, David W" <SmithD2@UTHSCSA.EDU>
>> Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
>> From: "Smith, David W" <SmithD2@UTHSCSA.EDU>
>> Subject: Re: NASA

>> Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
>> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
>> List-Help: <<https://lists.asu.edu/cgi-bin/wa?LIST=AAPORNET>>,
>> <<mailto:LISTSERV@LISTS.ASU.EDU?body=INFO%20AAPORNET>>
>> List-Unsubscribe: <<mailto:AAPORNET-unsubscribe-request@LISTS.ASU.EDU>>
>> List-Subscribe: <<mailto:AAPORNET-subscribe-request@LISTS.ASU.EDU>>
>> List-Owner: <<mailto:AAPORNET-request@LISTS.ASU.EDU>>
>> List-Archive: <<https://lists.asu.edu/cgi-bin/wa?LIST=AAPORNET>>

>> A survey of pilots may overestimate the number of incidents, of any
>> type, that involve two or more planes or multiple witnesses, since
>> each
>> of several witnesses can report the same incident.

>> If each plane had exactly one pilot and two planes have a near miss,
>> then both pilots would report the event. A census of all pilots would
>> result in exactly twice as many reported incidents as actual
>> incidents.

>> A properly weighted survey of pilots would yield exactly the same
>> result, subject to sampling variation.

>> Since commercial planes have several people in each cockpit, two or
>> three in most cases, as I understand it, the same incident can be
>> reported by four to six sampled witnesses from the involved aircraft.
>> Other pilots might also witness an incident, increasing the apparent
>> number of events.

>> I have no information about whether such over-reporting has
>> occurred and
>> been incorporated in the estimates that have not been released. It is
>> too late to design the interview to adjust for this kind of

>> over-reporting, eg, by asking how many others the respondent knows
>> witnessed an incident, but it may still be possible to correct
>> rates or
>> means by using some common sense regarding the probable numbers of
>> witnesses to specific incidents.

>>
>> A very high estimate may be nothing more than a tempest in a
>> teapot that
>> is due to poor design, poor analysis, and an unwarranted, politically
>> motivated response on the part of NASA staff and administrators. This
>> hypothesis requires secondary analysis of the data to test it.

>>
>> Regards,

>>
>> David Smith

>>
>> David W. Smith, Ph.D., M.P.H.
>> Biostatistics Division
>> San Antonio Campus
>> University of Texas School of Public Health
>> smithd2@uthscsa.edu
>> (210) 562-5512

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

>>
>> Subject: Response to NASA alleged suppression of survey data on
>> airline
>> safety
>> From: Jibum Kim <kim-jibum@NORC.ORG>
>> Reply-To: Jibum Kim <kim-jibum@NORC.ORG>
>> Date: Tue, 23 Oct 2007 13:10:27 -0700
>> Content-Type: text/plain

>>
>> According to AP:
>>
>> "among other results, the pilots reported at least twice as many bird
>> strikes, near mid-air collisions and runway incursions as other
>> government
>> monitoring systems show, according to a person familiar with the
>> results
>>
>> who was not authorized to discuss them publicly."

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

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

> request@asu.edu

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

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

Date: Thu, 1 Nov 2007 21:30:12 -0700
Reply-To: Jon Krosnick <krosnick@STANFORD.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jon Krosnick <krosnick@STANFORD.EDU>
Subject: Re: NASA
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
In-Reply-To: <20071102025042.A82DB187E23D@bcnet3.asu.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Leora:

That's my best guess at the moment, but we haven't seen the NAOMS data or analyses yet, so we can't know for sure.

Jon

At 05:37 PM 11/1/2007, Leora Lawton wrote:

>Jon,
>
>So are we to understand then that someone saw the unadjusted number of
>incidents, compared it to previous studies with different methodology and
>then decided that the NAOMS must be the one that's flawed or too scary?

>
>-leora

>
>Leora Lawton
>TechSociety Research

>
>> ----- Information from the mail header

>> -----
>> Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
>> Poster: Jon Krosnick <krosnick@STANFORD.EDU>
>> Subject: Re: NASA

>> -----
>>
>> All:

>> David is exactly right on this.

>>
>> I talked about this issue yesterday during my testimony before the

>> House Committee on Science and Technology yesterday. Some
>> interesting fireworks. You can watch the video of it:

>>
>> [http://www.science.house.gov/publications/
>> hearings_markup_details.aspx?NewsID=2022](http://www.science.house.gov/publications/hearings_markup_details.aspx?NewsID=2022)

>>
>> Not sure if anything good will come of this, but we'll see ...

>>
>> Best,

>>
>> Jon

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

>>> Date: Thu, 1 Nov 2007 11:39:47 -0500
>>> Reply-To: "Smith, David W" <SmithD2@UTHSCSA.EDU>
>>> Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
>>> From: "Smith, David W" <SmithD2@UTHSCSA.EDU>
>>> Subject: Re: NASA
>>> Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
>>> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
>>> List-Help: <<https://lists.asu.edu/cgi-bin/wa?LIST=AAPORNET>>,
>>> <<mailto:LISTSERV@LISTS.ASU.EDU?body=INFO%20AAPORNET>>
>>> List-Unsubscribe: <<mailto:AAPORNET-unsubscribe-request@LISTS.ASU.EDU>>
>>> List-Subscribe: <<mailto:AAPORNET-subscribe-request@LISTS.ASU.EDU>>
>>> List-Owner: <<mailto:AAPORNET-request@LISTS.ASU.EDU>>
>>> List-Archive: <<https://lists.asu.edu/cgi-bin/wa?LIST=AAPORNET>>

>>>
>>> A survey of pilots may overestimate the number of incidents, of any
>>> type, that involve two or more planes or multiple witnesses, since
>>> each
>>> of several witnesses can report the same incident.

>>>
>>> If each plane had exactly one pilot and two planes have a near miss,
>>> then both pilots would report the event. A census of all pilots would
>>> result in exactly twice as many reported incidents as actual
>>> incidents.

>>>
>>> A properly weighted survey of pilots would yield exactly the same
>>> result, subject to sampling variation.

>>>
>>> Since commercial planes have several people in each cockpit, two or
>>> three in most cases, as I understand it, the same incident can be
>>> reported by four to six sampled witnesses from the involved aircraft.
>>> Other pilots might also witness an incident, increasing the apparent
>>> number of events.

>>>
>>> I have no information about whether such over-reporting has
>>> occurred and
>>> been incorporated in the estimates that have not been released. It is
>>> too late to design the interview to adjust for this kind of
>>> over-reporting, eg, by asking how many others the respondent knows

>>> witnessed an incident, but it may still be possible to correct
>>> rates or
>>> means by using some common sense regarding the probable numbers of
>>> witnesses to specific incidents.

>>>
>>> A very high estimate may be nothing more than a tempest in a
>>> teapot that
>>> is due to poor design, poor analysis, and an unwarranted, politically
>>> motivated response on the part of NASA staff and administrators. This
>>> hypothesis requires secondary analysis of the data to test it.

>>>
>>> Regards,

>>>
>>> David Smith

>>>
>>> David W. Smith, Ph.D., M.P.H.
>>> Biostatistics Division
>>> San Antonio Campus
>>> University of Texas School of Public Health
>>> smithd2@uthscsa.edu
>>> (210) 562-5512

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

>>>
>>> Subject: Response to NASA alleged suppression of survey data on
>>> airline
>>> safety
>>> From: Jibum Kim <kim-jibum@NORC.ORG>
>>> Reply-To: Jibum Kim <kim-jibum@NORC.ORG>
>>> Date: Tue, 23 Oct 2007 13:10:27 -0700
>>> Content-Type: text/plain

>>>
>>> According to AP:
>>>
>>> "among other results, the pilots reported at least twice as many bird
>>> strikes, near mid-air collisions and runway incursions as other
>>> government
>>> monitoring systems show, according to a person familiar with the
>>> results

>>>
>>> who was not authorized to discuss them publicly."

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

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

>

>-----

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

>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

>

>-----

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

>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Date: Fri, 2 Nov 2007 10:25:39 -0400

Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>

Subject: A Child's Day: 2004

Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Census Reveals Fear Over Neighborhoods

New York Times

<http://www.nytimes.com/2007/11/01/us/01census.html>

Nearly half the nation's children live in places where their parents fear that neighbors may be a bad influence, and one-third or more of black and Hispanic children are generally kept inside their homes because their neighborhoods are considered too dangerous.

The Census Bureau reported those findings yesterday in an analysis, entitled "A Child's Day," which suggested that children were marginally better off in 2004 than they were a decade ago, but with few differences from 2003.

Over all, more than one in five children are kept indoors because they live in dangerous neighborhoods, according to the survey. That proportion rises to 34 percent among blacks and 37 percent among Hispanics surveyed.

SNIP

<Actual Census Press Release with links to report and data table>

Parents More Active in Raising Their Children;

Children Get Less Television Time

<http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/releases/archives/children/01085>

0.html

--

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

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Fri, 2 Nov 2007 10:49:52 -0400
Reply-To: Yasamin Miller <yd17@CORNELL.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Yasamin Miller <yd17@CORNELL.EDU>
Subject: cell only studies
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

We have been asked to conduct a survey using a cell only sample. Not having done this before, are there any special protocols one must be aware of (other than not using an auto-dialer)? Is there an effective/proper front-end to use? How does one assure the individual is not currently driving a vehicle or doing anything else that may put them at risk while talking to our interviewers (and thereby making us liable)? Any insight into effective protocol to use for calling cell only numbers would be greatly appreciated.

Thanks,
Yasamin

Yasamin Miller, Director
Survey Research Institute - SRI
391 Pine Tree Road, Rm. 118
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14850
* yd17@cornell.edu
(607-255-0148
fax: 607-255-7118
www.sri.cornell.edu

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

Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Date: Fri, 2 Nov 2007 12:59:30 -0400

Reply-To: Yasamin Miller <yd17@CORNELL.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Yasamin Miller <yd17@CORNELL.EDU>

Subject: Fwd: RE: RE: cell only studies

Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Since I've gotten a lot of requests to receive the responses to this inquiry, I thought it best to post to the list.

Randy ZuWallack has shared a white paper along with his screening protocol. Also attached is a presentation made by Linda Piekarski at AAPOR.

Yasamin

>Subject: RE: RE: cell only studies

>Date: Fri, 2 Nov 2007 12:05:53 -0400

>X-MS-Has-Attach: yes

>X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:

>Thread-Topic: RE: cell only studies

>Thread-Index: AcgdYOA+UhpUeylAR5WQSpUo678J5wACI8zg

>X-PH: V4.1@veronica

>From: "Randal S. ZuWallack" <Randal.ZuWallack@macrointernational.com>

>To: "Yasamin Miller" <yd17@cornell.edu>

>X-OriginalArrivalTime: 02 Nov 2007 16:14:42.0827 (UTC)

>FILETIME=[7A28F5B0:01C81D6B]

>X-Original-IP: 207.226.255.29

>X-Original-Hostname: 207-226-255-29.btnaccess.net

>X-PMX-Version: 5.3.1.294258, Antispam-Engine: 2.5.1.298604, Antispam-Data:

>2007.8.5.21623

>X-PMX-Version: 5.3.3.310218, Antispam-Engine: 2.5.2.313940, Antispam-Data:

>2007.11.2.85823

>X-PMX-CORNELL-SPAM-CHECKED: veronica

>

>Yasamin,

>

>Attached is a white paper we wrote about a cell phone pilot we conducted

>last year. We also just completed the first wave of a cell-phone omnibus

>that will be running quarterly. Below are the screening and selection

>questions we use for the omnibus.

>

>Randy

>

>

>

>

>

>

>Introduction<?xml:namespace prefix = o ns =
>"urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:office" />
>
>
>
>HELLO, I'm (name) calling for Macro
>International. We're conducting a national opinion survey with cell phone
>users and would like to have you participate. As a thank you for your
>time, we will give you a \$10 Amazon.com® gift certificate upon completion
>of the interview.
>
>
>
>1 Continue
>
>2 Terminate
>
>3 Callback
>
>4 Answering machine
>
>5 Hang up before intro
>
>
>
>
>
>[]
>
>
>Script for answering machines: CATI DISPLAY ON 3rd and 5th ATTEMPT:
>
>We're conducting a national opinion survey with cell phone users and would
>like to have you participate. As a thank you for your time, we will give
>you a \$10 Amazon.com® gift certificate. Please call 1-888-792-6141 to
>let us know what day and time would be convenient for us to call
>you. Please clearly state your telephone number so we will be able to
>return your call. Thanks!
>
>
>Screening
>
>
>
>S1. Your safety is important. Are you driving in a car, walking
>down the street, in a public place or other location where talking on the
>phone might distract you or jeopardize your safety and/or confidentiality?
>
>
>
> 01 Yes
>
> 02 No
>

> 99 REFUSED //TERMINATE//
>
>
>
>
>If S1=01
>
>S1a. I would like to call you at a more convenient time. What day and
>time would be best? [INTERVIEWER: set up call-back].
>
>
>
>01 Schedule callback
>
>99 REFUSED //TERMINATE//
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>If S1=02 then <?xml:namespace prefix = st1 ns =
>"urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:smarts" />GOTO S2.
>
>
>
>S2. What is your age, please?
>
>
>
>__ Code age in years //RANGE?//
>
>Do not read:
>
> 777 Don't know / Not sure
>
> 999 Refused
>
>
>
>If S2=777 or S2=999, GOTO S2a. Otherwise, GOTO S3.
>
>
>
>
>S2a. In which of these age categories do you belong?
>
>
>
>
>01 Under 18
>
>02 18 to 21
>

>03 22 to 24
>
>04 25 to 29
>
>05 30 to 34
>
>06 35 to 39
>
>07 40 to 44
>
>08 45 to 49
>
>09 50 to 54
>
>10 55 to 59
>
>11 60 to 64
>
>12 65 to 69
>
>13 70 to 74
>
>14 75 or older
>

>Do not read:

>99 Refused
>
>
>

>If S2a=99, GOTO S2b. Otherwise, GOTO S3.
>
>

>S2b. Are you at least 18 years old?
>
>
>

> 01 Yes

> 02 No
>
>

> Do not read:

> 99

Refused
>
>
>

>If S2b=99,
>

>Thank you very much for your time. STOP
>
>

>Otherwise GOTO S4a.
>
>
>
>S4a. How many adults aged 18 and over receive calls on this cell phone?
>
>__ Number of people //RANGE 1-20//
>
>Do not read:
>
>88 NOT CURRENTLY ON CELL PHONE //TERMINATE//
>
>9 8 None
>
>9 9 Refused
>
>
>
>If S4a=98, 99 then
>
>Thank you very much, but we are only interviewing people age 18 and
>older. STOP
>
>If S4a=88
>
>Thank you very much, but we are only interviewing people on cell phones.
STOP
>
>
>
>If S4a=1 then
>
>May I please speak with the adult who receives calls on this cell phone?
>
>
>
>If S4a>1 then
>
>Randomly select number between 1 and S4a, 1<=RANDOM<=S4a.
>
>If RANDOM=1, SELECTED=Oldest
>
>If RANDOM=2, SELECTED=Second oldest
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>If RANDOM=S3a, SELECTED=Youngest
>
>
>

>May I please speak with the SELECTED adult who receives calls on this cell
>phone?

>
>
>

>If new respondent, repeat Introduction and Screening. Do not re-ask S4 or
>S4a.

>
>
>

>If SELECTED adult is unavailable then

>

>For recontacting at a convenient time, may I please have the first name of
>the SELECTED adult who receives calls on this cell phone? [INTERVIEWER:

>Record name] NAME = _____

>
>
>

>Is there a particular time and day when we can reach NAME? [INTERVIEWER:
>set-up callback.]

>
>
>

>Confidentiality

>
>
>

>Your cell phone number has been chosen randomly. The interview may be
>monitored for quality assurance, but all responses to questions obtained
>in this study will be confidential. You don't have to answer any question
>you don't want to, and you can end the interview at any time. If you have
>any questions about this survey, I will provide a telephone number for you
>to call to get more information. The interview takes about 15 minutes to
>complete.

>
>
>

>IF NEEDED:

>

>If you have any questions about this study, you can call the study
>verification line at 1-888-792-6141.

>

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

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

>>Sent: Friday, November 02, 2007 10:50 AM

>>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

>>Subject: cell only studies

>>

>>We have been asked to conduct a survey using a cell only sample. Not

>>having done this before,

>>are there any special protocols one must be aware of (other than not

>>using

>>an auto-dialer)? Is there

>>an effective/proper front-end to use? How does one assure the

>>individual
>>is not currently driving a vehicle or
>>doing anything else that may put them at risk while talking to our
>>interviewers (and thereby making us
>>liable)? Any insight into effective protocol to use for calling cell
>>only
>>numbers would be greatly appreciated.
>>Thanks,
>>Yasamin
>>
>>
>>Yasamin Miller, Director
>>Survey Research Institute - SRI
>>391 Pine Tree Road, Rm. 118
>>Cornell University
>>Ithaca, NY 14850
>> * yd17@cornell.edu
>>(607-255-0148
>>fax: 607-255-7118
>>www.sri.cornell.edu
>>
>>

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Fri, 2 Nov 2007 13:08:23 -0400
Reply-To: Yasamin Miller <yd17@CORNELL.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Yasamin Miller <yd17@CORNELL.EDU>
Subject: Re: Fwd: RE: RE: cell only studies
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <6.2.1.2.2.20071102125628.064c29f0@postoffice9.mail.cornell.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Sorry for sending so many postings - but I realized attachments aren't allowed on the list so please let me know if you would like the attachments and I'll forward them to you. Yasamin

At 12:59 PM 11/2/2007, Yasamin Miller wrote:
>Since I've gotten a lot of requests to receive the responses to this
>inquiry, I thought it best to post to the list.
>Randy ZuWallack has shared a white paper along with his screening
>protocol. Also attached is a presentation made
>by Linda Piekarski at AAPOR.
>Yasamin

>
>>Subject: RE: RE: cell only studies
>>Date: Fri, 2 Nov 2007 12:05:53 -0400
>>X-MS-Has-Attach: yes
>>X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:
>>Thread-Topic: RE: cell only studies
>>Thread-Index: AcgdYOA+UhpUeylAR5WQSpUo678J5wACI8zg
>>X-PH: V4.1@veronica
>>From: "Randal S. ZuWallack" <Randal.ZuWallack@macrointernational.com>
>>To: "Yasamin Miller" <yd17@cornell.edu>
>>X-OriginalArrivalTime: 02 Nov 2007 16:14:42.0827 (UTC)
>>FILETIME=[7A28F5B0:01C81D6B]
>>X-Original-IP: 207.226.255.29
>>X-Original-Hostname: 207-226-255-29.btnaccess.net
>>X-PMX-Version: 5.3.1.294258, Antispam-Engine: 2.5.1.298604,
>>Antispam-Data: 2007.8.5.21623
>>X-PMX-Version: 5.3.3.310218, Antispam-Engine: 2.5.2.313940,
>>Antispam-Data: 2007.11.2.85823
>>X-PMX-CORNELL-SPAM-CHECKED: veronica

>>
>>Yasamin,
>>
>>Attached is a white paper we wrote about a cell phone pilot we conducted
>>last year. We also just completed the first wave of a cell-phone omnibus
>>that will be running quarterly. Below are the screening and selection
>>questions we use for the omnibus.

>>
>>Randy

>>
>>
>>
>>Introduction<?xml:namespace prefix = o ns =
>>"urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:office" />

>>
>>
>>HELLO, I'm (name) calling for Macro
>>International. We're conducting a national opinion survey with cell
>>phone users and would like to have you participate. As a thank you for
>>your time, we will give you a \$10 Amazon.com® gift certificate upon
>>completion of the interview.

>>
>>
>>1 Continue
>>
>>2 Terminate
>>
>>3 Callback
>>
>>4 Answering machine
>>
>>5 Hang up before intro
>>

>>
>>
>>
>>
>>[]
>>
>>
>>
>>Script for answering machines: CATI DISPLAY ON 3rd and 5th ATTEMPT:
>>

>>We're conducting a national opinion survey with cell phone users and
>>would like to have you participate. As a thank you for your time, we will
>>give you a \$10 Amazon.com® gift certificate. Please call 1-888-792-6141
>>to let us know what day and time would be convenient for us to call
>>you. Please clearly state your telephone number so we will be able to
>>return your call. Thanks!

>>Screening

>>S1. Your safety is important. Are you driving in a car, walking
>>down the street, in a public place or other location where talking on the
>>phone might distract you or jeopardize your safety and/or confidentiality?

- >>
>>
>> 01 Yes
>>
>> 02 No
>>
>> 99 REFUSED //TERMINATE//

>>If S1=01

>>S1a. I would like to call you at a more convenient time. What day
>>and time would be best? [INTERVIEWER: set up call-back].

- >>
>>
>>01 Schedule callback
>>
>>99 REFUSED //TERMINATE//

>>If S1=02 then <?xml:namespace prefix = st1 ns =
>>"urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:smarts" />GOTO S2.

>>
>>
>>

>>S2. What is your age, please?

>>
>>
>>

>>__ Code age in years //RANGE?//

>>

>>Do not read:

>>

>> 777 Don't know / Not sure

>>

>> 999 Refused

>>

>>

>>

>>If S2=777 or S2=999, GOTO S2a. Otherwise, GOTO S3.

>>

>>

>>

>>S2a. In which of these age categories do you belong?

>>

>>

>>

>>01 Under 18

>>

>>02 18 to 21

>>

>>03 22 to 24

>>

>>04 25 to 29

>>

>>05 30 to 34

>>

>>06 35 to 39

>>

>>07 40 to 44

>>

>>08 45 to 49

>>

>>09 50 to 54

>>

>>10 55 to 59

>>

>>11 60 to 64

>>

>>12 65 to 69

>>

>>13 70 to 74

>>

>>14 75 or older

>>
>>Do not read:
>>
>>99 Refused
>>
>>
>>
>>If S2a=99, GOTO S2b. Otherwise, GOTO S3.
>>
>>
>>
>>S2b. Are you at least 18 years old?
>>
>>
>>
>> 01 Yes
>>
>> 02 No
>>
>> Do not read:
>>
>> 99
>> Refused
>>
>>
>>
>>If S2b=99,
>>
>>Thank you very much for your time. STOP
>>
>>
>>
>>S3. Indicate sex of respondent. [INTERVIEWER: Ask only if necessary.]
>>
>>
>>
>>01 Male
>>
>>02 Female
>>
>>
>>
>>S4. Does anyone else receive calls on this cell phone?
>>
>>
>>
>> 01 Yes
>>
>> 02 No
>>
>> Do not read:
>>
>> 88 NOT CURRENTLY ON CELL PHONE //TERMINATE//
>>

>> 98 Don't know / Not sure
>>
>> 99 Refused
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>If (S2<18 or S2a=01 or S2b=02) and S4=02, 98 or 99 then
>>
>>Thank you very much, but we are only interviewing people age 18 and
>>older. STOP
>>
>>If S4=88
>>
>>Thank you very much, but we are only interviewing people on cell
>>phones. STOP
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>If (S2>=18 or S2a>=01 or S2b=01) and S4=02, 98 or 99 then GOTO
>>Confidentiality.
>>
>>Otherwise GOTO S4a.
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>S4a. How many adults aged 18 and over receive calls on this cell phone?
>>
>>__ Number of people //RANGE 1-20//
>>
>>Do not read:
>>
>>88 NOT CURRENTLY ON CELL PHONE //TERMINATE//
>>
>>9 8 None
>>
>>9 9 Refused
>>
>>
>>
>>If S4a=98, 99 then
>>
>>Thank you very much, but we are only interviewing people age 18 and
>>older. STOP
>>
>>
>>If S4a=88
>>

>>Thank you very much, but we are only interviewing people on cell
>>phones. STOP
>>
>>
>>
>>If S4a=1 then
>>
>>May I please speak with the adult who receives calls on this cell phone?
>>
>>
>>
>>If S4a>1 then
>>
>>Randomly select number between 1 and S4a, $1 \leq \text{RANDOM} \leq \text{S4a}$.
>>
>>If RANDOM=1, SELECTED=Oldest
>>
>>If RANDOM=2, SELECTED=Second oldest
>>
>>.
>>
>>.
>>
>>.
>>
>>If RANDOM=S3a, SELECTED=Youngest
>>
>>
>>
>>May I please speak with the SELECTED adult who receives calls on this
>>cell phone?
>>
>>
>>
>>If new respondent, repeat Introduction and Screening. Do not re-ask S4
>>or S4a.
>>
>>
>>
>>If SELECTED adult is unavailable then
>>
>>For recontacting at a convenient time, may I please have the first name
>>of the SELECTED adult who receives calls on this cell phone?
>>[INTERVIEWER: Record name] NAME = _____
>>
>>
>>
>>Is there a particular time and day when we can reach
>>NAME? [INTERVIEWER: set-up callback.]
>>
>>
>>
>>Confidentiality
>>

>>
>>
>>Your cell phone number has been chosen randomly. The interview may be
>>monitored for quality assurance, but all responses to questions obtained
>>in this study will be confidential. You don't have to answer any
>>question you don't want to, and you can end the interview at any
>>time. If you have any questions about this survey, I will provide a
>>telephone number for you to call to get more information. The interview
>>takes about 15 minutes to complete.

>>
>>
>>
>>IF NEEDED:

>>
>>If you have any questions about this study, you can call the study
>>verification line at 1-888-792-6141.

>>
>>>-----Original Message-----
>>>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Yasamin Miller
>>>Sent: Friday, November 02, 2007 10:50 AM
>>>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
>>>Subject: cell only studies

>>>
>>>We have been asked to conduct a survey using a cell only sample. Not
>>>having done this before,
>>>are there any special protocols one must be aware of (other than not
>>>using
>>>an auto-dialer)? Is there
>>>an effective/proper front-end to use? How does one assure the
>>>individual
>>>is not currently driving a vehicle or
>>>doing anything else that may put them at risk while talking to our
>>>interviewers (and thereby making us
>>>liable)? Any insight into effective protocol to use for calling cell
>>>only
>>>numbers would be greatly appreciated.

>>>Thanks,
>>>Yasamin

>>>
>>>
>>>Yasamin Miller, Director
>>>Survey Research Institute - SRI
>>>391 Pine Tree Road, Rm. 118
>>>Cornell University
>>>Ithaca, NY 14850
>>> * yd17@cornell.edu
>>>(607-255-0148
>>>fax: 607-255-7118
>>>www.sri.cornell.edu
>>>

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Date: Fri, 2 Nov 2007 17:17:02 -0700

Reply-To: Sam Luks <sam@POLIMETRIX.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Sam Luks <sam@POLIMETRIX.COM>

Subject: Announcement: YouGov/Polimetrix's 2008 Cooperative Campaign
Analysis Project (CCAP)

Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Announcement: YouGov/Polimetrix's 2008 Cooperative Campaign Analysis
Project (CCAP)

If interested, please reply to lynn@polimetrix.com

<mailto:lynn@polimetrix.com>=20

Simon Jackman and I invite interested scholars to participate in the Cooperative Campaign Analysis Project (CCAP) that we are fielding with Doug Rivers at YouGov/Polimetrix during this presidential election cycle. Like the Cooperative Congressional Election Study (CCES), this project aims to bring together scholars (or groups of scholars) from Universities around the world.

CCAP is planned to be a six wave panel with roughly 20,000 people completing all six waves. The sample will be representative at the state level and oversample battleground and early primary states. Waves are planned for December, January, March, August, October, and November (post-election). Individuals or teams will get December 2007, November 2008, and one interim wave of data for \$15,000.00. Additional waves can be added for marginal costs. As with earlier cooperative projects, a portion of each interview will be reserved for individual content by scholars who buy in to the project. The Common Content of CCAP will focus on the presidential primaries and the general election.

If you are interested in participating in CCAP, you should let Lynn Vavreck know by November 15th (lynn@polimetrix.com). A complete description of the project is available upon request. Please do not hesitate to contact me with questions at this email address or call me at 310-825-4855.

-- Lynn

Lynn Vavreck, Principal Investigator

Cooperative Campaign Analysis Project

YouGov/Polimetrix and UCLA Political Science

=20

Simon D. Jackman, Principal Investigator=20

Cooperative Campaign Analysis Project=20

Stanford University Department of Political Science

=20

=20

=20

Samantha Luks, Ph.D.

Director, Special Projects Group

YouGovPolimetrix

285 Hamilton Ave., Suite 200

Palo Alto, CA 94301

Tel: (650) 462-8009

Fax: (650) 462-8422

<http://www.polimetrix.com>

<outbind://34-000000008BBA75E6E8A96841959C1A64C26934840700016D23FB66B59D

45A107C4741789271A0000002420A00000016D23FB66B59D45A107C4741789271A000000

2428220000/exchweb/bin/redirect.asp?URL=3Dhttp://www.polimetrix.com>=20

=20

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

Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====
Date: Sat, 3 Nov 2007 09:12:31 -0400

Reply-To: Paul J Lavrakas PhD <pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Paul J Lavrakas PhD <pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET>

Subject: Re: cell only studies

Comments: To: Yasamin Miller <yd17@CORNELL.EDU>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

In-Reply-To: <6.2.1.2.2.20071102104435.05cd0bc0@postoffice9.mail.cornell.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Yasamin et al,

AAPOR Exec Council appointed a Task Force in June that has been working on completing a comprehensive report of Cell Phone Surveying by year's end. I believe Council will disseminate the information in the report in many ways in early 2008, but right now we cannot send along a copy of the draft report. Sorry that it doesn't meet your needs right now.

PJL

P.S. Also, a special issue of POQ will be out in December focusing on the state of research knowledge on Cell Phone Surveying in the U.S.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Yasamin Miller
Sent: Friday, November 02, 2007 10:50 AM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: cell only studies

We have been asked to conduct a survey using a cell only sample. Not having done this before, are there any special protocols one must be aware of (other than not using an auto-dialer)? Is there an effective/proper front-end to use? How does one assure the individual is not currently driving a vehicle or doing anything else that may put them at risk while talking to our interviewers (and thereby making us liable)? Any insight into effective protocol to use for calling cell only numbers would be greatly appreciated.

Thanks,
Yasamin

Yasamin Miller, Director
Survey Research Institute - SRI
391 Pine Tree Road, Rm. 118
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14850
* yd17@cornell.edu
(607-255-0148
fax: 607-255-7118
www.sri.cornell.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Sun, 4 Nov 2007 10:13:15 -0500
Reply-To: Pat Lewis <plewis@AAPOR.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Pat Lewis <plewis@AAPOR.ORG>
Subject: Two Months Before NASA Date to be Released; More Methodological Questions Raised
Comments: To: aapor net <aapornet@asu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=WINDOWS-1252
Content-Disposition: inline
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Aviation Week
Nov. 3, 2007

By John M. Doyle and Frances Fiorino

It started out as a program to identify emerging aviation safety problems. But six years and \$11.3 million later, it has mushroomed into a public relations headache for NASA Administrator Michael Griffin that's hurting his credibility with Congress.

Now Griffin is working to mollify incensed lawmakers and calm a media frenzy without violating the confidentiality of the 24,000 commercial airline and 5,000 general aviation pilots that participated in the study.

In the middle of the touchy STS-120 shuttle mission, Griffin was summoned to Capitol Hill last week to explain why the agency wasn't releasing aviation incident data that reportedly indicate the rate of safety incidents, such as runway incursions and equipment failures, was higher than FAA statistics suggested.

Griffin told the House Science and Technology Committee it was a mistake for NASA to say it wouldn't release data gleaned from the pilot survey, known as the National Aviation Operations Monitoring Service (NAOMS). But scrubbing the incident data to meet legal requirements could delay its release for up to two months, he said.

"The survey results that we can legally release will be released. Period," Griffin told the committee. He apologized for NASA's initial denial of a Freedom of Information Act request from the Associated Press for NAOMS data. At the time, NASA said disclosure could "affect the public confidence in, and the commercial welfare of, the air carriers and general aviation companies."

In addition to that gaffe, Griffin admitted NASA had not done a good job managing the NAOMS project or its contractor, Battelle Memorial Institute. Unlike NASA's 30-year-old and highly regarded Aviation Safety Reporting System (ASRS)—a voluntary, non-punitive program which collects data from pilots and other aviation personnel—the NAOMS pilot survey was conducted by "telephone polling surveyors," who had no knowledge of the industry, Griffin said. ASRS aviation specialists can contact reporting individuals for follow-up questions, but that was not the case with NAOMS, said Griffin, adding that his major concern with the data "is that somebody might put too much credence in it."

That has prompted him to check on the management of other NASA research projects, he said.

http://www.aviationweek.com/aw/generic/story_channel.jsp?channel=space&id=news/aw110507p3.xml&headline=Two%20Months%20Before%20Release%20of%20NASA%20Pilot%20Survey%20Data

Copyright (c) 2007 Aviation Week, a division of The McGraw-Hill Companies.

All rights reserved. Terms of Use | Privacy Policy

--
Pat Lewis
Communications Director
American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR)
1405 North George Mason Drive
Arlington, Virginia
703.527-5245
cell 703.201.5070
www.aapor.org

AAPOR -- the leading association of public opinion and survey research professionals.

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

=====
Date: Mon, 5 Nov 2007 15:04:35 +0100
Reply-To: Edith de Leeuw <edithl@XS4ALL.NL>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Edith de Leeuw <edithl@XS4ALL.NL>
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU, nrworkshop@cbs.nl, nosmo@nic.surfnet.nl,
SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU
Comments: cc: bms-rc33@services.cnrs.fr
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

On behalf of my colleagues at the Department of Methodology and Statistics at the University of Utrecht, I would like to draw your attention to following (apologies for any cross-posting)

NEW INTERNATIONAL MASTERS PROGRAM "METHODOLOGY AND STATISTICS FOR SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES".
(Faculty of Social Sciences at Utrecht University, the Netherlands, taught in English)

The aim of this two-year research master is to prepare students to become PhD students involved in developing new methodologies and

statistical methods for the social and behavioral sciences, or to become methodologists working as advisors at universities and research institutes.

The program consists of advanced courses on methodology and statistics, a traineeship, a master's thesis, and research seminars. The instructors are fellows of the Dutch Interuniversity Graduate School of Psychometrics and Sociometrics (IOPS).

Further information on this program can be found at

<http://www.fss.uu.nl/master/mands>

Information on practical issues, such as admissions and finances, can be found at the international master's website of Utrecht University: <http://www.internationalmasters.uu.nl>

<<http://www.internationalmasters.uu.nl/>>

We would like to ask you to forward this information to any of your bachelor's students who might be interested in this program. Students with a bachelor degree in the Social or Behavioral Sciences, Statistics, Mathematics, Econometrics, Biometrics, or Information Sciences are welcome to apply. As this master is an international program, we also invite students living outside the Netherlands to apply.

Dr. Edith D. de Leeuw
Department of Methodology and Statistics
Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences
Utrecht University

e-mail edithl@xs4all.nl

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

Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====
Date: Mon, 5 Nov 2007 08:36:33 -0500

Reply-To: Sid Groeneman <sid@GROENEMAN.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Sid Groeneman <sid@GROENEMAN.COM>

Subject: Acquiescence, Yea-Saying Among African-Americans and Hispanics

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII; format=flowed; delpsp=yes

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Mime-Version: 1.0 (Apple Message framework v912)

I'm pretty sure that there's research showing that racial/ethnic minorities in the U.S. (African-Americans and Hispanics) acquiesce and yea-say more than others in response to questions/items presented in surveys. I've found one supporting citation (Bachman and O'Malley, POQ 1984), but I'm trying to locate others, especially for Hispanics. I'd be most appreciative of any help.

Sid Groeneman

Groeneman Research & Consulting
Survey Design/Management/Analysis
Bethesda, Maryland
sid@groeneman.com
301 469-0813
www.groeneman.com

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Mon, 5 Nov 2007 10:00:30 -0500
Reply-To: Ron Czaja <Ronc@SERVER.SASW.NCSU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Ron Czaja <Ronc@SERVER.SASW.NCSU.EDU>
Subject: Shaw Univ. - Survey Director opening
Comments: To: AAPORNET automatic digest system <LISTSERV@asu.edu>, AAPORNET@asu.edu>
In-Reply-To: <AAPORNET%200711042100005748.F1D5@LISTS.ASU.EDU>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

THE INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH, SOCIAL, AND COMMUNITY RESEARCH
CENTER FOR SURVEY RESEARCH (CSR)

POSITION TITLE: DIRECTOR, Center for Survey Research (Full-Time)

PURPOSE OF THE CENTER FOR SURVEY RESEARCH:

The purpose of the Center for Survey Research is to support research activities by conducting telephone surveys, mail surveys, opinion polls, questionnaire design and analysis. The Center will document issues such as public health, minority health, and other issues of concern to the community at large and research investigators in The Institute for Health, Social, and Community Research based at Shaw University. The CSR was developed from a Core of the Carolina-Shaw Partnership for the Elimination of Health Disparities grant funded by the National Center on Minority Health and Health Disparities in 2002.

DESCRIPTION OF RESPONSIBILITIES:

- oProvide leadership and oversight of all CSR activities to assure high quality performance.
- oMonitor and assure completion of all survey operations performed by CSR including data collection, data entry, and preparation of data for reports for IHSCR projects as needed.
- oSupervise and coordinate tasks for all center staff consistent with needs of IHSCR projects.
- oMerge, edit, modify, clean files for data analysis and reports.
- oPerform programming and analysis tasks using Excel, Access, and other software as appropriate.
- oConduct surveys using WinCATI application.
- oProgram questionnaires using Ci3 and/or Sensus.
- oMaintain communication with IHSCR Administrative Team as needed.
- oSubmit written reports about CSR activities as needed for progress reports and IHSCR meetings.
- oCoordinate with IHSCR Assistant Director regarding scheduling and resource needs of the CSR.
- oParticipate in the IHSCR, IT Committee to ensure CSR needs are properly addressed.
- oMarket the Center for Survey Research locally and nationally.
- oMonitor expenditures of effort by staff to assure that projects resources are expended efficiently.
- oLead the development of proposal components related to survey and questionnaire design.
- oSolicit and acquire contracts for the center.
- oInteract with clients to ensure that their project needs are met.
- oPlan and implement data analysis for studies as needed.
- oPerform questionnaire design and analysis as needed.

QUALIFICATIONS:

Minimum requirements include a Master's degree with extensive experience in survey design and implementation in a research setting. Strong skills in project management required. Thorough knowledge of the principles and processes of survey methodology required including WinCATI application. Experience with SAS, SUDAAN, Access, and Excel is preferred. Strong written and verbal communication skills are necessary. Must be able to function effectively in a team environment.

For more information about the Center for Survey Research visit <http://www.ihscr.org/csr>.

Send CV or Resume to:

Chanetta R. Washington, MPH, Associate Director
The Institute for Health, Social, and Community Research
Shaw University
118 East South Street
Raleigh, NC 27601
Telephone: 919-719-1892
Email: cwashington@shawu.edu

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

Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Date: Tue, 6 Nov 2007 10:43:38 +0900

Reply-To: Christian Collet <ccollet@MAIL.DOSHISHA.AC.JP>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Christian Collet <ccollet@MAIL.DOSHISHA.AC.JP>

Subject: Re: Acquiescence, Yea-Saying Among African-Americans and Hispanics

Comments: To: Sid Groeneman <sid@groeneman.com>

Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu

In-Reply-To: <93BFE408-369C-42DC-8D35-37D58E3D7E8B@groeneman.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=UTF-8

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Disposition: inline

Sid,

Hope these are helpful.

--

Christian Collet

Doshisha University

<http://www1.doshisha.ac.jp/~ccollet/>

Gibbons, Judith L., Jennifer A. Zellner and David J. Rudek. 1999.

"Effects of Language on Meaningfulness on the Use of Extreme Response Style by Spanish-English Bilinguals." *Cross-cultural Research* 33 (4): 369-381.

Hui. C. Harry and Harry C. Triandis. 1989. "Effects of Culture and Response Format on Extreme Response Style." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 20: 296-309.

Hurtado, Aida. 1994. "Does Similarity Breed Respect?: Interviewer Evaluations of Mexican-Descent Respondents in a Bilingual Survey." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 58: 77-95.

Marin, Gerardo, Raymond J. Gamba and Barbara V. Marin. 1992. "Extreme Response Style and Acquiescence among Hispanics: The Role of Acculturation and Education." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 23: 498-509.

On 11/5/07, Sid Groeneman <sid@groeneman.com> wrote:

> I'm pretty sure that there's research showing that racial/ethnic
> minorities in the U.S. (African-Americans and Hispanics) acquiesce and
> yea-say more than others in response to questions/items presented in
> surveys. I've found one supporting citation (Bachman and O'Malley, POQ
> 1984), but I'm trying to locate others, especially for Hispanics. I'd
> be most appreciative of any help.

>
> Sid Groeneman
>
> Groeneman Research & Consulting
> Survey Design/Management/Analysis
> Bethesda, Maryland
> sid@groeneman.com
> 301 469-0813
> www.groeneman.com
>
> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> set aapornet nomail
> On your return send this: set aapornet mail
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Mon, 5 Nov 2007 21:37:07 -0800
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>
Subject: using fpc for margin of error
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi,

I've created an excel spreadsheet where I can calculate the sample size for populations without a finite population correction factor, and one with. I've also put in a calculator for the margin of error for the regular sample size, but I'm having trouble finding the algorithm for calculating margin of error with fpc. The calculators without fpc are readily available on the web and elsewhere but not for fpc.

I'd be grateful for help from somehow who knows what the algorithm is. I'll create a link for downloading it off my website once I add this feature in.

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
Yahoo Messenger: leora_lawton

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Tue, 6 Nov 2007 01:35:05 -0500
Reply-To: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Subject: Re: using fpc for margin of error
Comments: To: Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <20071106053318.95CDD20FCA3C@bcnet4.asu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

For a simple calculator, try Decision Analyst's free downloadable STAT utility. It does not refer to finite population correction explicitly (on the version I have, at least) but you are always asked to specify the universe size, which is used in the calculations, presumably for that reason. Their default upper limit of universe size is 99,999. After that it's asymptotic (increments are statistically inconsequential.) The formula is available in many introductory statistics texts.

<http://www.decisionanalyst.com/download.aspx>

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
J.P. MURPHY & COMPANY
Post Office Box 150
Princeton, NJ 08542
610 408 8800
www.jpmurphy.com
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Leora Lawton
Sent: Tuesday, November 06, 2007 12:37 AM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: using fpc for margin of error

Hi,

I've created an excel spreadsheet where I can calculate the sample size for populations without a finite population correction factor, and one with. I've also put in a calculator for the margin of error for the regular sample size, but I'm having trouble finding the algorithm for calculating margin of error with fpc. The calculators without fpc are readily available on the web and elsewhere but not for fpc.

I'd be grateful for help from somehow who knows what the algorithm is. I'll create a link for downloading it off my website once I add this feature in.

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
Yahoo Messenger: leora_lawton

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Tue, 6 Nov 2007 09:53:01 -0600
Reply-To: "Steen, Bob" <bob.steen@FLEISHMAN.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Steen, Bob" <bob.steen@FLEISHMAN.COM>
Subject: Re: using fpc for margin of error
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: A<20071106053318.95CDD20FCA3C@bcnet4.asu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

The formula is:

$$1.96 * \sqrt{((p*q/(n-1)) * ((N-n)/N))}$$

Where:

1.96 is used for 95% level of confidence

p is the percentage of the answer
q = 100-p
N = size of population
n = size of sample

I have prepared a spreadsheet that does the calculations which includes adjustments for weighted samples. Let me know if you would like a copy.

Bob Steen

Vice President
Fleishman-Hillard
Research
200 N. Broadway
St. Louis, MO 63102

Office direct: 011 314-982-1752
Office fax: 011 314-982-9105

I've created an excel spreadsheet that calculates the sample size for populations without a finite population correction factor, and one with. I've also put in a calculator for the margin of error for the regular sample size, but I'm having trouble finding the algorithm for calculating margin of error with fpc. The calculators without fpc are readily available on the web and elsewhere but not for fpc.

I'd be grateful for help from somehow who knows what the algorithm is. I'll create a link for downloading it off my website once I add this feature in.

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 Yahoo Messenger: leora_lawton

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Tue, 6 Nov 2007 11:54:03 -0500
Reply-To: Jonathan Brill <brillje@UMDNJ.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jonathan Brill <brillje@UMDNJ.EDU>
Subject: Re: using fpc for margin of error
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU, Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Disposition: inline

Leora:

The statistical estimate you want is typically called the McNemar estimate for sample proportions in recognition of the work of Quinn McNemar. Many statistics books document the McNemar formula which I reproduce below:

$$z * (p*q/(n-1)**(1/2) * (N - n)/(N - 1))$$

Where:

* = multiplication

** = exponentiation

z = z score value for the area under the normal curve corresponding to the level of confidence desired (e.g., for 95% confidence level or 95% area under the normal curve, z = 1.96 approximately)

p = observed proportion (usually expressed as a decimal) of the sample

q = 1 - p

N = population size

n = sample size

The latter term of the three terms is the unbiased estimator of the finite population correction factor. For the biased estimator, use N instead of N - 1 in the denominator. As you can see, as N becomes very large, the limit of this term is 1 and the value of 1 can be substituted, effectively removing it from the expression.

Regards,
Jonathan

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

www.oranjbowl.info

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.

>>> Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM> 11/6/2007 12:37 AM >>>
Hi,

I've created an excel spreadsheet where I can calculate the sample size for populations without a finite population correction factor, and one with.

I've also put in a calculator for the margin of error for the regular sample size, but I'm having trouble finding the algorithm for calculating margin of error with fpc. The calculators without fpc are readily available on the web and elsewhere but not for fpc.

I'd be grateful for help from somehow who knows what the algorithm is. I'll create a link for downloading it off my website once I add this feature in.

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
Yahoo Messenger: leora_lawton

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Tue, 6 Nov 2007 15:36:21 -0500

Reply-To: Sid Groeneman <sid@GROENEMAN.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Sid Groeneman <sid@GROENEMAN.COM>

Subject: Acquiescence, Yea-Saying,
Extreme Response Tendencies of Racial/Ethnic/Cultural Groups

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Mime-Version: 1.0 (Apple Message framework v912)

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=WINDOWS-1252; format=flowed; delsp=yes

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Thanks to all of you who so graciously (and rapidly) responded to the =20=

inquiry I posted Monday morning. I've combined the citations into this =20=

list and am posting them for those of you who asked to have a copy of =20=

the results. Since no one tried to do their own brief summary, I can =20
only forward the citations:

Bernal, H., Wooley, S., & Schensul, J.J. (1997). The challenge of =20
using Likert-type scales with low-literate ethnic populations. Nursing =20=

Research, 46(3), 179-181.

Brown, S.A., Becker, H.A., Garcia, A.A., Barton, S.A., & Hanis, C.L. =20
(2002). Measuring health beliefs in Spanish-speaking Mexican Americans =20=

with type 2 diabetes: Adapting an existing instrument. Research in =20
Nursing & Health, 25(2), 145-158.

Clarke III, I. (2000) 'Extreme Response Style in Cross-cultural =20
Research', Journal of Social Behavior and Personality 15(1): 137-52.

Flaskerud, J.H. (1988). Is the Likert scale format culturally biased? =20=

Nursing Research, 37(3), 185-186.

Gibbons, Judith L., Jennifer A. Zellner and David J. Rudek. 1999.

"Effects of Language on Meaningfulness on the Use of Extreme Response =20=

Style by Spanish-English Bilinguals." Cross-cultural Research 33 (4): =20=

369-381.

Harzing, A. W. (2006) "Response Styles in Cross-national Survey =20
Research A 26-country Study", International Journal of Cross Cultural =20=

Management 2006 Vol 6(2): 243-266.

Hendrickson, S.G. (2003). Beyond translation =85 cultural fit. Western =20=

Journal of Nursing Research, 25(5), 593-608.

Holbrook, Allyson et al. 2006 AAPOR paper: "Extreme Response Style: =20
Style or Substance?"

Hui, C.H. and Triandis, H.C. (1989) 'Effects of Culture and Response =20
Format on Extreme Response Style', Journal of Cross-Cultural =20
Psychology 20(3): 296-309.

Hurtado, Aida. 1994. "Does Similarity Breed Respect?: Interviewer =20
Evaluations of Mexican-Descent Respondents in a Bilingual Survey." =20
Public Opinion Quarterly 58: 77-95.

Johnson, T., O'Rourke, D., Chavez, N., Sudman, S., Warnecke, R., =20
Lacey, L. and Horm, J. (1997) 'Social Cognition and Responses to Survey =20=

Questions Among Culturally Diverse Populations', in L. Lyberg, P. =20
Biemer, M. Collins, E. de Leeuw, C. Dippo, N. Schwarz and D. Trewin =20
(eds) Survey Measurement and Process Quality, pp. 87-113. New York: =20
John Wiley & Sons.

Marin, Gerardo and Barbara VanOss. Research with Hispanic Populations. =20=

The book is part of the Applied Social Research Methods Series, Volume =20=

23 published by Sage Publications, copyright 1991.

Marin, Gerardo, Raymond J. Gamba and Barbara V. Marin. 1992. "Extreme =20=

Response Style and Acquiescence among Hispanics: The Role of =20
Acculturation and Education." Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology =20
23: 498-509.

McQuiston, C., Larson, K., Parrado, E.A., & Flaskerud, J.H. (2002). =20
AIDS knowledge and measurement considerations with unacculturated =20
Latinos. Western Journal of Nursing Research, 24(4), 354-372.

Pasick, R. J., et al. 1996, "Problems and Progress in Translation of =20
Health Survey Questions: The Pathways Experience," Health Education =20
Quarterly, 23: 28-40.

Ross, C.E. and Mirowsky, J. (1984) 'Socially desirable Response and =20
Acquiescence in a Cross-cultural Survey of Mental Health', Journal of =20=

Health and Social Behavior 25(2): 189-97.

Rui Wang, Brian Hempton, John P Dugan, and Susan R. Komives, =93Cultural =
=20

Differences or What? Why Asians Avoid Extreme Responses, =94 paper =20
presented at the 2007 AAPOR conference.=

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Wed, 7 Nov 2007 11:42:30 -0500
Reply-To: Melissa Marcello <mmarcello@PURSUANTRESEARCH.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Melissa Marcello <mmarcello@PURSUANTRESEARCH.COM>
Subject: Online survey invitations/strategies for dealing with spam
blockers
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Dear Colleagues,

We conduct some surveys online, typically for associations and employers whose members/employees have e-mail access. At present we design and program them in-house using a vendor's product (which costs us approx \$10k per year) that we have an annual site license for, and are able to populate the survey with our e-mail lists. At a pre-determined time the program sends invites and reminders from what appears to be our e-mail address, but is actually one of the vendor's IP addresses (the surveys and sample do not live on our servers-we log on to our surveys, etc. on our vendor's Web site).

We want to know what strategies other AAPOR members have employed to ensure that survey invitations that are sent from software programs like I described don't end up in the junk e-mail folder flagged as spam. From what we can tell of recent (and this really does seem to be a new problem) adding our email address to participants' address books doesn't seem to help. In fact we sent ourselves an invitation to participate in a test version of a survey and that ended up in our junk mail folder.

Unfortunately our vendor hasn't been all that helpful in trouble-shooting. They even confided yesterday that someone who had a site license to their product WAS using the product to spam people for marketing purposes (not research), and because of this they were having problems with certain ISPs (AOL!) accepting any survey e-mails with their IP addresses. They claim that they handled this (and such instances) internally, but we are really concerned about the bias that might result from certain ISPs blocking their IP addresses. One suggestion they did have was to scrub the lists to ensure that the lists have valid e-mail addresses, attempting to reduce error messages which could potentially flag the email as spam. But in the last

instance, our lists were clean and we still had issues.

Right now our solution has simply been to include a link to the survey from an e-mail that we send to participants from our company's e-mail address (or our client's), rather than have the e-mail come from the program, but then we lose functionality when it comes to reminder emails for partial completes or surveys that haven't been touched. Has anyone else dealt with this issue, and how was it resolved?

Thanks so much for your help!!!

Melissa

Melissa Marcello

President

Pursuant, Inc.

2141 P Street NW

Suite 105

Washington, DC 20037

d. 202.887.0070, ext. 11

f. 800.567.1723

Please visit our Website at www.pursuantresearch.com

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====
Date: Wed, 7 Nov 2007 13:29:14 -0500

Reply-To: Howard Fienberg <hfienberg@CMOR.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Howard Fienberg <hfienberg@CMOR.ORG>
Subject: Re: Online survey invitations/strategies for dealing with spam blockers
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Bill MacElroy, a volunteer on CMOR's Government Affairs Committee, originally developed these three keys as a guide to the control that researchers can directly exercise over the likelihood of their recruitment emails being tagged as spam:

. When possible, avoid HTML messages - they are categorized as "spam" more often than text messages . Avoid use of the color red - it seems to trip spam filters . Avoid subject line keywords that are "sales-y": offer, free, cash, bargain, win, promo, reward, marketing

Sincerely,
Howard Fienberg
Director of Government Affairs
CMOR: Promoting & Advocating Survey & Opinion Research hfienberg@cmor.org
1111 16th St. NW, Suite 120
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 775-5170
Fax: (202) 775-5172
<http://www.cmor.org>
<http://www.youropinioncounts.org>

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Melissa Marcello
Sent: Wednesday, November 07, 2007 11:43 AM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Online survey invitations/strategies for dealing with spam blockers

Dear Colleagues,

We conduct some surveys online, typically for associations and employers whose members/employees have e-mail access. At present we design and program them in-house using a vendor's product (which is costs us approx \$10k per year) that we have an annual site license for, and are able to populate the survey with our e-mail lists. At a pre-determined time the program sends invites and reminders from what appears to be our e-mail address, but is actually one of the vendor's IP addresses (the surveys and sample do not live on our servers-we log on to our surveys, etc. on our vendor's Web site).

We want to know what strategies other AAPOR members have employed to ensure that survey invitations that are sent from software programs like I described don't end up in the junk e-mail folder flagged as spam. From what we can tell of recent (and this really does seem to be a new problem) adding our email address to participants' address books doesn't seem to help. In fact we sent ourselves an invitation to participate in a test version of a survey and that ended up in our junk mail folder.

Unfortunately our vendor hasn't been all that helpful in trouble-shooting. They even confided yesterday that someone who had a site license to their product WAS using the product to spam people for marketing purposes (not research), and because of this they were having problems with certain ISPs (AOL!) accepting any survey e-mails with their IP addresses. They claim that they handled this (and such instances) internally, but we are really concerned about the bias that might result from certain ISPs blocking their IP addresses. One suggestion they did have was to scrub the lists to ensure that the lists have valid e-mail addresses, attempting to reduce error messages which could potentially flag the email as spam. But in the last instance, our lists were clean and we still had issues.

Right now our solution has simply been to include a link to the survey from an e-mail that we send to participants from our company's e-mail address (or our client's), rather than have the e-mail come from the program, but then we lose functionality when it comes to reminder emails for partial completes or surveys that haven't been touched. Has anyone else dealt with this issue, and how was it resolved?

Thanks so much for your help!!!

Melissa

Melissa Marcello

President

Pursuant, Inc.

2141 P Street NW

Suite 105

Washington, DC 20037

d. 202.887.0070, ext. 11

f. 800.567.1723

Please visit our Website at www.pursuantresearch.com

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

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

Date: Thu, 8 Nov 2007 09:18:16 +1300
Reply-To: "Healey, Benjamin" <B.J.Healey@MASSEY.AC.NZ>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Healey, Benjamin" <B.J.Healey@MASSEY.AC.NZ>
Subject: Re: Online survey invitations/strategies for dealing with spam
blockers
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

To add to Howard's comments:

Bill MacElroy wrote an article on email invitations for Quirks in 2003:
<http://www.quirks.com/articles/a2003/20030707.aspx>

You may also find the following articles by Stephen Spencer useful:
<http://www.netconcepts.com/watch-your-language/>
<http://www.stephanspencer.com/archives/2006/12/21/email-marketing-101-and-201-in-podcasts-and-powerpoints/>

Stephen is an online marketer, but he isn't evil. His tips apply just as well to online surveys as they do to customer contact email.

In terms of pre-testing, I've recently come across a tool that looks like it would be perfect for testing different versions of online survey invitations on spam filters before they are sent:
<http://www.campaignmonitor.com/testing/>. I've not had an opportunity to

use it, but would be very keen to be involved in some methodological research around this if you are interested.

Playing with the text/format of the message will only get you so far, especially since it appears that your vendor's IP address is compromised. With that in mind, I'd seriously consider sending your mail shot via your own servers. Your tech people should be able to find some bulk mailer software that would do the trick. Alternatively, you could try a different third-party mailer like Campaign Monitor.

If the email send is heavily tied into the product you are using (e.g., it auto generates login codes etc. which it then tracks), you may need to put a little pressure on your vendor to change the IP they send their mail from.

Best regards,
Ben

Benjamin Healey
Lecturer
Department of Communication, Journalism and Marketing
Massey University
Private Bag 11222
Palmerston North
NEW ZEALAND
Telephone: + 64 6 350 5799 ext. 5580
Facsimile: + 64 6 350 2260
Web: http://marketing.massey.ac.nz/staff_detail.asp?staffid=11

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Melissa Marcello
Sent: Thursday, 8 November 2007 5:43 a.m.
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Online survey invitations/strategies for dealing with spam blockers

Dear Colleagues,

We conduct some surveys online, typically for associations and employers whose members/employees have e-mail access. At present we design and program them in-house using a vendor's product (which costs us approx \$10k per year) that we have an annual site license for, and are able to populate the survey with our e-mail lists. At a pre-determined time the program sends invites and reminders from what appears to be our e-mail address, but is actually one of the vendor's IP addresses (the surveys and sample do not live on our servers-we log on to our surveys, etc. on our vendor's Web site).

We want to know what strategies other AAPOR members have employed to ensure that survey invitations that are sent from software programs like I described don't end up in the junk e-mail folder flagged as spam. From what we can tell of recent (and this really does seem to be a new problem) adding our email address to participants' address books doesn't seem to help. In fact we sent ourselves an invitation to participate in a test version of a survey and that ended up in our junk mail folder.

Unfortunately our vendor hasn't been all that helpful in trouble-shooting. They even confided yesterday that someone who had a site license to their product WAS using the product to spam people for marketing purposes (not research), and because of this they were having problems with certain ISPs (AOL!) accepting any survey e-mails with their IP addresses. They claim that they handled this (and such instances) internally, but we are really concerned about the bias that might result from certain ISPs blocking their IP addresses. One suggestion they did have was to scrub the lists to ensure that the lists have valid e-mail addresses, attempting to reduce error messages which could potentially flag the email as spam. But in the last instance, our lists were clean and we still had issues.

Right now our solution has simply been to include a link to the survey from an e-mail that we send to participants from our company's e-mail address (or our client's), rather than have the e-mail come from the program, but then we lose functionality when it comes to reminder emails for partial completes or surveys that haven't been touched. Has anyone else dealt with this issue, and how was it resolved?

Thanks so much for your help!!!

Melissa

Melissa Marcello

President

Pursuant, Inc.

2141 P Street NW

Suite 105

Washington, DC 20037

d. 202.887.0070, ext. 11

f. 800.567.1723

Please visit our Website at www.pursuantresearch.com

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

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

Date: Wed, 7 Nov 2007 16:58:16 -0500
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: NASA Gets a Pollster Pat on the Back for Its Data Decision
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

NASA Gets a Pollster Pat on the Back for Its Data Decision

<http://newswire.ascribe.org/cgi-bin/ behold.pl?ascribeid=20071107.052731&time=07%2039%20PST&year=2007&public=0>

or

<http://tinyurl.com/2zyhvk>

OLATHE, Kan., Nov. 7 (AScribe Newswire) -- The nation's top group of pollsters and public opinion researchers today applauded NASA's decision to make public the findings of its recent safety survey.

"NASA did the right thing," said Rob Daves, past president of the American Association for Public Opinion Research.

SNIP

--

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

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====
Date: Wed, 7 Nov 2007 14:21:11 -0800
Reply-To: Paolo Gardinali <paolo@SURVEY.UCSB.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Paolo Gardinali <paolo@SURVEY.UCSB.EDU>
Subject: Re: Online survey invitations/strategies for dealing with spam blockers

Comments: To: Howard Fienberg <hfienberg@CMOR.ORG>

Comments: cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

In-Reply-To: <20071107183332.211951FF2382@bcnet1.asu.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

On Wed, 7 Nov 2007, Howard Fienberg wrote:

- > Bill MacElroy, a volunteer on CMOR's Government Affairs Committee,
- > originally developed these three keys as a guide to the control that
- > researchers can directly exercise over the likelihood of their recruitment
- > emails being tagged as spam:
- >
- > . When possible, avoid HTML messages - they are categorized as "spam" more
- > often than text messages . Avoid use of the color red - it seems to trip
- > spam filters . Avoid subject line keywords that are "sales-y": offer, free,
- > cash, bargain, win, promo, reward, marketing

This is not going to help if the mailer (vendor) has been blacklisted.

Best,

--

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

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

Date: Wed, 7 Nov 2007 20:44:16 -0500
Reply-To: Pat Lewis <plewis@AAPOR.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Pat Lewis <plewis@AAPOR.ORG>
Subject: VOA -- Polling Propels Political Process
Comments: To: aapor net <aapornet@asu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Disposition: inline

Polling Propels Political Process
By Jeffrey Young
Washington
07 November 2007

full article: <http://www.voanews.com/english/2007-11-07-voa22.cfm>

Every presidential aspirant uses opinion polling data to shape his or her campaign in the quest for the White House. In this segment of How America Elects, VOA's Jeffrey Young looks at the vital role of polls and pollsters in forging campaign strategies.

Who leads the race to the White House? What are the big issues voters care about? Political candidates and their parties get those answers from public opinion polling.

Political campaigns use polls to make critical strategy and resource decisions -- everything from where the candidate needs to make personal appearances to which campaign issues resonate with voters.

The Gallup Organization has conducted political polling since the 1930s. Gallup official Frank Newport says these surveys serve as blueprints. "Candidates today, or political parties, use polling to set the framework, to actually design their campaign," he explains. "Oftentimes, they will look to see what issues they should emphasize and what issues they shouldn't emphasize in their overall strategy. Then, campaigns and candidates and parties use the polling as a benchmark as the campaign continues to know how they're doing."

--

Pat Lewis
Communications Director
American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR)
1405 North George Mason Drive
Arlington, Virginia
703.527-5245
cell 703.201.5070
www.aapor.org

AAPOR -- the leading association of public opinion and survey research professionals.

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

=====
Date: Thu, 8 Nov 2007 08:26:42 -0500
Reply-To: jclark@clarkandchase.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jack Clark <jclark@CLARKANDCHASE.COM>
Organization: Clark & Chase Research, Inc.
Subject: Business Listings
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Colleagues,=20

=20

We are looking to do an online survey of a representative cross-section =
of
businesses in the U.S. Does anyone have recommendations for someone who =
can
provide a good business sample with email addresses? =20

=20

Thanks

=20

Jack

=20

Jack E. Clark, PhD

Clark & Chase Research, Inc.

PO Box 49215

Charlotte, NC 28277-3432

704.998.9661

866.779.5947 (fax)

<mailto:jclark@clarkandchase.com> jclark@clarkandchase.com

=20

Visit our website at:

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

=20

This message (including any attachments) contains confidential =
information
intended for a specific individual and purpose, and is protected by law. =
If
you are not the intended recipient, you should delete this message. Any
disclosure, copying, or distribution of this message, or the taking of =
any
action based on it, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this
e-mail in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete =
this
e-mail and attached files from your system. Thank you.=20

=20

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Thu, 8 Nov 2007 07:45:43 -0800
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>
Subject: postdoc at Rutgers' Center for Women and Work
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Post-Doctoral Opportunity-IMMEDIATE OPENING

Post-doctoral position for the Center for Women and Work, School of Management and Labor Relations, Rutgers University
(1 year position, with possibility of reappointment for a second year)
The Center for Women and Work at Rutgers University is seeking a postdoctoral fellow to co-direct and organize the evaluation research of a series of intervention programs for "at risk" youth in Newark, New Jersey. The fellowship includes (among other duties) the co-direction of a research team with undergraduates and graduate students; the collection of student data; the development of surveys and questionnaires, conducting surveys/questionnaires, and analyzing results; fieldwork studies and site visits, evaluate best practices, and write policy and academic reports. Candidates should possess a Doctoral Degree (advanced ABDs will be considered) in sociology, economics, public policy, political science, education, or other relevant area. The ideal candidate should have strong writing skills, research and analytical skills, experience conducting research, as well as public speaking and presentation skills. Candidates must demonstrate experience applying basic research principles, conducting interviews and/or focus groups, analyzing qualitative and quantitative data, writing research and/or policy reports and using Microsoft Access, Excel, Word and Powerpoint. Statistical skills are preferred, along with a knowledge and familiarity with SPSS or SAS (or other statistical package). Salary range is \$45,000 to 50,000 and commensurate with experience. The position will begin immediately. Please send resume and cover letter to: Mary Gatta Fax: 732-932-1254 or email to: gatta@rci.rutgers.edu. Rutgers University is an equal opportunity/affirmative action employer, and position is contingent upon grant funding.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Thu, 8 Nov 2007 11:58:25 -0500
Reply-To: Craig Wiles <cwiles@PSCINC.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Craig Wiles <cwiles@PSCINC.COM>
Subject: Position Announcement
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Public Sector Consultants is currently seeking applicants for the following position:

Senior Consultant for Evaluation and Survey Research=20

Job Summary: Conduct and manage evaluation and survey research projects for the firm's clients in the policy arenas of economics, the environment, education, health, and technology=20

Salary: Commensurate with experience=20

Essential Duties of the Job (listed in order of importance):=20

- * Conduct all aspects of the evaluation process (assist with proposals, design and implement evaluation methodologies, analyze qualitative and quantitative results, present findings)=20
- * Conduct all aspects of the survey research process (assist with proposals, define survey methodology, write and edit survey instruments, analyze results, present findings)=20
- * Manage subcontractors (e.g., telephone banks, database/sample providers)=20
- * Assist the firm's consultants with questions of methodology, statistics, and analysis=20

Other duties as assigned including (but not limited to):=20

- * Assist the firm's staff with aspects of projects that may include non-evaluation and non-survey activities, depending on skills and interest=20

Skills Required to Perform the Essential Duties of the Job:=20

- * Thorough understanding of how to develop and implement evaluation and survey research projects=20
- * Excellent writing ability=20
- * Ability to present complex information in a clear and concise manner orally and in writing to audiences ranging from "informed laypeople" to policy experts=20
- * Ability to efficiently manage tasks, timelines, and subcontractors while working on multiple projects simultaneously=20
- * Working knowledge of Microsoft Office suite, as well as statistical analysis tools (e.g., SPSS, SAS)=20
- * Ability to work on evaluation and survey research projects alone or as part of a larger project team=20

Education Required to Perform the Duties of the Job:=20

- * At least a master's degree in statistics, public policy, public administration or similar social science, along with at least five years of evaluation and/or survey research and analysis experience
=09
or=20
- * A 4-year-college degree in statistics, public policy, public administration or similar social science, along with at least ten years of evaluation and/or survey research and analysis experience=20

Physical Abilities Required to Perform the Essential Duties of the Job:=20

- * Ability to sit for long periods of time, spend varying amounts of time in front of a computer screen, and move about office areas as required=20
- * Visual and hearing abilities, as well as manual dexterity, to operate a computer and various other office equipment=20

To apply for this position:=20

Send a cover letter and resume no later than Wednesday, November 14, 2007, to:=20

Jeff Williams=20
Senior Vice President=20
Public Sector Consultants Inc.=20
600 W. Saint Joseph St., Suite 10=20
Lansing, MI 48933=20

Materials also may be submitted by e-mail in either Microsoft Word or Adobe Acrobat format to: psc@pscinc.com <<mailto:%20psc@pscinc.com>>=20

<<http://www.pscinc.com/>>=20

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Thu, 8 Nov 2007 12:42:05 -0500
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: NASA Probing Handling of Pilot Survey
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

NASA Probing Handling of Pilot Survey
AP

By RITA BEAMISH - 16 hours ago
http://ap.google.com/article/ALeqM5jKO38hKOG37Omy4Iv7Bi9q_L98bQD8SP5ON02
or
<http://tinyurl.com/2arvh2>

NASA's internal watchdog said Wednesday it is auditing the agency's handling of a survey on air safety that NASA shut down after it had spent \$11.3 million and then withheld the results.

The inspector general's office is looking into management of the National Aviation Operations Monitoring Service, a multiyear project that surveyed 24,000 commercial air pilots and 5,000 general aviation pilots on safety-related issues they encountered in flight and on the runways.

SNIP

In its first public comment on the matter, the contractor that conducted the survey for NASA, Battelle Memorial Institute, on Wednesday said its work had been "very high quality."

SNIP

Rep. Bart Gordon, the committee chairman, welcomed news of the audit.

"In our hearing last week, several members raised concerns about whether NASA had wasted almost \$12 million for the NAOMS project by cutting off the funding before any serious analysis of the safety data was done. This is the type of audit an agency inspector general should be doing," Gordon, D-Tenn., said in a statement.

SNIP

Experts who helped develop the survey also said it would not make sense to interview thousands of pilots just to test the method, and that type of testing was done at the outset by interviewing fewer than 700 pilots.

Griffin told lawmakers that NASA did not manage the project well and questioned the validity of the findings.

Battelle spokesman Katy Delaney said Wednesday, however, that the contractor stands by its work.

"We believe this work was done to a very high quality with very high quality results," she said.

SNIP

--

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

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Thu, 8 Nov 2007 15:34:07 -0500
Reply-To: Jon Cohen <CohenJ@WASHPOST.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jon Cohen <CohenJ@WASHPOST.COM>
Subject: Washington Post poll, summer 2008
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0

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

The Washington Post has an opening for a twelve-week, paid internship in Polling. This internship runs from June to August, and offers an exceptional candidate the opportunity to work in a fast-paced news polling operation during campaign 2008.

You must be a college junior, senior or graduate student enrolled in a degree program as of November 1, 2007. A deep interest in politics, facility with data analysis and an exacting attention to detail are essential. Previous work experience and familiarity with SPSS are preferred.

To apply for this position, please submit a cover letter, resume, work samples, two letters of recommendation and an updated academic transcript to:

Jennifer Agiesta
The Washington Post
1150 15th St. NW
Washington, D.C. 20071
polls@washpost.com

The application deadline for this position is Dec. 15.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Thu, 8 Nov 2007 15:07:56 -0700
Reply-To: Robert Kernish <rkernish@BIOVID.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Robert Kernish <rkernish@BIOVID.COM>
Subject: Market Research Job Posting - Business Development
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

BioVid provides primary market research services to pharmaceutical, biotech, medical device, and diagnostics firms worldwide. BioVid offers a range of qualitative and quantitative research services; each initiative is custom-designed to address specific client (internal and external) project objectives.

Our people represent BioVid's greatest competitive advantage, based upon their experience, their expertise, and their unique perspective. This mix

=20
of talent and philosophy enables BioVid to provide strategic guidance and=
=20
real-world information that helps clients improve not only their brand bu=
t=20
also their individual professional performance=E2=80=9D.

Team Executive Business Development

This is an executive position reporting to the President or a Senior Team=
=20
Executive. The qualified candidate will have well established ties in th=
e=20
pharmaceutical industry and demonstrated business development skills. Of=
=20
equal importance, to be successful in the position the candidate must hav=
e=20
in depth knowledge of executing market research projects and managing a=20=
team of professionals to deliver high quality strategic research within=20=
established budgets. Specific requirements of the position include:

=E2=80=A2=09Extensive client interaction across all phases of MR projects=
from=20
proposal, through design, execution and reporting=20
=E2=80=A2=09Ability to expand the company=E2=80=99s client base by both f=
ostering of=20
existing client companies and exploring new client opportunities
=E2=80=A2=09Proposal writing for quantitative and qualitative research=20=
projects that address various key MR questions
=E2=80=A2=09Development and management of project budgets that achieve ta=
rget=20
profit margins=20
=E2=80=A2=09Mentoring of staff including development of project-related s=
kills=20
and provision of advancement opportunities
=E2=80=A2=09Management/Coordination of all members of project team that c=
ould=20
include Operations, Advanced Methods Group, junior staff and consultants=20=
to ensure objectives/expectations are met within project timeline
=E2=80=A2=09Responsible for all aspects of MR projects including material=
s=20
development, data collection and analysis; including interaction with=20
Advanced Methods Group

Requirements:

=E2=80=A2=09Bachelor Degree (graduate-level preferred)
=E2=80=A2=0910+ year=E2=80=99s market research experience
=E2=80=A2=09Strong analytic and writing abilities
=E2=80=A2=09Excellent client management skills

=E2=80=A2=09Willingness to travel out-of-state/out-of-country

Contact Barbara Durning Human Resources Director at bdurning@biovid.com o=
r=20
609-750-1400 x 135

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

Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====
Date: Thu, 8 Nov 2007 15:12:26 -0700

Reply-To: Robert Kernish <rkernish@BIOVID.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Robert Kernish <rkernish@BIOVID.COM>

Subject: Market Research Job Posting - Pharmaceutical

Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

BioVid provides primary market research services to pharmaceutical,=20
biotech, medical device, and diagnostics firms worldwide. BioVid offers a=
=20

range of qualitative and quantitative research services; each initiative=20=

is custom-designed to address specific client (internal and external) and=
=20

project objectives.

Our people represent BioVid's greatest competitive advantage, based upon=20=

their experience, their expertise, and their unique perspective. This mix=
=20

of talent and philosophy enables BioVid to provide strategic guidance and=
=20

real-world information that helps clients improve not only their brand bu=
t=20

also their individual professional performance.

Associate Team Executive

The Associate Team Executive role would involve designing, executing,=20
analyzing, and reporting the results from qualitative and quantitative=20=

market research data in the healthcare arena. Position reports to Team=20=

Executive and is located in Princeton, NJ.

About the Role:

=09

=E2=80=A2=09Manage/Coordinate project team: Operations, Advanced Methods =
Group=20

and associates/interns, and guide team/department progress against work=20=

flow plans=20

=E2=80=A2=09Develop questionnaires, discussion guides and other project=20=

materials under supervision of TE=E2=80=99s=20=20

=E2=80=A2=09Data collection on qualitative side (TDI, IDI, Focus Groups)

=E2=80=A2=09Analyze data, supervision of field, coordinate process with=20=

Advanced Methods Group, develop analysis plan, tab plan, ensure data=20

quality control, ensure development of graphics plan

=E2=80=A2=09Report writing, preparation and some direct client presentati=

ons=20

(at Senior ATE levels)

=E2=80=A2=09Proposal writing =E2=80=93 assist with proposal, sales materi=

als

=E2=80=A2=09Some domestic Travel; International travel may be expected as=

well

=E2=80=A2=09This and all other duties as needed

Report to: Team Executive

Requirements:

Education: Bachelor Degree (graduate level preferred)

Experience: 5+ year=E2=80=99s industry experience

Contact Barbara Durning Human Resources Director at bdurning@biovid.com o=

r=20

609-750-1400 x 135

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

Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====
Date: Thu, 8 Nov 2007 16:58:29 -0600

Reply-To: Jeanie Harper <JHarper@GOAMP.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Jeanie Harper <JHarper@GOAMP.COM>

Subject: AAPOR Job Posting

Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Organizational Unit - Survey Research Center

=20

Title - Associate Director (Payroll Title: Academic Coordinator II).

=20

Salary - Salary commensurate with education and experience. =20

=20

Position Description -The University of California, Riverside College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences is seeking an Associate Director (Academic Coordinator II) to administer the day-to-day operations of the Survey Research Center lab. The incumbent will identify opportunities for research activities appropriate for the survey lab, develop responses to requests for proposals and grant applications in consultation with the directors and UC Riverside researchers, brief faculty members on the services of the survey research lab, deliver research and consulting services to campus and community organizations and individuals, including serving as contact or liaison with clients. The incumbent will supervise the activities of a BD time graduate student researcher (GSR), will design training materials for undergraduate survey interviewers, construct and test Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) survey instruments in consultation with the lab director and other researchers, with the support of the GSR; and coordinate the activities of the lab with computing managers, programmers, analysts, and support staff in the Institute for Social Research, College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Science, Statistical Computing Collaboratory, and Computing & Communications. This is a two year position with renewal contingent upon funding.

=20

Required Qualifications - Successful applicant must have outstanding quantitative reasoning skills, excellent proof-reading skills, and a good command of the English language. Must be able to work well with clients and co-workers. Must be able to manage multiple projects simultaneously, manage time effectively, and meet deadlines. Applicant must have completed M.A. or Ph.D. in relevant social science discipline (e.g., Economics, Sociology, Political Science), with evidence of advanced training in survey research methods. Must have experience with the preparation of CATI survey instruments and experience with statistical computing programs (e.g., STATA, SPSS).=20

=20

Preferred Qualifications - Communication skills in the Spanish language.

=20

Application Information -Review of applications will begin December 14, 2007 and will continue until the position is filled. Applications should include a letter discussing interest and relevant experience, a current curriculum vita, and contact information for at least three professional references. Submit materials to: Martin Johnson, Director of Political Science, University of California Riverside, Riverside, CA =

92521 or fax to (951) 827-3933.

=20

The University of California, Riverside, is an affirmative action/equal =
opportunity employer.

=20

=20

Jeanie Harper

Administrative Assistant, AAPOR

P.O. Box 14263, Lenexa, KS 66285

18000 W. 105th St., Olathe, KS 66061

Phone: (913) 895-4601

Fax: (913) 895-4652=20

=20

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

Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====
Date: Thu, 8 Nov 2007 21:34:09 -0600

Reply-To: Woody Carter <wcarter@UCHICAGO.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Woody Carter <wcarter@UCHICAGO.EDU>

Subject: IMLS research and statistics jobs

Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=UTF-8

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

November 5, 2007

IMLS Press Contacts

202-653-4632

Jeannine Mjoseth, jmjoseth@imls.gov

Mamie Bittner, mbittner@imls.gov

IMLS Recruiting for Research and Statistics Positions

WASHINGTON, DC--The IMLS Office of Policy, Planning, Research and Communication (OPPRC) is building a first-rate team to lead the agency's research, statistics, and evaluation activities. Two positions are available:

Associate Deputy Director for Research and Statistics - The incumbent will identify program-related issues of interest to the agency, and develop and implement short, intermediate, and long-range research, program evaluation, and statistics plans. These efforts must take into account agency policies and programmatic directions and the needs and state of libraries and museums in the United States.

Statistical Analyst - The candidate will apply state-of-the-art knowledge of mathematical statistics, survey design, and analysis techniques and systems analysis to ensure the collection of policy-relevant data for the agency's statistics programs. The candidate will conduct validity studies, establish programs to assist respondents to improve their record systems and methods of transmitting data, and design sampling plans for special surveys on topical issues.

For more information see
<http://www.imls.gov/about/employment.shtm>.

For any questions relating to either of these positions, please contact Antoine Dotson at (202) 208-3184. The closing date for applications is December 5, 2007.

About the Institute of Museum and Library Services

The Institute of Museum and Library Services is the primary source of federal support for the nation's 122,000 libraries and 17,500 museums. The Institute's mission is to create strong libraries and museums that connect people to information and ideas. The Institute works at the national level and in coordination with state and local organizations to sustain heritage, culture, and knowledge; enhance learning and innovation; and support professional development. To learn more about the Institute, please visit www.imls.gov.

Woody Carter
Lecturer in Public Policy
in the College
University of Chicago
wcarter@uchicago.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Date: Fri, 9 Nov 2007 09:30:58 -0500
Reply-To: Pat Lewis <plewis@AAPOR.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Pat Lewis <plewis@AAPOR.ORG>
Subject: NewsU Offering Special Election Webinar Rate to AAPOR Members
Comments: To: aapor net <aapornet@asu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Disposition: inline

NewsU is offering a special rate for AAPOR members for its latest election
Webinar: The Electronic Election: Covering the 2008 Vote (
www.newsu.org/electionWebinar07 <<http://www.newsu.org/electionWebinar07>>).

The Webinar, offered at 10 a.m. or 4 p.m. Eastern time, Nov. 14, is with
Poynter's Al Tompkins. He will explore innovative ways to track election
issues and the candidates using the Internet.

AAPOR members may attend the Webinar for just \$14.95, \$5 off the
registration price. When you register, use this promotional code on the
Checkout page to receive the discount rate: AAPOR1107.

In this one-hour Webinar, you'll learn:

- * How social networking and video-sharing sites such as YouTube,
MySpace and Facebook will affect the 2008 election
- * How newsrooms are finding creative ways to explore election issues
and display candidate profiles
- * How to track candidate spending and campaign contributions
- * How to build interactive maps and tag clouds quickly, easily and
free

NewsU is offering this Webinar at two times for your convenience. The URL
for more information and to register is www.newsu.org/electionWebinar07 <
<http://www.newsu.org/electionWebinar07>> .

--
Pat Lewis
Communications Director
American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR)
1405 North George Mason Drive
Arlington, Virginia
703.527-5245
cell 703.201.5070
www.aapor.org

AAPOR -- the leading association of public opinion and survey research
professionals.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Fri, 9 Nov 2007 07:35:58 -0800
Reply-To: Phil Trounstine <phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Phil Trounstine <phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU>
Subject: "progressives"
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Is anyone aware of polling that has identified "progressives" on the political or ideological continuum? Or any article that distinguishes progressives from liberals using some set of attributes, beliefs, behaviors or convictions?

Philip J. Trounstine, Director
Survey and Policy Research Institute
at San Jose State University
408-924-6993

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Fri, 9 Nov 2007 11:57:08 -0500
Reply-To: Phil Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Phil Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>
Subject: Re: "progressives"
Comments: To: Phil Trounstine <phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU>
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <OF3CB65F57.A8E838BB-ON8825738E.0055B0A6-8825738E.0055B0BA@sjsu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi, Phil

A progressive is a liberal who has decided to accede to the right wing's campaign to demonize the word "liberal."

Not me! Sure, I'm a progressive, but first I'm a tree-hugging, Volvo-driving, tax-and-spend, bleeding heart liberal!

Cheers,

Phil

Phil Trounstine wrote:

> Is anyone aware of polling that has identified "progressives" on the
> political or ideological continuum? Or any article that distinguishes
> progressives from liberals using some set of attributes, beliefs, behaviors
> or convictions?

>
> -----
> Philip J. Trounstine, Director
> Survey and Policy Research Institute
> at San Jose State University
> 408-924-6993

> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> signoff aapornet
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Fri, 9 Nov 2007 17:13:56 -0000
Reply-To: Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Iain Noble <Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK>
Subject: Re: "progressives"
Comments: To: pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: A<47349164.7080108@email.unc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

In UK terms a 'progressive' would be mainly interested in economic issues (e.g. taxation, state investment and welfare), it's also an archaic term used by Communists for themselves in the days of the Popular Front. A liberal here would primarily be concerned with socio-cultural issues (e.g. human rights, death penalty, racism, green issues etc). An economic liberal, on the other hand, would be an anti-state interventionist free trader. But then we also have Liberals here as well who are an entirely different thing altogether.

Iain Noble
Department for Children, Schools and Families
Young People Analysis Division - YCS and Next Steps Study,
W606, Moorfoot, Sheffield, S1 4PQ.
0114 259 1180
For information about the Next Steps Study go to

www.nextstepsstudy.org.uk or
http://www.esds.ac.uk/longitudinal/access/lstype/

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

>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Phil Meyer
>Sent: 09 November 2007 16:57
>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
>Subject: Re: "progressives"

>

>Hi, Phil

>

> A progressive is a liberal who has decided to accede to the right
>wing's campaign to demonize the word "liberal."

>

> Not me! Sure, I'm a progressive, but first I'm a tree-hugging,
>Volvo-driving, tax-and-spend, bleeding heart liberal!

>

>Cheers,

>Phil

>

>

>

>

>

>Phil Trounstine wrote:

>> Is anyone aware of polling that has identified "progressives" on the
>> political or ideological continuum? Or any article that distinguishes
>> progressives from liberals using some set of attributes, beliefs,
behaviors
>> or convictions?

>>

>> _____
>> Philip J. Trounstine, Director
>> Survey and Policy Research Institute
>> at San Jose State University
>> 408-924-6993

>> -----

>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>> Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
>> signoff aapornet
>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>>

>

>-----

>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
>signoff aapornet
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>

>This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the Government
Secure

>Intranet Anti-Virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless in partnership
with MessageLabs.

>(CCTM Certificate Number 2006/04/0007.) In case of problems, please
call your

>organisation's IT Helpdesk.

>Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for
>legal purposes.

The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intranet Anti-Virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2006/04/0007.) On leaving the GSi this email was certified virus free.

Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Fri, 9 Nov 2007 12:55:16 -0500
Reply-To: allenbarton@mindspring.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Allen Barton <allenbarton@MINDSPRING.COM>
Subject: Re: "progressives"
Comments: To: Phil Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Check the Rasmussen Report of a July 24-25 poll which shows that people have a net negative response to a candidate labelled "liberal" and a net-positive response to the label "progressive." ("Reagan-like" gets the most positives!)

Allen Barton

> [Original Message]
> From: Phil Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>
> To: <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
> Date: 11/9/2007 12:03:28 PM
> Subject: Re: "progressives"
>
> Hi, Phil
>
> A progressive is a liberal who has decided to accede to the right wing's campaign to demonize the word "liberal."
>
> Not me! Sure, I'm a progressive, but first I'm a tree-hugging, Volvo-driving, tax-and-spend, bleeding heart liberal!
>
> Cheers,
> Phil
>
>
>
> Phil Trounstine wrote:
>> Is anyone aware of polling that has identified "progressives" on the

>> political or ideological continuum? Or any article that distinguishes
>> progressives from liberals using some set of attributes, beliefs,
behaviors
>> or convictions?

>> _____
>> Philip J. Trounstein, Director
>> Survey and Policy Research Institute
>> at San Jose State University
>> 408-924-6993

>> -----
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>> Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
>> signoff aapornet
>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>>
>

> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> signoff aapornet
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Fri, 9 Nov 2007 13:01:50 -0500
Reply-To: allenbarton@mindspring.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Allen Barton <allenbarton@MINDSPRING.COM>
Subject: PROGRESSIVE VS LIBERAL AS A LABEL
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>, Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

See attached note on preference for "progressive" vs. "liberal" - from Gallup data.

Allen Barton
allenbarton@mindspring.com
Why Wait? Move to EarthLink.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Fri, 9 Nov 2007 14:56:40 -0500
Reply-To: allenbarton@mindspring.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Allen Barton <allenbarton@MINDSPRING.COM>
Subject: Re: PROGRESSIVE VS LIBERAL AS A LABEL
Comments: To: Phil Trounstine <phil.trounstine@sjsu.edu>, AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Sorry - here is the attachment

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

From: Phil Trounstine
To: allenbarton@mindspring.com
Sent: 11/9/2007 1:26:44 PM
Subject: Re: PROGRESSIVE VS LIBERAL AS A LABEL

Thanks, but nothing attached.

Philip J. Trounstine, Director
Survey and Policy Research Institute
at San Jose State University
408-924-6993

-----AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU> wrote: -----

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
From: Allen Barton <allenbarton@mindspring.com>
Sent by: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
Date: 11/09/2007 10:01AM
Subject: PROGRESSIVE VS LIBERAL AS A LABEL

See attached note on preference for "progressive" vs. "liberal" - from Gallup data.

Allen Barton
allenbarton@mindspring.com
Why Wait? Move to EarthLink.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Fri, 9 Nov 2007 11:56:36 -0800
Reply-To: Dominic Lusinchi <dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Dominic Lusinchi <dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM>
Organization: Far West Research
Subject: Re: Online survey invitations/strategies for dealing with spam blockers
Comments: To: "Healey, Benjamin" <B.J.Healey@MASSEY.AC.NZ>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <59ADAF5CA6A8FC4C889BD4097D912BB108F6FB68@its-xchg4.massey.ac.nz>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

One issue I see with using a text format for the survey invitation is the additional burden on the potential participant of having to copy the survey link and pasting it into the browser.

It is a balancing act: is it preferable to insure that the email message reaches the intended recipient (I would think so, assuming the sender's IP address is not compromised as Ben points out) versus increase the risk of noncooperation (does it?) because of the additional burden (copy the link, open the browser, paste the link, as opposed to just click on the link).

All these issues merit a good deal of empirical research to sort things out.

Dominic Lusinchi
Consultant
Far West Research
Statistical Consulting
San Francisco, California
415-664-3032
www.farwestresearch.com

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Healey, Benjamin
Sent: Wednesday, November 07, 2007 12:18 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: Online survey invitations/strategies for dealing with spam blockers

To add to Howard's comments:

Bill MacElroy wrote an article on email invitations for Quirks in 2003:
<http://www.quirks.com/articles/a2003/20030707.aspx>

You may also find the following articles by Stephen Spencer useful:
<http://www.netconcepts.com/watch-your-language/>
<http://www.stephenspencer.com/archives/2006/12/21/email-marketing-101-and-d-201-in-podcasts-and-powerpoints/>

Stephen is an online marketer, but he isn't evil. His tips apply just as well to online surveys as they do to customer contact email.

In terms of pre-testing, I've recently come across a tool that looks like it would be perfect for testing different versions of online survey

invitations on spam filters before they are sent:

<http://www.campaignmonitor.com/testing/>. I've not had an opportunity to use it, but would be very keen to be involved in some methodological research around this if you are interested.

Playing with the text/format of the message will only get you so far, especially since it appears that your vendor's IP address is compromised. With that in mind, I'd seriously consider sending your mail shot via your own servers. Your tech people should be able to find some bulk mailer software that would do the trick. Alternatively, you could try a different third-party mailer like Campaign Monitor.

If the email send is heavily tied into the product you are using (e.g., it auto generates login codes etc. which it then tracks), you may need to put a little pressure on your vendor to change the IP they send their mail from.

Best regards,
Ben

Benjamin Healey
Lecturer
Department of Communication, Journalism and Marketing
Massey University
Private Bag 11222
Palmerston North
NEW ZEALAND
Telephone: + 64 6 350 5799 ext. 5580
Facsimile: + 64 6 350 2260
Web: http://marketing.massey.ac.nz/staff_detail.asp?staffid=11

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Melissa Marcello
Sent: Thursday, 8 November 2007 5:43 a.m.
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Online survey invitations/strategies for dealing with spam blockers

Dear Colleagues,

We conduct some surveys online, typically for associations and employers whose members/employees have e-mail access. At present we design and program them in-house using a vendor's product (which costs us approx \$10k per year) that we have an annual site license for, and are able to populate the survey with our e-mail lists. At a pre-determined time the program sends invites and reminders from what appears to be our e-mail address, but is actually one of the vendor's IP addresses (the surveys and sample do not live on our servers-we log on to our surveys, etc. on our

vendor's Web site).

We want to know what strategies other AAPOR members have employed to ensure that survey invitations that are sent from software programs like I described don't end up in the junk e-mail folder flagged as spam. From what we can tell of recent (and this really does seem to be a new problem) adding our email address to participants' address books doesn't seem to help. In fact we sent ourselves an invitation to participate in a test version of a survey and that ended up in our junk mail folder.

Unfortunately our vendor hasn't been all that helpful in trouble-shooting. They even confided yesterday that someone who had a site license to their product WAS using the product to spam people for marketing purposes (not research), and because of this they were having problems with certain ISPs (AOL!) accepting any survey e-mails with their IP addresses. They claim that they handled this (and such instances) internally, but we are really concerned about the bias that might result from certain ISPs blocking their IP addresses. One suggestion they did have was to scrub the lists to ensure that the lists have valid e-mail addresses, attempting to reduce error messages which could potentially flag the email as spam. But in the last instance, our lists were clean and we still had issues.

Right now our solution has simply been to include a link to the survey from an e-mail that we send to participants from our company's e-mail address (or our client's), rather than have the e-mail come from the program, but then we lose functionality when it comes to reminder emails for partial completes or surveys that haven't been touched. Has anyone else dealt with this issue, and how was it resolved?

Thanks so much for your help!!!

Melissa

Melissa Marcello

President

Pursuant, Inc.

2141 P Street NW

Suite 105

Washington, DC 20037

d. 202.887.0070, ext. 11

f. 800.567.1723

Please visit our Website at www.pursuantresearch.com

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

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

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Fri, 9 Nov 2007 17:52:31 -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 survey invitations/strategies for dealing with spam blockers
Comments: To: Dominic Lusinchi <dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM>
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <004c01c8230a\$a3db9120\$6401a8c0@acer14219167c5>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Unformatted text is much more likely to get past anti-spam filters than formatted text, but email readers treat any text string that begins with "http://" as a clickable link, whether or not the message itself is formatted, so you can have clickable links in plain text messages.

Leaving out the "http://" will get you past some filters designed to reject embedded links (as opposed to HTML formatting), but anything that can be pasted into a browser can be recognized by most anti-phishing filters, so there really isn't much gained by making links unclickable in plain text messages.

Jan Werner

Dominic Lusinchi wrote:

> One issue I see with using a text format for the survey invitation is the
> additional burden on the potential participant of having to copy the survey
> link and pasting it into the browser.

>
> It is a balancing act: is it preferable to insure that the email message
> reaches the intended recipient (I would think so, assuming the sender's IP
> address is not compromised as Ben points out) versus increase the risk of
> noncooperation (does it?) because of the additional burden (copy the link,
> open the browser, paste the link, as opposed to just click on the link).

>
> All these issues merit a good deal of empirical research to sort things out.

>
> Dominic Lusinchi
> Consultant
> Far West Research
> Statistical Consulting
> San Francisco, California
> 415-664-3032
> www.farwestresearch.com

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Healey, Benjamin
> Sent: Wednesday, November 07, 2007 12:18 PM
> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
> Subject: Re: Online survey invitations/strategies for dealing with spam
> blockers

>
> To add to Howard's comments:

>
> Bill MacElroy wrote an article on email invitations for Quirks in 2003:
> <http://www.quirks.com/articles/a2003/20030707.aspx>
>
> You may also find the following articles by Stephen Spencer useful:
> <http://www.netconcepts.com/watch-your-language/>
> <http://www.stephenspencer.com/archives/2006/12/21/email-marketing-101-and-201-in-podcasts-and-powerpoints/>
>
> Stephen is an online marketer, but he isn't evil. His tips apply just
> as well to online surveys as they do to customer contact email.
>
> In terms of pre-testing, I've recently come across a tool that looks
> like it would be perfect for testing different versions of online survey
> invitations on spam filters before they are sent:
> <http://www.campaignmonitor.com/testing/>. I've not had an opportunity to
> use it, but would be very keen to be involved in some methodological
> research around this if you are interested.
>
> Playing with the text/format of the message will only get you so far,
> especially since it appears that your vendor's IP address is
> compromised. With that in mind, I'd seriously consider sending your
> mail shot via your own servers. Your tech people should be able to find
> some bulk mailer software that would do the trick. Alternatively, you
> could try a different third-party mailer like Campaign Monitor.
>
> If the email send is heavily tied into the product you are using (e.g.,
> it auto generates login codes etc. which it then tracks), you may need
> to put a little pressure on your vendor to change the IP they send their
> mail from.
>
> Best regards,
> Ben
>
>
> _____
> Benjamin Healey
> Lecturer
> Department of Communication, Journalism and Marketing
> Massey University
> Private Bag 11222
> Palmerston North
> NEW ZEALAND
> Telephone: + 64 6 350 5799 ext. 5580
> Facsimile: + 64 6 350 2260
> Web: http://marketing.massey.ac.nz/staff_detail.asp?staffid=11
>
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Melissa Marcello
> Sent: Thursday, 8 November 2007 5:43 a.m.
> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
> Subject: Online survey invitations/strategies for dealing with spam
> blockers

>
> Dear Colleagues,
>
>
>
> We conduct some surveys online, typically for associations and employers
> whose members/employees have e-mail access. At present we design and
> program them in-house using a vendor's product (which costs us approx
> \$10k per year) that we have an annual site license for, and are able to
> populate the survey with our e-mail lists. At a pre-determined time the
> program sends invites and reminders from what appears to be our e-mail
> address, but is actually one of the vendor's IP addresses (the surveys
> and
> sample do not live on our servers-we log on to our surveys, etc. on our
> vendor's Web site).
>
>
>
> We want to know what strategies other AAPOR members have employed to
> ensure
> that survey invitations that are sent from software programs like I
> described don't end up in the junk e-mail folder flagged as spam. From
> what
> we can tell of recent (and this really does seem to be a new problem)
> adding
> our email address to participants' address books doesn't seem to help.
> In
> fact we sent ourselves an invitation to participate in a test version of
> a
> survey and that ended up in our junk mail folder.
>
>
>
> Unfortunately our vendor hasn't been all that helpful in
> trouble-shooting.
> They even confided yesterday that someone who had a site license to
> their
> product WAS using the product to spam people for marketing purposes (not
> research), and because of this they were having problems with certain
> ISPs
> (AOL!) accepting any survey e-mails with their IP addresses. They claim
> that they handled this (and such instances) internally, but we are
> really
> concerned about the bias that might result from certain ISPs blocking
> their
> IP addresses. One suggestion they did have was to scrub the lists to
> ensure
> that the lists have valid e-mail addresses, attempting to reduce error
> messages which could potentially flag the email as spam. But in the
> last
> instance, our lists were clean and we still had issues.
>
>
>
>

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

> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> signoff aapornet
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Mon, 12 Nov 2007 09:19:15 -0500
Reply-To: ramirez@aacor.org
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
Comments: RFC822 error: <W> Invalid RFC822 field - "On Thursday,
all current members will receive an e-mail invitat=". Rest of
header flushed.
From: Carl Ramirez <ramirez@AAPOR.ORG>
Subject: The AAPOR Membership Survey is Coming!
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

On Thursday, all current members will receive an e-mail invitation to participate in the 2007 AAPOR Membership Survey. The Executive Council wants to know what you think about AAPOR: what's good, what needs improvement, and where our organization should go in the future. The questionnaire is mostly composed of items from the last full membership survey, conducted in 1996 - let's see how our opinions about AAPOR have changed over the past decade. We are also conducting a survey with former members who left AAPOR in the last two years to learn from their experiences. You will be able to complete the confidential survey, conducted by the Survey Sciences Group, LLC on behalf of Council, on the Web. Paper invitations are being mailed to members for whom we have no e-mail address. A description of methods and summary of results will be shared and discussed in the weeks leading up to the Annual Conference in May. Happily, I don't have to explain to you why your participation is so important to the success of this survey. So, please model good respondent behavior and answer completely, candidly, and promptly. If you have any questions, concerns, or don't receive an invitation to the questionnaire (or know a member who didn't) by Friday, please contact me at ramirez@aacor.org, or (202) 512-3721. Thanks, Carl Ramirez
Membership & Chapter Relations Chair
American Association for Public Opinion Research

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Mon, 12 Nov 2007 13:46:51 -0500
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Speaking of Progressive and Liberal as labels
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Dems wary of 'liberal' label; GOP embraces 'conservative'
http://www.usatoday.com/news/politics/2007-11-12-liberal-conservative_N.htm
or
<http://tinyurl.com/2kyozo>

Hillary Rodham Clinton was asked this summer if she would describe herself as a "liberal."
The Democratic front-runner shied away, saying the "word" - noticeably not using the word - has taken on a connotation that "describes big government.

"I prefer the word 'progressive,'" she said. It has a "real American meaning."

Then she expanded the term to "modern progressive," and, finally, clarified that she was a "modern American progressive."

SNIP

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

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Tue, 13 Nov 2007 11:00:40 -0000
Reply-To: Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Iain Noble <Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK>
Subject: Re: Speaking of Progressive and Liberal as labels

Comments: To: Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

In-Reply-To:

A<3248A9B21DD5574785FE5E2C8E521684993D71@exchange.local.artsience.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Well, here's another view of the subject, courtesy of Gilbert and Sullivan (and as a loyal public servant I have to protest that while their view of MPs may have been valid in the late nineteenth century, this is certainly not the case these days, no, no, definitely not, perish the thought). I'd remind you that the hero of Iolanthe was a conservative as far down as his waist but from thereon was a radical. The libretto actually repays reading even now (just as Wilde's contemporary plays do), in fact I've had to tear myself away from it today otherwise I won't get any work done. You can find it at http://www.karadar.it/Librettos/sullivan_iolanthe.html . :

When all night long a chap remains
On sentry-go, to chase monotony
He exercises of his brains,
That is, assuming that he's got any.
Though never nurtured in the lap
Of luxury, yet I admonish you,
I am an intellectual chap,
And think of things that would astonish you.

I often think it's comical--Fal, la, la! Fal, la, la!
How Nature always does contrive--Fal, la, la, la!
That every boy and every gal
That's born into the world alive
Is either a little Liberal
Or else a little Conservative!
Fal, la, la! Fal, la, la!
Is either a little Liberal
Or else a little Conservative!
Fal, la, la!

When in that House M.P.'s divide,
If they've a brain and cerebellum, too,
They've got to leave that brain outside,
And vote just as their leaders tell 'em to.
But then the prospect of a lot
Of dull M. P.'s in close proximity,
All thinking for themselves, is what
No man can face with equanimity.

Then let's rejoice with loud Fal la--Fal la la! Fal la la!
That Nature always does contrive--Fal, la, la, la!
That every boy and every gal
That's born into the world alive
Is either a little Liberal
Or else a little Conservative!
Fal, la, la! Fal, la, la!

Is either a little Liberal
Or else a little Conservative!
Fal, la!, la!

Iain Noble
Department for Children, Schools and Families
Young People Analysis Division - YCS and Next Steps Study,
W606, Moorfoot, Sheffield, S1 4PQ.
0114 259 1180
For information about the Next Steps Study go to
www.nextstepsstudy.org.uk or
<http://www.esds.ac.uk/longitudinal/access/lstype/>

The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intranet Anti-Virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2006/04/0007.) On leaving the GSi this email was certified virus free.

Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

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

=====
Date: Tue, 13 Nov 2007 12:34:18 -0500
Reply-To: Subscriptions <subscriptions@FD.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Subscriptions <subscriptions@FD.COM>
Subject: Expert In Survey Research Methodology with Substantial Courtroom
Experience Wanted

Comments: To: send to <aapornet@asu.edu>
Comments: cc: David Goldstein <David.Goldstein@fd.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

=20

=20

FD,=20a=20leading=20communications=20consulting=20firm,=20is=20looking=20f=
or=20a=20PhD
academic=20with=20expertise=20in=20survey=20research=20methodology,=20who=20=
also=20has
experience=20testifying=20about=20survey=20design=20in=20court=20during=20=
high=20stakes
litigation=20situations.=20=20

=20

If=20interested,=20please=20send=20a=20letter=20and=20CV=20to=20David=20Go=

ldstein=20at
david.goldstein@fd.com.=20=20No=20calls=20please.

=20

Subscriptions@fd.com

88=20Pine=20Street,=2028th=20Floor
New=20York,=20NY,=2010005
www.fd.com=20<http://www.fd.com/>=20

=20

This=20email=20has=20been=20scanned=20by=20the=20MessageLabs=20Email=20Sec=
urity=20System.
For=20more=20information=20please=20visit=20http://www.message-labs.com/ema=
il=20

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

Date: Tue, 13 Nov 2007 11:41:24 -0600
Reply-To: Eckman-Stephanie <Eckman-Stephanie@NORC.UCHICAGO.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Eckman-Stephanie <Eckman-Stephanie@NORC.UCHICAGO.EDU>
Subject: Sampling Native Americans
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I'm involved in a small pilot study here at NORC, testing a questionnaire among 200 Native American women (face-to-face). We are seeking a cost effective approach to screen households for Native Americans, so I'm hoping to get some tips from the members of AAPORNET on how we can efficiently identify these households.

Ideally we'd like to reach women from a variety of tribes, to make our test as robust as possible. Geographic diversity is less important: we are happy to interview in only 1 or 2 counties if that is most efficient.

Does anyone out there have experience doing an efficient in-person study of Native Americans? We have been exploring working with tribes to get access to their membership lists, but that has proven to be quite difficult.

Any help you can provide would be very welcome. Please respond to me off list.

Thanks very much.

eckman-stephanie@norc.uchicago.edu

Stephanie Eckman
Sr Survey Methodologist
NORC, DC Office
202 223 3411

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

Date: Tue, 13 Nov 2007 11:07:35 -0800
Reply-To: Charles DiSogra <cdisogra@KNOWLEDGENETWORKS.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Charles DiSogra <cdisogra@KNOWLEDGENETWORKS.COM>
Subject: Job Opportunity in Washington State
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Submitted on behalf of a colleague at The Washington State Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS)

Position: Evaluation Research Program Manager

The Washington State Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS), specifically the Health and Recovery Services Administration (HRSA) is recruiting for the position of an Evaluation Research Program Manager in the Program Evaluations Unit within the Division of Rates and Finance (DRF).

The incumbent of this senior level professional position, which reports to the DRF Assistant Director, designs and manages evaluation studies of HRSA policies, programs, and functions that aim at utilizing HRSA's Medicaid resources most efficiently; conducts statistical and other analyses pertinent to evaluation research; coordinates evaluation research activities with internal/external researchers, and federal/state/local agency staff; develops reports for executive management, state legislators, and the public.=20

=20

QUALIFICATIONS

Advanced degree (Ph.D. preferred) in social sciences, bio-statistics, public administration, public health, nursing, or a related field with strong quantitative emphasis, plus 5 years' experience in managing research and program evaluation studies.

Knowledge of

=20

- * Healthcare organizations, delivery systems, and policy issues.

=20

- * Advanced research methodology including designs, database construction, outcome measurement, and statistical analyses.

=20

- * Current literature on research activities and methods relating to physical and behavioral health fields, and national and state initiatives and priorities in healthcare cost savings and quality.

=20

- * Washington State's Medicaid program operations.

=20

=20

Skills and Abilities

- * Manages evaluation research, both qualitative and quantitative, of HRSA's programs and functions that include analyses of feasibility, operations, outcomes, resource needs, quality improvement, cost savings and cost-effectiveness.

=20

- * Independently plans, designs, and executes research studies, including theoretical framework, experimental and non-experimental designs, survey research techniques, data collection, and statistical analysis and interpretation.

=20

- * Coordinates with contractors, researchers, federal and state agency staff in data collection, analysis, and process and quality improvement activities.

=20

- * Contributes to deliberation of policy directions, performance measures, program efficiency, and quality improvements.

=20

- * Develops comprehensive reports for executive management, state

legislators, health plans and the public, including client constituencies. =20

=20

* Interprets and presents research studies to inform management of possible impact on programs and policies. Provides technical assistance to program staff, management, and others as necessary.

=20

SALARY AND BENEFITS

\$61,235.00 - 84,941 per year depending on qualifications, plus an employee benefits package that includes vacation and sick leave, eleven paid holidays per year, a full array of health, dental, life and other optional insurance, retirement, social security, and military leave.

=20

APPLICATION PROCESS

To apply, send a cover letter describing qualifications, resume, and a list of three professional references to Jennifer Usrey-Scott, Administrative Assistant, Health and Recovery Services Administration, P.O. Box 45509, Olympia, WA 98504-5509, FAX (360)586-9323. Please provide a completed profile data sheet (below).

=20

=20

=20

=20

Department of Social and Health Services

Health and Recovery Services Administration

Division of Business and Finance

Exempt Recruitment Announcement

=20

PROFILE DATA

=20

The Washington State Department of Social and Health Services is an equal opportunity employer and encourages all qualified persons including disabled and Vietnam era veterans, women, racial and ethnic minorities, people with disabilities, and persons over 40 years of age to apply. We ask you to voluntarily answer the following questions and return with your completed application. This information will be treated as confidential. This page will be separated from your application and used by authorized personnel only.

=20

Name: _____ Social Security #:

=20

Date of Birth: _____ Sex: Male Female

=20

Do you have a physical, sensory, or mental condition that substantially limits any of your major life functions, such as working, caring for yourself, walking, doing things with your hands, seeing, hearing, speaking, or learning? Yes No

=20

Do you have a physical, mental, or other health condition that has lasted six (6) or more months and which limits the kind or amount of work you can do at a job? Yes No

=20

Vietnam Era Veteran: Yes No

=20

Disabled Veteran: Yes No Percent of Disability: _____%

=20

What race or culture do you consider yourself? Please check only one group. If you are of more than one race, please check "Other Race."

=20

Black/African-American White/Caucasian Asian or Pacific Islander

=20

Indian/Native American Hispanic/Spanish/Latino(a)

=20

Other: (Please indicate race(s)/culture(s) and list in order of preference for Affirmative Action purposes.)

=20

=20

=20

Signature: _____ Date:

=20

Persons of disability needing assistance in the application process, or those needing this job announcement in an alternative format, may call Jennifer Usrey-Scott 360-725-1866.

=20

=20

=20

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

Date: Tue, 13 Nov 2007 15:33:59 -0600
Reply-To: Nancy Mathiowetz <nancym2@UWM.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nancy Mathiowetz <nancym2@UWM.EDU>
Subject: Blogging on Huffington Post
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Friends,

As of today, I've joined the bloggers on Huffington Post. Although some of you may be surprised seeing me blog on this site, it offers AAPOR a great opportunity to weigh in on issues related to polling and the use of polls in the media. I was excited that AAPOR was extended the invitation to blog on the site.

The first posting is intended to disseminate information about our NewsU collaboration to an audience that may not necessarily be aware of AAPOR. You can find the post at:

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/nancy-mathiewetz/making-sense-of-polls_b_72454.html

For those of you who have fond or less than fond memories of Arianna from our conference in Nashville, I encourage you to check out the site. Whether you agree with the politics and prose or not, the site offers a place for AAPOR to speak out on topics of interest.

As always, I welcome your comments.

All best,

Nancy

Nancy A. Mathiewetz
President, American Association for Public Opinion Research
www.aapor.org

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

Date: Tue, 13 Nov 2007 16:44:54 -0500
Reply-To: Melissa Marcello <mmarcello@PURSUANTRESEARCH.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Melissa Marcello <mmarcello@PURSUANTRESEARCH.COM>
Subject: The Can-Spam Act of 2003
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Dear Colleagues,

Does the CAN-SPAM Act of 2003 apply to survey research?

Here is a link to the Act:

<http://www.ftc.gov/bcp/online/pubs/buspubs/canspam.shtm>

We are using a magazine company's e-mail database to conduct a survey (they are actually sending out the emails) and they insist that we must comply with all aspects of The CAN-SPAM Act (e.g., an opt-out mechanism, provide them with a suppression file), etc.

This statement from the Act would suggest to me that it does not apply to what we do: "The law, which became effective January 1, 2004, covers email whose primary purpose is advertising or promoting a commercial product or service, including content on a Web site."

Have others dealt with this before? Is our interpretation correct that it does not apply?

Thanks,

Melissa

Melissa Marcello

President

Pursuant, Inc.

2141 P Street NW

Suite 105

Washington, DC 20037

d. 202.887.0070, ext. 11

f. 800.567.1723

Please visit our Website at www.pursuantresearch.com

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

=====
Date: Tue, 13 Nov 2007 17:51:20 -0500
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing
Subject: Re: The Can-Spam Act of 2003
Comments: To: Melissa Marcello <mmarcello@PURSUANTRESEARCH.COM>
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <006801c8263e\$6dc60160\$6601a8c0@pursuant.local>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

This does not make a lot of sense.

If you are using their email database and they are sending out the emails, then THEY would be the ones who need to worry about how to comply with CAN-SPAM (if it applies at all), not you.

Beyond that, if they provided an option to opt out of email surveys, as many publishers do, they should be able to provide you with a database that excludes those who have opted out, or alternatively, with some means to identify such people in the database.

Jan Werner

_____ -
Melissa Marcello wrote:

> Dear Colleagues,

>

>

>

> Does the CAN-SPAM Act of 2003 apply to survey research?

>

> Here is a link to the Act:

> <http://www.ftc.gov/bcp/online/pubs/buspubs/canspam.shtm>

>

>

>

> We are using a magazine company's e-mail database to conduct a survey (they
> are actually sending out the emails) and they insist that we must comply
> with all aspects of The CAN-SPAM Act (e.g., an opt-out mechanism, provide
> them with a suppression file), etc.

>

>

>

> This statement from the Act would suggest to me that it does not apply to
> what we do: "The law, which became effective January 1, 2004, covers email
> whose primary purpose is advertising or promoting a commercial product or
> service, including content on a Web site."

>

>

>

> Have others dealt with this before? Is our interpretation correct that it
> does not apply?

>

>

>
> Thanks,
>
> Melissa
>
>
>
> Melissa Marcello
>
> President
>
> Pursuant, Inc.
>
> 2141 P Street NW
>
> Suite 105
>
> Washington, DC 20037
>
> d. 202.887.0070, ext. 11
>
> f. 800.567.1723
>
>
>
> Please visit our Website at www.pursuantresearch.com

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

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

Date: Tue, 13 Nov 2007 16:58:44 -0800
Reply-To: Dominic Lusinchi <dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Dominic Lusinchi <dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM>
Organization: Far West Research
Subject: Re: The Can-Spam Act of 2003
Comments: To: jwerner@jwdp.com, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <473A2A68.3070005@jwdp.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

It is confusing.

But here is how I understand it- and much of it is still a mystery to me. People who have opted in to the magazine's email distribution list have agreed to receive emails from third parties. Most of the third parties are companies promoting/advertising their product, NOT survey research organizations that are conducting a study.

Yes, they are sending out the email but they are doing it on behalf of the third party who is advertising widgets, or, in our case, conducting a survey.

The opt-out link that you need to include in your survey invitation is for people who do not want to receive any more surveys from you in the future (how long? 5 years?) and you have to give that list of individuals to the list owner - at least that's what has been asked of us.

The suppression file is a list of people who have asked not to receive survey invitations from you on prior occasions (again, how far back does one have to go? 5 years?) - and could be subscribers of the magazine's whose list you are renting.

I'm not sure I understand Jan's last point. A list owner or his broker will NEVER provide you with a list of names - at least, in my experience with trade publications or magazines. Their list is their bread and butter - they guard it like the crown jewels. That's why they send out the email invitation not you.

Dominic Lusinchi
Consultant
Far West Research
Statistical Consulting
San Francisco, California
415-664-3032
www.farwestresearch.com

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jan Werner
Sent: Tuesday, November 13, 2007 2:51 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: The Can-Spam Act of 2003

This does not make a lot of sense.

If you are using their email database and they are sending out the emails, then THEY would be the ones who need to worry about how to comply with CAN-SPAM (if it applies at all), not you.

Beyond that, if they provided an option to opt out of email surveys, as many publishers do, they should be able to provide you with a database

that excludes those who have opted out, or alternatively, with some means to identify such people in the database.

Jan Werner

-

Melissa Marcello wrote:

> Dear Colleagues,

>

>

>

> Does the CAN-SPAM Act of 2003 apply to survey research?

>

> Here is a link to the Act:

> <http://www.ftc.gov/bcp/online/pubs/buspubs/canspam.shtm>

>

>

>

> We are using a magazine company's e-mail database to conduct a survey (they

> are actually sending out the emails) and they insist that we must comply

> with all aspects of The CAN-SPAM Act (e.g., an opt-out mechanism, provide

> them with a suppression file), etc.

>

>

>

> This statement from the Act would suggest to me that it does not apply to

> what we do: "The law, which became effective January 1, 2004, covers email

> whose primary purpose is advertising or promoting a commercial product or

> service, including content on a Web site."

>

>

>

> Have others dealt with this before? Is our interpretation correct that it

> does not apply?

>

>

>

> Thanks,

>

> Melissa

>

>

>

> Melissa Marcello

>

> President

>

> Pursuant, Inc.

>

> 2141 P Street NW

>

> Suite 105

Thanks in advance,
Ken

--

Kenneth Pick
Kenneth.Pick@yahoo.com

Be a better sports nut! Let your teams follow you with Yahoo Mobile. Try it now.

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

Date: Wed, 14 Nov 2007 07:14:39 -0500
Reply-To: Paul J Lavrakas PhD <pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Paul J Lavrakas PhD <pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET>
Subject: Re: Online Research - Teens
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <849696.61439.qm@web55509.mail.re4.yahoo.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Just curious -- how will you secure parental consent for those teens under 18 years of age?

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Kenneth Pick
Sent: Tuesday, November 13, 2007 10:12 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Online Research - Teens

Hi Folks,

I have a client who wants to conduct a 30 minute online survey among teenagers. I am trying to talk this client into reducing the length of interview (and those pesky MRQ that encourage satisficers) but I need some data to back up my argument. Is there any research out there regarding an acceptable max LOI among this particular segment of the population?

Thanks in advance,
Ken

--

Kenneth Pick
Kenneth.Pick@yahoo.com

Be a better sports nut! Let your teams follow you with Yahoo Mobile. Try it now.

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

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Wed, 14 Nov 2007 10:33:33 -0500
Reply-To: Jonathan Brill <brillje@UMDNJ.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jonathan Brill <brillje@UMDNJ.EDU>
Subject: Re: The Can-Spam Act of 2003
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU, Melissa Marcello
<mmarcello@PURSUANTRESEARCH.COM>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Disposition: inline

Legitimate survey research, whether it be basic science or applied investigation to support a commercial interest, is neither unsolicited pornography nor unsolicited marketing activity and therefore is not relevant to the act which specifically targets e-mail spam dealing with pornography or communications to support the sales/promotion of commercial products and services.

The federal government has recognized this distinction between survey research and marketing/selling by excluding survey research from telemarketing legislation (e.g., Do Not Call lists).

While I am unaware of any governmental proclamation that survey research is distinct from unsolicited pornography, I would accept this risk and proceed.

Regards,
Jonathan

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm) Panel Research Program
Associate Director, Research Call Center & 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
www.oranjbowl.info

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.

>>> Melissa Marcello <mmarcello@PURSUANTRESEARCH.COM> 11/13/2007 4:44 PM >>>

Dear Colleagues,

Does the CAN-SPAM Act of 2003 apply to survey research?

Here is a link to the Act:

<http://www.ftc.gov/bcp/online/pubs/buspubs/canspam.shtm>

We are using a magazine company's e-mail database to conduct a survey (they are actually sending out the emails) and they insist that we must comply with all aspects of The CAN-SPAM Act (e.g., an opt-out mechanism, provide them with a suppression file), etc.

This statement from the Act would suggest to me that it does not apply to what we do: "The law, which became effective January 1, 2004, covers email whose primary purpose is advertising or promoting a commercial product or service, including content on a Web site."

Have others dealt with this before? Is our interpretation correct that it does not apply?

Thanks,

Melissa

Melissa Marcello

President

Pursuant, Inc.

2141 P Street NW

Suite 105

Washington, DC 20037

d. 202.887.0070, ext. 11

f. 800.567.1723

Please visit our Website at www.pursuantresearch.com

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

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Wed, 14 Nov 2007 11:55:29 -0500
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Pollsters Take the Political Pulse of American Voters
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

13 November 2007

Pollsters Take the Political Pulse of American Voters
California's Field Poll copes with changing attitudes, demographics

By Howard Cincotta
USINFO Special Correspondent
<http://usinfo.state.gov/xarchives/display.html?p=washfile-english&y=2007&m=November&x=20071113154038attocnich0.7833979>
or
<http://tinyurl.com/2o59wh>

Washington -- In 1936, when public opinion polls were in their infancy, the prestigious Literary Digest conducted an ambitious survey using phone books and automobile registrations. Their conclusion: Republican Alf Landon handily would defeat incumbent President Franklin Roosevelt.

Roosevelt, of course, won in a landslide.

That public humiliation caused pollsters to adopt rigorous new standards to increase the accuracy and reliability of their results. Today, public opinion polls have not become infallible, but polling has become ubiquitous in American life, whether measuring attitudes toward presidential candidates or public schools, car insurance or computers.

SNIP

A growing concern, however, is the more than 10 percent of Americans who use only cell phones. RDD only generates landline numbers. So far, studies indicate that the exclusion of cell phone users does not affect the validity of the results, according to the industry's professional organization, the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR).

SNIP

--

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

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Date: Wed, 14 Nov 2007 12:06:46 -0600
Reply-To: Brooks-Keeshawna <Brooks-Keeshawna@NORC.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Brooks-Keeshawna <Brooks-Keeshawna@NORC.ORG>
Subject: Mailing cell phones to respondents?
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: A<s73acf05.093@smtpnpc.umdj.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Hi,

I'm posting this for a colleague who is looking for any papers or presentations on mailing cell phones to potential respondents. In other words, he's wondering if anyone has had experience with using an address frame to draw a sample and then to mail cell phones to addresses in order to conduct CATI interviews with respondents via the mailed cell phone.

Any recommendations would be appreciated. Please reply to me directly at brooks-keeshawna@norc.org.

Thanks for any suggestions,
Keeshawna Brooks

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Wed, 14 Nov 2007 18:26:52 +0000
Reply-To: jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Organization: J.P. MURPHY & COMPANY
Subject: Customer Satisfaction Metrics
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="utf-8"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

References to any non-proprietary* customer satisfaction metrics other than the Michigan ACSI, or to reviews or comparisons of same would be appreciated. Our application is for a professional membership organization that is global in scope. I will summarize and post references and suggestions received. Thank you!

*i.e. public domain, not a "black box," etc.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
J.P. MURPHY & COMPANY
Post Office Box 150
Princeton, NJ 08542
610 408 8800
www.jpMurphy.com

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Wed, 14 Nov 2007 13:26:12 -0500
Reply-To: Howard Fienberg <hfienberg@CMOR.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Howard Fienberg <hfienberg@CMOR.ORG>
Subject: Re: The Can-Spam Act of 2003
Comments: To: Jonathan Brill <brillje@UMDNJ.EDU>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <s73acf05.093@smtpnpc.umdnj.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Jonathan is spot-on.

The CAN-SPAM Act regulates unsolicited commercial emails. Research emails (unless for the purposes of sales, marketing, or business promotion) are implicitly exempt.

However, CMOR encourages survey and opinion researchers to follow the requirements of CAN-SPAM: include accurate header and subject information and opt out notices in all email distributions, regardless of whether the message is commercial or non-commercial in nature, and whether or not the email is solicited or unsolicited. Researchers should also honor opt out requests, and maintain some form of internal do-not-email list.

Fulfilling the most basic expectations of lawmakers, regulators, and the public, even when we are not legally bound to so, will improve individual research contacts, promote respondent cooperation, and help prevent unwanted legislative or regulatory action against survey and opinion research.

Sincerely,
Howard Fienberg
Director of Government Affairs
CMOR: Promoting & Advocating Survey & Opinion Research
hfienberg@cmor.org
1111 16th St. NW, Suite 120
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 775-5170
Fax: (202) 775-5172

<http://www.cmor.org>

<http://www.youropinioncounts.org>

Disclaimer: The information provided in this message is for guidance and informational purposes only. It is not intended to be a substitute for legal advice. CMOR advises all parties to consult with private legal counsel regarding the interpretation and application of any laws to your business.

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

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

Sent: Wednesday, November 14, 2007 10:34 AM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: Re: The Can-Spam Act of 2003

Legitimate survey research, whether it be basic science or applied investigation to support a commercial interest, is neither unsolicited pornography nor unsolicited marketing activity and therefore is not relevant to the act which specifically targets e-mail spam dealing with pornography or communications to support the sales/promotion of commercial products and services.

The federal government has recognized this distinction between survey research and marketing/selling by excluding survey research from telemarketing legislation (e.g., Do Not Call lists).

While I am unaware of any governmental proclamation that survey research is distinct from unsolicited pornography, I would accept this risk and proceed.

Regards,
Jonathan

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.

General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm) Panel Research Program Associate Director,
Research Call Center & 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

www.oranjbowl.info

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.

>>> Melissa Marcello <mmarcello@PURSUANTRESEARCH.COM> 11/13/2007 4:44 PM >>>

Dear Colleagues,

Does the CAN-SPAM Act of 2003 apply to survey research?

Here is a link to the Act:

<http://www.ftc.gov/bcp/online/pubs/buspubs/canspam.shtm>

We are using a magazine company's e-mail database to conduct a survey (they are actually sending out the emails) and they insist that we must comply with all aspects of The CAN-SPAM Act (e.g., an opt-out mechanism, provide them with a suppression file), etc.

This statement from the Act would suggest to me that it does not apply to what we do: "The law, which became effective January 1, 2004, covers email whose primary purpose is advertising or promoting a commercial product or service, including content on a Web site."

Have others dealt with this before? Is our interpretation correct that it does not apply?

Thanks,

Melissa

Melissa Marcello

President

Pursuant, Inc.

2141 P Street NW

Suite 105

Washington, DC 20037

d. 202.887.0070, ext. 11

f. 800.567.1723

Please visit our Website at www.pursuantresearch.com

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

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail Please ask authors before
quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Wed, 14 Nov 2007 13:44:28 -0500
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: "Margin of Error", When Used by Pollsters, Is Widely
Misunderstood
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

The Harris Poll(r) #113 , November 13, 2007

"Margin of Error", When Used by Pollsters, Is Widely Misunderstood and
Confuses Most People
A Large Majority Believes That Calculations of "Margin of Error" Should
Include All Sources of Error, Not Just "Sampling Error"

http://www.harrisinteractive.com/harris_poll/index.asp?PID=832
or
<http://tinyurl.com/2p8rfc>

Many media and pollsters, when releasing new poll results, include statements such as "the margin of error for this survey is +/- 3 percent". A new Harris Poll was developed to measure the public's understanding, or misunderstanding, of the phrase "margin of error" when used to describe opinion polls. It found that these words are misunderstood by most people. Arguably they confuse more people than they enlighten, and they suggest a level of accuracy that no statistician could justify.

These conclusions are based on a Harris Poll of 1,052 U.S. adults surveyed by telephone between October 16 and 23, 2007 by Harris Interactive(r).

SNIP

--

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

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Wed, 14 Nov 2007 14:22:53 -0500
Reply-To: Jonathan Brill <brillje@UMDNJ.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jonathan Brill <brillje@UMDNJ.EDU>
Subject: Re: The Can-Spam Act of 2003
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU, Howard Fienberg <hfienberg@cmor.org>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Disposition: inline

Hmmm. I think Howard is spot on too! The CMOR guidelines should be followed as if they were law.

I would add that the professional behavior that CMOR encourages is not only good for survey research from a legislative relations perspective (i.e., "government regulators keep your hands off of research"), but also AND EQUALLY IMPORTANT from a public relations and respondent

cooperation perspective. The more we show respect for persons by plain talk, candid disclosure of our purpose, and providing clear and painless avenues to honor refusals to participate or "opt-out," the more likely we are to set ourselves perceptually apart from those snake-oil peddlers and related telemarketing/spammer cretins of the world. In the long run, our distinguishing and respectful behavior can only help us avoid enduring unwarranted wrath from the public, acquire opportunities to educate the public about the value of research for protecting individual privacy in a free society, and (ultimately) gain the public's cooperation when we ask for participation in our research.

I think the AAPORNET listserv is well aware from past posts that, based on my own Internet-based research experiences, I believe that the vast majority of online surveys are largely without scientific merit, that Internet surveys are egregiously overused and generally produce less valid and less useful data than more traditional survey methods would yield. But even so, as infrequent as the right times may be, there are times when the Internet can be a powerful research tool and, therefore, it is important to protect this turf. So, when we do use the Internet for survey research, we should at least behave like we are scientists at every turn.

Regards,
Jonathan

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm) Panel Research Program
Associate Director, Research Call Center & 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
www.oranjbowl.info

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.

>>> Howard Fienberg <hfienberg@cmor.org> 11/14/2007 1:26 PM >>>
Jonathan is spot-on.

The CAN-SPAM Act regulates unsolicited commercial emails. Research emails

(unless for the purposes of sales, marketing, or business promotion)
are
implicitly exempt.

However, CMOR encourages survey and opinion researchers to follow the requirements of CAN-SPAM: include accurate header and subject information and opt out notices in all email distributions, regardless of whether the message is commercial or non-commercial in nature, and whether or not the email is solicited or unsolicited. Researchers should also honor opt out requests, and maintain some form of internal do-not-email list.

Fulfilling the most basic expectations of lawmakers, regulators, and the public, even when we are not legally bound to so, will improve individual research contacts, promote respondent cooperation, and help prevent unwanted legislative or regulatory action against survey and opinion research.

Sincerely,
Howard Fienberg
Director of Government Affairs
CMOR: Promoting & Advocating Survey & Opinion Research
hfienberg@cmor.org
1111 16th St. NW, Suite 120
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 775-5170
Fax: (202) 775-5172
<http://www.cmor.org>
<http://www.youropinioncounts.org>

Disclaimer: The information provided in this message is for guidance and informational purposes only. It is not intended to be a substitute for legal advice. CMOR advises all parties to consult with private legal counsel regarding the interpretation and application of any laws to your business.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jonathan Brill
Sent: Wednesday, November 14, 2007 10:34 AM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: The Can-Spam Act of 2003

Legitimate survey research, whether it be basic science or applied investigation to support a commercial interest, is neither unsolicited

pornography nor unsolicited marketing activity and therefore is not relevant to the act which specifically targets e-mail spam dealing with pornography or communications to support the sales/promotion of commercial products and services.

The federal government has recognized this distinction between survey research and marketing/selling by excluding survey research from telemarketing legislation (e.g., Do Not Call lists).

While I am unaware of any governmental proclamation that survey research is distinct from unsolicited pornography, I would accept this risk and proceed.

Regards,
Jonathan

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm) Panel Research Program Associate
Director,
Research Call Center & 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
www.oranjbowl.info

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.

>>> Melissa Marcello <mmarcello@PURSUANTRESEARCH.COM> 11/13/2007 4:44 PM >>>

Dear Colleagues,

Does the CAN-SPAM Act of 2003 apply to survey research?

Here is a link to the Act:

<http://www.ftc.gov/bcp/conline/pubs/buspubs/canspam.shtm>

We are using a magazine company's e-mail database to conduct a survey (they are actually sending out the emails) and they insist that we must comply with all aspects of The CAN-SPAM Act (e.g., an opt-out mechanism, provide them with a suppression file), etc.

This statement from the Act would suggest to me that it does not apply to what we do: "The law, which became effective January 1, 2004, covers email whose primary purpose is advertising or promoting a commercial product or service, including content on a Web site."

Have others dealt with this before? Is our interpretation correct that it does not apply?

Thanks,

Melissa

Melissa Marcello

President

Pursuant, Inc.

2141 P Street NW

Suite 105

Washington, DC 20037

d. 202.887.0070, ext. 11

f. 800.567.1723

Please visit our Website at www.pursuantresearch.com

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

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail Please ask authors before
quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Wed, 14 Nov 2007 14:40:24 -0500
Reply-To: Howard Fienberg <hfienberg@CMOR.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Howard Fienberg <hfienberg@CMOR.ORG>
Subject: Re: The Can-Spam Act of 2003
Comments: To: Dominic Lusinchi <dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <[007201c82659\\$8191a5d0\\$6401a8c0@acer14219167c5](mailto:007201c82659$8191a5d0$6401a8c0@acer14219167c5)>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Dominic, in regards to your question about how long someone would need to maintain an email address on their internal do-not-email list, the CAN-SPAM Act requires that emails be added permanently.

Survey and opinion researchers -- not being subject to this federal law in most instances -- must decide themselves for how long such opt outs will be honored. For guidance, you might look at the federal telemarketing regulations require additions to an internal do not call list to be kept for at least five years -- something comparable might make sense for some organizations for email.

Sincerely,
Howard Fienberg
Director of Government Affairs
CMOR

Disclaimer: The information provided in this message is for guidance and informational purposes only. It is not intended to be a substitute for legal advice. CMOR advises all parties to consult with private legal counsel regarding the interpretation and application of any laws to your business.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Dominic Lusinchi
Sent: Tuesday, November 13, 2007 7:59 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: The Can-Spam Act of 2003

It is confusing.

But here is how I understand it- and much of it is still a mystery to me. People who have opted in to the magazine's email distribution list have agreed to receive emails from third parties. Most of the third parties are companies promoting/advertising their product, NOT survey research organizations that are conducting a study.

Yes, they are sending out the email but they are doing it on behalf of the third party who is advertising widgets, or, in our case, conducting a survey.

The opt-out link that you need to include in your survey invitation is for people who do not want to receive any more surveys from you in the future (how long? 5 years?) and you have to give that list of individuals to the list owner - at least that's what has been asked of us.

The suppression file is a list of people who have asked not to receive survey invitations from you on prior occasions (again, how far back does one have to go? 5 years?) - and could be subscribers of the magazine's whose list you are renting.

I'm not sure I understand Jan's last point. A list owner or his broker will NEVER provide you with a list of names - at least, in my experience with trade publications or magazines. Their list is their bread and butter - they guard it like the crown jewels. That's why they send out the email invitation not you.

Dominic Lusinchi

Consultant
Far West Research
Statistical Consulting
San Francisco, California
415-664-3032
www.farwestresearch.com

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jan Werner
Sent: Tuesday, November 13, 2007 2:51 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: The Can-Spam Act of 2003

This does not make a lot of sense.

If you are using their email database and they are sending out the emails, then THEY would be the ones who need to worry about how to comply with CAN-SPAM (if it applies at all), not you.

Beyond that, if they provided an option to opt out of email surveys, as many publishers do, they should be able to provide you with a database that excludes those who have opted out, or alternatively, with some means to identify such people in the database.

Jan Werner

Melissa Marcello wrote:

> Dear Colleagues,

>

>

>

> Does the CAN-SPAM Act of 2003 apply to survey research?

>

> Here is a link to the Act:

> <http://www.ftc.gov/bcp/online/pubs/buspubs/canspam.shtm>

>

>

>

> We are using a magazine company's e-mail database to conduct a survey (they

> are actually sending out the emails) and they insist that we must

> comply with all aspects of The CAN-SPAM Act (e.g., an opt-out

> mechanism, provide them with a suppression file), etc.

>

>

>

> This statement from the Act would suggest to me that it does not apply

> to what we do: "The law, which became effective January 1, 2004,

> covers

email

> whose primary purpose is advertising or promoting a commercial product

> or service, including content on a Web site."

>

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

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Wed, 14 Nov 2007 18:22:29 -0800
Reply-To: John Nienstedt <john@CERC.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: John Nienstedt <john@CERC.NET>
Subject: Re: "Margin of Error", When Used by Pollsters,
Is Widely Misunderstood
Comments: To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>,
"AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
In-Reply-To:
<3248A9B21DD5574785FE5E2C8E521684993ED8@exchange.local.artsience.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

How about inserting the word "sampling" between "margin of" and "error?" It may be no more understandable, but at least it's correct. Obviously the one thing we CAN quantify is sampling error; we'll never accurately quantify non-sampling error.

John Nienstedt, Sr.
800-576-CERC
Get the Edge at www.cerc.net

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta
Sent: Wednesday, November 14, 2007 10:44 AM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: "Margin of Error", When Used by Pollsters, Is Widely Misunderstood

The Harris Poll(r) #113 , November 13, 2007

"Margin of Error", When Used by Pollsters, Is Widely Misunderstood and Confuses Most People
A Large Majority Believes That Calculations of "Margin of Error" Should Include All Sources of Error, Not Just "Sampling Error"

http://www.harrisinteractive.com/harris_poll/index.asp?PID=832
or
<http://tinyurl.com/2p8rfc>

Many media and pollsters, when releasing new poll results, include statements such as "the margin of error for this survey is +/- 3 percent". A new Harris Poll was developed to measure the public's understanding, or misunderstanding, of the phrase "margin of error" when used to describe opinion polls. It found that these words are misunderstood by most people. Arguably they confuse more people than they enlighten, and they suggest a level of accuracy that no statistician could justify.

These conclusions are based on a Harris Poll of 1,052 U.S. adults surveyed by telephone between October 16 and 23, 2007 by Harris Interactive(r).

SNIP

--

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

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Wed, 14 Nov 2007 23:14:47 -0500
Reply-To: "Wolf, James G" <jamwolf@IUPUI.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Wolf, James G" <jamwolf@IUPUI.EDU>
Subject: Re: "Margin of Error", When Used by Pollsters,
Is Widely Misunderstood
Comments: To: "AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
In-Reply-To:
<CA62D583B8F55A4ABADEEF50C662DF6223CC7DD0@EXCHANGE.CERC2.cerc.local>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Leo,

Director of Research
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road, Suite 101
Baltimore MD 21209

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Thu, 15 Nov 2007 08:41:52 -0500
Reply-To: "Miriam L. Gerver" <mgerver@GMAIL.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Miriam L. Gerver" <mgerver@GMAIL.COM>
Subject: pre-notification letters for online survey with panel sample
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Disposition: inline

Hi,

Do any of you know of research on pre-notification letters/email messages for online surveys with a panel sample? Specifically, I am interested in length of these letter, as well as content (i.e., how detailed is the description of the survey, whether the topic is stated explicitly, how much incentives are emphasized, etc.). Pre-notification letters for a panel sample could conceivably be different than ones for the general population, since these individuals sign up to participate in surveys and therefore are perhaps already motivated to complete them.

Thanks,
Miriam Gerver

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Thu, 15 Nov 2007 14:21:09 -0000
Reply-To: Bob Worcester <Bob.Worcester@IPSOS-MORI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Bob Worcester <Bob.Worcester@IPSOS-MORI.COM>
Subject: Re: "Margin of Error", When Used by Pollsters,
Is Widely Misunderstood
Comments: To: "Wolf, James G" <jamwolf@IUPUI.EDU>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: A
<62661625119C1E4F8F5329FD4A6EBDB212A2C62C55@iu-mssg-mbx01.ads.iu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Letter from Britain

We here tend not to encourage our clients to use the confusing and mostly misleading so-called "margin of error", as so many journalists take it as the 'band width' of poll findings of any sort, no matter the size of the sample, the methodology or the other design factors at work. Too many times have I listened to BBC and other commentators say of a e.g. three point Labour 'lead' that it is equally likely that it could be nil and alternatively could be a six point 'lead' thus compounding two basic errors of interpretation of margin of error in one sound bite.

Trying to explain bell curves and multiple poll evidence to most journalists here is pretty futile. I know, I've been trying to do it for nearly forty years! Besides, the empirical evidence is that despite design factors and alternative methodologies, properly conducted and weighted eve of election day poll findings in both the US and Britain tend to be well within the + or - 3% figure for the sahref of vote for each party (other than the two internet polls at the last US election which 'elected' the right president when unfortunately the voters didn't)!

Jim, lead the client if you can; you know more about what you're doing than they do in most cases, certainly when it comes to calculations of margins of error!

Bob

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Wolf, James G
Sent: 15 November 2007 04:15
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: "Margin of Error", When Used by Pollsters, Is Widely Misunderstood

--

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

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail Please ask authors before
quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail Please ask authors before
quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail Please ask authors before
quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
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.

Market & Opinion Research International Ltd , Registered in England and Wales
No. 948470 , 79-81 Borough Road , London SE1 1FY, United Kingdom, Email:
info@ipsos-mori.com

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Thu, 15 Nov 2007 10:37:26 -0500
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Predictive dialers and Ghost calls
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

November 15, 2007
Battling Ghost Calls, That Telemarketing Annoyance
By PETER WAYNER
The phone rings. But no one is there.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2007/11/15/technology/personaltech/15ghost.html>
or
<http://tinyurl.com/25zu2x>

Ghost calls have long been a staple of horror movies and urban legends about frightened baby sitters. Ray Bradbury wrote a teleplay about a telephone switch that reached sentience only to start stalking a person.

But the culprit behind what is becoming a common occurrence in some households may have a less than otherworldly explanation. More often than not it is a telemarketer - and one that complies with federal regulation. Indeed, adherence to the rules may be one reason for the ghost calls.

Most fingers point at telemarketers who use a predictive dialer, a device that makes hundreds of calls a minute and uses artificial intelligence to detect when a person actually answers. These are then connected directly to a telemarketer waiting to promote a new low mortgage rate, a political candidate or a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity. If no one in the cubicle farm is ready to start pitching, the predictive dialer just hangs up.

Rick Morris, the chief operating officer of the predictive dialer company TouchStar, said that dialers are forced to hang up so abruptly by various regulations. He said that if no agent is available within two seconds, the predictive dialer must hang up because the Federal Communications Commission says the dialers cannot monopolize a line.

SNIP

Whocalled and similar sites like 800notes.com or numberzoom.com collect notes from anyone who received a phone call and wants to know a bit more about the number on the caller ID screen. Whocalled has logged almost

400,000 calls and identified about 92,000 numbers. Mr. Hirsch said he is planning on hooking up the Web site to his computer to filter out the worst offenders.

The postings about one of the top offenders at whocalled.us, 859-212-1501, show that hundreds of people have received a confusing message in Spanish from that number. The caller hangs up on the people who respond in English.

Numbers that begin with 859-212 are normally located in Boone County, Ky., but the callers could be located anywhere in the world thanks to modern phone switches. Several calls to the number showed that it had been disconnected.

SNIP

Copyright 2007 The New York Times Company

--

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

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Thu, 15 Nov 2007 07:49:33 -0800
Reply-To: Dominic Lusinchi <dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Dominic Lusinchi <dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM>
Organization: Far West Research
Subject: Re: pre-notification letters for online survey with panel sample
Comments: To: "Miriam L. Gerver" <mgerver@GMAIL.COM>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <22e2056d0711150541j6f9f23c3o1a9230c2e827dbe0@mail.gmail.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Miriam,

I am not aware of such research.

I have conducted research (one experiment) on that issue which I presented recently at the 2007 FCSM conference. The experiment consisted in sending a pre-notification email to a random half of a panel of electronics engineering managers and engineers in advance of an upcoming web-survey.

I found that the advance email had no significant impact on the cooperation rate. Although one can speculate that perhaps the wording of the pre-notice

could have been more polished, or that the timing was not optimal (the pre-notice was sent 6 days ahead of the actual survey invitation), my explanation for the "failure" was along the line you suggest: "these individuals sign up to participate in surveys and therefore are perhaps already motivated to complete them".

I'm happy to send you the paper for more details if you like.

Best regards,
Dominic

Dominic Lusinchi
Applied Statistician
Far West Research
Statistical Consulting
San Francisco, California
415-664-3032
www.farwestresearch.com

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Miriam L. Gerver
Sent: Thursday, November 15, 2007 5:42 AM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: pre-notification letters for online survey with panel sample

Hi,

Do any of you know of research on pre-notification letters/email messages for online surveys with a panel sample? Specifically, I am interested in length of these letter, as well as content (i.e., how detailed is the description of the survey, whether the topic is stated explicitly, how much incentives are emphasized, etc.).

Pre-notification letters for a panel sample could conceivably be different than ones for the general population, since these individuals sign up to participate in surveys and therefore are perhaps already motived to complete them.

Thanks,
Miriam Gerver

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Thu, 15 Nov 2007 12:27:21 -0500
Reply-To: "Guerino, Paul" <PGuerino@AIR.ORG>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Guerino, Paul" <PGuerino@AIR.ORG>
Subject: REMINDER: DC-AAPOR First Annual Outstanding Achievement Award
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Reminder: Tomorrow is the deadline!

DC-AAPOR First Annual Outstanding Achievement Award

Overview

The Washington-Baltimore Chapter of the American Association for Public Opinion Research (DC-AAPOR) invites nominations for its First Annual Outstanding Achievement Award. The Award is intended to recognize local members of the Baltimore-Washington area research community, who have (a) made an outstanding contribution to the theory, methods, or applications of survey research, public opinion research, market research, or other related fields, or (b) substantially contributed to the vitality, strength, and spirit of the local research community. =20

Nomination Process

To nominate someone for the award, please send an electronic copy of your nomination to Paul Guerino (pguerino@air.org) by Friday, November 16, 2007. In your nomination, please be sure to include:

1. The nominee's name, affiliation, and contact information=20
2. Your name, affiliation, and contact information
3. A brief description of how the nominee exemplifies the award criteria as outlined above=20

You will receive confirmation that your nomination has been received.=20

Eligibility

Eligibility is open to all Baltimore-Washington area members of the research community. However, only members of DC-AAPOR are eligible to submit nominations. To become a member, please visit the DC-AAPOR website at <http://www.dc-aapor.org>.

Selection Process

The DC-AAPOR Executive Council will select the winner by a majority vote of the Executive Council and Past President.

Award

The winner will be recognized with a commemorative plaque and an honorary lifetime membership in DC-AAPOR. The award will be announced at the DC-AAPOR Annual Holiday Party in mid-December. =20

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Thu, 15 Nov 2007 13:28:30 -0500
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Weird calls in Iowa
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I stumbled a cross a couple of references to possible Iowa push polls in the media yesterday and poked around to little avail.

Today I found that our own Mystery Pollster had done some nice foot work.

See

http://www.pollster.com/blogs/about_those_ugly_iowa_calls.php

--

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

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Thu, 15 Nov 2007 14:38:24 -0500
Reply-To: Eric Plutzer <exp12@PSU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Eric Plutzer <exp12@PSU.EDU>
Subject: Length of mail surveys
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
In-Reply-To: <AAPORNET%200711142100003190.1DB1@LISTS.ASU.EDU>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Colleagues,

I would be grateful if you could steer me to research evaluating how the length of a survey may impact the quality of responses. This is with respect to a mail survey but relevant literature on all surveys would be welcome as well.

Thanks!
Eric

Eric Plutzer
Department of Political Science
Penn State University
Voice: 814/865-6576
<http://www.personal.psu.edu/exp12/>

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Thu, 15 Nov 2007 15:19:33 -0500
Reply-To: John Healy <jhealy@NYSUTMAIL.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: John Healy <jhealy@NYSUTMAIL.ORG>
Subject: Thoughts on Call Center Contact Software Products
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=utf-8
Content-Disposition: inline
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Hello - I am sending out this message to get a flavor for what people prefer, have thoughts about, opinions, anecdotal comments from experiences on, good and bad, etc.

We use Telescript - strictly for outbound calls. It is one of those situations where, "Well, it's what we've always used." It works well enough for us, I cut my teeth on it and I do not have a current reference as to how "buggy" it is compared to other options. Largely very livable and very readily remedied or worked around, for the most part. It's buggy to be sure, but I have to believe that I would be exaggerating things if I really thought "I was the only one" on something like this, on just this one product?

I have begun to investigate other products out there for capabilities in, but not limited to:

Programmability - Script logic versatility, branching, grouping for batteries, randomization, rotation, split-sampling, etc.

Database environment, requirements - We run using SQL Server; used to use Access and got bottled up like rush hour trying to write back to the server

Phone queue versatility, management - stratification, etc.

Quota versatility, management - allowing for a wide variety of sampling techniques. For instance, in our old version we could not, but now can, accommodate cluster sampling

Agentsâ€™ usability and navigation, monitoring, reporting features, export/import features and so on.

We may very well find that we are happy enough with what we have, but I have begun to look at Sawtooth WinCati, SPSS Dimensions products, as two examples to date.

Thank you in advance for any input, particularly from current and past end-users of any and all data collection by telephone software options.

John

John Healy
Manager, Polling Center
NYSUT
800 Troy-Schenectady Road
Latham, NY 12110-2455
(518) 213-6000
x.6680
jhealy@nysutmail.org

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Thu, 15 Nov 2007 15:10:22 -0700
Reply-To: Pamela Hunter <Pamela.Hunter@ASU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Pamela Hunter <Pamela.Hunter@ASU.EDU>
Subject: Response rates
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

I am wondering if AAPOR members can help me out. We recently conducted a local survey (multi-mode) for a group of Arizona State University faculty members regarding the environment, quality of life and so forth in the greater Phoenix metro area. We achieved a 51 percent response rate. The survey was funded through NSF and a reviewer commented that the response rate was "low." NSF also seems to want information about non-responders. I'd like to counter these comments with research or articles on these issues. =20

=20

I found some articles about response rates such as rates required by journals but I am looking for more on how response rates have declined and what a reasonable response rate is now. I'm also not clear on how we could have obtained information about non-responders. When someone

shuts the door or hangs up the phone, how can anyone obtain more information?

=20

Any insights on these issues are appreciated. Feel free to contact me off line at Pamela.hunter@asu.edu. Thanks in advance.

=20

=20

Pamela Hunter, Ph.D.

Institute for Social Science Research

Arizona State University

Tempe, Arizona 85287

480-965-5030

=20

=20

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Thu, 15 Nov 2007 18:02:46 -0500
Reply-To: Patrick Glaser <pglaser@CMOR.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Patrick Glaser <pglaser@CMOR.ORG>
Subject: Re: Response rates
Comments: To: Pamela Hunter <Pamela.Hunter@asu.edu>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To:
<C1F20BA78E1E7A48AFA560BE9090000904B20778@EX01.asurite.ad.asu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I have data which may be of some use to you in supplementing your own lit review. I'll follow-up offline.

But, in general, it seems we know enough to at least say that comparisons with 'average' (or an ultimate) rates are inappropriate & perhaps misleading, and we should only evaluate a response rate in the context of the survey variables and the particulars of the study. The POQ special edition on non-response should provide support for this line of thought.

Patrick Glaser
CMOR

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Pamela Hunter
Sent: Thursday, November 15, 2007 5:10 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Response rates

I am wondering if AAPOR members can help me out. We recently conducted a local survey (multi-mode) for a group of Arizona State University faculty members regarding the environment, quality of life and so forth in the greater Phoenix metro area. We achieved a 51 percent response rate. The survey was funded through NSF and a reviewer commented that the response rate was "low." NSF also seems to want information about non-responders. I'd like to counter these comments with research or articles on these issues.

I found some articles about response rates such as rates required by journals but I am looking for more on how response rates have declined and what a reasonable response rate is now. I'm also not clear on how we could have obtained information about non-responders. When someone shuts the door or hangs up the phone, how can anyone obtain more information?

Any insights on these issues are appreciated. Feel free to contact me off line at Pamela.hunter@asu.edu. Thanks in advance.

Pamela Hunter, Ph.D.

Institute for Social Science Research

Arizona State University

Tempe, Arizona 85287

480-965-5030

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

--

No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG Free Edition.
Version: 7.5.503 / Virus Database: 269.15.33/1132 - Release Date:
11/15/2007 9:34 AM

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Fri, 16 Nov 2007 09:00:50 -0500
Reply-To: Claire Durand <Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Claire Durand <Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA>
Subject: Re: Response rates
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.edu
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Hi,

I conducted 3 surveys among Faculty members at Universite de Montreal, in 1998, 2002 and 2006, the first two using the organizations's internal mail, the last using internet. With lots of reminders, a second questionnaire for the mail surveys and a field period of more than 2 months, I achieved a 60% response rate in 1998 (it was the first survey and there was much insatisfaction at that time) and a 51% response rate for the 2 subsequent surveys. Comparisons of some important variables with the administrative information that we had show not much difference between the samples and the population. We could even estimate rather well the number of maternity leaves that had been taken during the preceding 5 years. However, for salary, there were some differences that varied between the 3 surveys : men with market premiums were underrepresented in the first survey, well represented in the second and overrepresented in the third.

Best,

>Le 17:10 2007-11-15,Pamela Hunter écrit:

>>I am wondering if AAPOR members can help me out. We recently conducted
>>a local survey (multi-mode) for a group of Arizona State University
>>faculty members regarding the environment, quality of life and so forth
>>in the greater Phoenix metro area. We achieved a 51 percent response
>>rate. The survey was funded through NSF and a reviewer commented that
>>the response rate was "low." NSF also seems to want information about
>>non-responders. I'd like to counter these comments with research or
>>articles on these issues.

>>
>>
>>

>>I found some articles about response rates such as rates required by
>>journals but I am looking for more on how response rates have declined
>>and what a reasonable response rate is now. I'm also not clear on how
>>we could have obtained information about non-responders. When someone
>>shuts the door or hangs up the phone, how can anyone obtain more
>>information?

>>
>>
>>

>>Any insights on these issues are appreciated. Feel free to contact me
>>off line at Pamela.hunter@asu.edu. Thanks in advance.

>>
>>
>>
>>
>>

>>Pamela Hunter, Ph.D.

>>

>>Institute for Social Science Research

>>

>>Arizona State University

>>

>>Tempe, Arizona 85287

>>

>>480-965-5030

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>-----

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

>>Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:

>>signoff aapornet

>>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>

Claire Durand
professeur titulaire,
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

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

Date: Fri, 16 Nov 2007 10:05:43 -0500
Reply-To: Nancy Whelchel <nlwhelch@GW.FIS.NCSU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nancy Whelchel <nlwhelch@GW.FIS.NCSU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Response rates
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <7.0.1.0.2.20071116090005.0d04a600@umontreal.ca>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=UTF-8
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

In early spring semester 2006 we conducted a faculty survey at NC State, and had a 70% response rate (1,132 of 1,625 faculty). We started off with a pre-notification letter from the Provost (sent through campus mail), then an email invitation when the (online) survey went live, and up to 3 follow-up email reminders to non-respondents (including those who had not completed all sections of the survey). (FYI - the survey was VERY long [350+ questions], so we broke it into 14 sections. Respondents could stop at the end of a given section, then come back at a later time and pick up where they left off. Ultimately, 90% of those who started the survey completed all sections.)

We found literally no differences between respondents and non-respondents on any of the following characteristics: rank, tenure status, gender, race/ethnicity, age (collapsed categories), years at NCSU (collapsed categories), and college.

We were really, really happy! For more details on methods and findings, go to
<http://www2.acs.ncsu.edu/UPA/survey/faculty/facsurv06.methods.rpt.htm>

Nancy

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

>>> Claire Durand <Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA> 11/16/2007 9:00 AM >>>

Hi,

I conducted 3 surveys among Faculty members at Universite de Montreal, in 1998, 2002 and 2006, the first two using the organizations's internal mail, the last using internet. With lots of reminders, a second questionnaire for the mail surveys and a field period of more than 2 months, I achieved a 60% response rate in 1998 (it was the first survey and there was much dissatisfaction at that time) and a 51% response rate for the 2 subsequent surveys. Comparisons of some important variables with the administrative information that we had show not much difference between the samples and the population. We could even estimate rather well the number of maternity leaves that had been taken during the preceding 5 years. However, for salary, there were some differences that varied between the 3 surveys : men with market premiums were underrepresented in the first survey, well represented in the second and overrepresented in the third.

Best,

>Le 17:10 2007-11-15,Pamela Hunter Ã©crit:

>>I am wondering if AAPOR members can help me out. We recently conducted

>>a local survey (multi-mode) for a group of Arizona State University
>>faculty members regarding the environment, quality of life and so forth

>>in the greater Phoenix metro area. We achieved a 51 percent response

>>rate. The survey was funded through NSF and a reviewer commented that

>>the response rate was "low." NSF also seems to want information about

>>non-responders. I'd like to counter these comments with research or >>articles on these issues.

>>

>>

>>

>>I found some articles about response rates such as rates required by >>journals but I am looking for more on how response rates have declined

>>and what a reasonable response rate is now. I'm also not clear on how

>>we could have obtained information about non-responders. When someone

>>shuts the door or hangs up the phone, how can anyone obtain more
>>information?

>>
>>
>>
>>Any insights on these issues are appreciated. Feel free to contact
me
>>off line at Pamela.hunter@asu.edu. Thanks in advance.

>>
>>
>>
>>
>>Pamela Hunter, Ph.D.
>>
>>Institute for Social Science Research
>>
>>Arizona State University
>>
>>Tempe, Arizona 85287
>>
>>480-965-5030

>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>-----
>>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>>Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
>>signoff aapornet
>>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>

Claire Durand
professeur titulaire,
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

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

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

Date: Fri, 16 Nov 2007 10:34:58 -0500
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Sounds like message txsting mischaracterized
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

(The AAPORNET filter thought a correctly spelled "testing" indicated a test message and blocked it)

Voters get anti-Romney, anti-Mormon calls

<http://politicalticker.blogs.cnn.com/2007/11/16/voters-get-anti-romney-anti-mormon-calls/#more-3192>

or

<http://tinyurl.com/38mlap>

November 16, 2007

Some voters report receiving negative calls about Mitt Romney.

CONCORD, New Hampshire (AP) - Residents in New Hampshire and Iowa have received phone calls raising questions about Republican presidential hopeful Mitt Romney, his Mormon faith and the Vietnam War-era military deferments he received while serving as a missionary in France.

Western Wats, a Utah-based company, placed the calls that initially sound like a poll but then pose questions that cast Romney in a harsh light, according to those who received the calls.

In politics, this type of phone surveying is called "push polling" - contacting potential voters and asking questions intended to plant a message in voters' minds, usually negative, rather than gauging peoples' attitudes.

SNIP

The 20-minute calls started on Sunday in New Hampshire and Iowa.

At least seven people in the two early voting states received the calls.

Among the questions was whether a resident knew that Romney was a Mormon, that he received military deferments when he served as a Mormon missionary in France, that his five sons did not serve in the military, that Romney's faith did not accept blacks as bishops into the 1970s and that Mormons believe the Book of Mormon is superior to the Bible.

SNIP

Sabrina Matteson, a Republican from Epsom, N.H., said she got a call on Wednesday.

"The first 15 or 20 questions were general questions about the leading candidates," she said. "Then he started asking me very, very negatively phrased questions about Romney. The first one was would you have a more favorable, less favorable, blah, blah, blah, impression of Mitt Romney if you knew that his five sons had never served in the military and that he considered working on a presidential campaign as public service or some such question."

SNIP

Last year, Western Wats conducted polling that was intended to spread negative messages about Democratic candidates in a House race in New York and the Senate race in Florida. The Tampa Tribune and the Albany Times Union reported that Western Wats conducted the calls on behalf of the Tarrance Group.

That Virginia-based firm now works for Romney's rival, Rudy Giuliani. The campaign has paid the firm more than \$400,000, according to federal campaign reports.

SNIP

Western Wats also worked for Bob Dole's presidential campaign in, 1996. Employees said they used such calls to describe GOP rival Steve Forbes as pro-abortion rights.

New Hampshire law requires the all political advertising, including phone calls, identify the candidate being supported. No candidate was identified in the calls.

--

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

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

Date: Fri, 16 Nov 2007 10:57:01 -0500
Reply-To: Nancy Belden <NancyBelden@BRSPOLL.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nancy Belden <NancyBelden@BRSPOLL.COM>
Subject: Pamela Hunter's question about response to a university study
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Here is language from two reports of studies at UCSF - the first among faculty (60%) and the second among management level staff (54%). These were single mode: the first was paper questionnaires etc. in campus mail; and the 2nd email to the client's list. Hope this helps.

=09

Survey of faculty at University of California San Francisco - 2001

=20

The faculty members were mailed a questionnaire, and a stamped return envelope for returning the completed questionnaire, and a postcard printed with the respondent's name, title, and school, to be returned to BRS. =20

=20

UCSF sent initial questionnaires via campus mail to all paid faculty, March 30, 2001. A second mailing was sent to 1,256 faculty members who did not initially reply to the survey along with an updated letter from Nancy Belden of BRS, on May 18, 2001.

=09

The sample is a self-selected portion of the paid faculty. Of the 1,787 questionnaires mailed, seven were returned by the post office as undeliverable after the second mailing, reducing the universe to 1,780. Of these, 1,064 faculty members returned their questionnaires, for an overall response rate of 60%. Seven additional questionnaires returned were unusable because they were incomplete. Thus 1,057 appear in the data analyzed.=20

=20

Survey of management staff at UCSF -2005

=09

An initial letter from UCSF Executive Vice Chancellor Eugene Washington and Senior Vice Chancellor Steve Barclay was sent to all participants to explain the purpose of the survey and request the participation of management and professional staff members. This was followed on July 14, 2005 by an emailed invitation from the lead researcher, Nancy Belden=20

=09

The invitation was sent to 1,094 professional and management staff member's email addresses as provided by UCSF. Additionally, printed invitations directing the recipient to the internet survey site were sent via the US Postal Service to 16 members with no email address in the UCSF files. Over the following two weeks, we followed the initial invite with three more emails sent to these staff members that had not yet completed the questionnaire. =20

Of the 1,110 questionnaires emailed or mailed, 600 management and professional staff members completed their

questionnaires, for an overall response rate of 54%.=20
=20

Nancy Belden
Belden Russonello & Stewart
1320 19th Street NW, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20036
202.822.6090

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

Date: Fri, 16 Nov 2007 10:11:28 -0800
Reply-To: John Nienstedt <john@CERC.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: John Nienstedt <john@CERC.NET>
Subject: Re: Sounds like message txsting mischaracterized
Comments: To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>, <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

20 minute call cannot be a push-poll.

John Nienstedt, Sr.
Sent from my Treo

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

From: "Leo Simonetta" <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
To: "AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
Sent: 11/16/07 7:39 AM
Subject: Sounds like message txsting mischaracterized

(The AAPORNET filter thought a correctly spelled "testing" indicated a test message and blocked it)

Voters get anti-Romney, anti-Mormon calls

<http://politicalticker.blogs.cnn.com/2007/11/16/voters-get-anti-romney-anti-mormon-calls/#more-3192>

or
<http://tinyurl.com/38mlap>

November 16, 2007

Some voters report receiving negative calls about Mitt Romney.

CONCORD, New Hampshire (AP) - Residents in New Hampshire and Iowa have

received phone calls raising questions about Republican presidential hopeful Mitt Romney, his Mormon faith and the Vietnam War-era military deferments he received while serving as a missionary in France.

Western Wats, a Utah-based company, placed the calls that initially sound like a poll but then pose questions that cast Romney in a harsh light, according to those who received the calls.

In politics, this type of phone surveying is called "push polling" - contacting potential voters and asking questions intended to plant a message in voters' minds, usually negative, rather than gauging peoples' attitudes.

SNIP

The 20-minute calls started on Sunday in New Hampshire and Iowa.

At least seven people in the two early voting states received the calls.

Among the questions was whether a resident knew that Romney was a Mormon, that he received military deferments when he served as a Mormon missionary in France, that his five sons did not serve in the military, that Romney's faith did not accept blacks as bishops into the 1970s and that Mormons believe the Book of Mormon is superior to the Bible.

SNIP

Sabrina Matteson, a Republican from Epsom, N.H., said she got a call on Wednesday.

"The first 15 or 20 questions were general questions about the leading candidates," she said. "Then he started asking me very, very negatively phrased questions about Romney. The first one was would you have a more favorable, less favorable, blah, blah, blah, impression of Mitt Romney if you knew that his five sons had never served in the military and that he considered working on a presidential campaign as public service or some such question."

SNIP

Last year, Western Wats conducted polling that was intended to spread negative messages about Democratic candidates in a House race in New York and the Senate race in Florida. The Tampa Tribune and the Albany Times Union reported that Western Wats conducted the calls on behalf of the Tarrance Group.

That Virginia-based firm now works for Romney's rival, Rudy Giuliani. The campaign has paid the firm more than \$400,000, according to federal campaign reports.

SNIP

Western Wats also worked for Bob Dole's presidential campaign in, 1996.

Employees said they used such calls to describe GOP rival Steve Forbes as pro-abortion rights.

New Hampshire law requires the all political advertising, including phone calls, identify the candidate being supported. No candidate was identified in the calls.

--

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

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

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

=====
Date: Fri, 16 Nov 2007 11:58:33 -0700
Reply-To: Pamela Hunter <Pamela.Hunter@ASU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Pamela Hunter <Pamela.Hunter@ASU.EDU>
Subject: Clarification
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Hello. Seems that my email yesterday about response rates was unclear. The survey was of the general population in the Phoenix metro area. The survey was conducted by our unit within ASU for a group of faculty who had received a grant. =20

=20

However, I appreciate the input and am grateful this listserv is available.

=20

Pam Hunter

=20

Pamela Hunter, Ph.D.

Institute for Social Science Research

Arizona State University

Tempe, Arizona 85287

480-965-5030

=20

=20

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

Date: Fri, 16 Nov 2007 11:39:41 -0800
Reply-To: "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG>
Subject: Text messaging and TCPA
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
In-Reply-To: <AAPORNET%200711152100004296.2D6C@LISTS.ASU.EDU>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

We are planning a study that will sample cell phone numbers. Our protocol includes sending a text message before/after the 4th call if no one is reached on the first 3 calls. We planned to send these text messages individually using the internet interface for text messaging of each provider, but are wondering if this a violation of TCPA?

What is the best time to send a text message? Immediately before the call?

Thanks!

Lynda Voigt

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

Date: Fri, 16 Nov 2007 14:49:21 -0500
Reply-To: Howard Fienberg <hfienberg@CMOR.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Howard Fienberg <hfienberg@CMOR.ORG>
Subject: Re: Text messaging and TCPA
Comments: To: "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <CB9F3CE8E5D4B24993423892B53AB4F912FF2B@ISIS.fhcrc.org>
MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Lynda,

In addition to the application of the CAN-SPAM Act to any unsolicited commercial SMS or text messages, the content-neutral requirements of the TCPA (requiring express prior consent for use of automation to contact a cell phone) COULD apply to any automated text messaging (commercial or otherwise).

A 2005 court decision held that such messages ARE subject to the TCPA; a 2007 court decision held that such messages ARE NOT subject to the TCPA.

While the full applicability of the TCPA to SMS and text messaging is still a matter of contention in the court system, CMOR recommends that researchers ensure that any potentially commercial messages are in compliance with the CAN-SPAM Act, and any text message or SMS are (preferably) sent with prior express consent.

Sincerely,
Howard Fienberg
Director of Government Affairs
CMOR: Promoting & Advocating Survey & Opinion Research
hfienberg@cmor.org
1111 16th St. NW, Suite 120
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 775-5170
Fax: (202) 775-5172
<http://www.cmor.org>
<http://www.youopinioncounts.org>

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Voigt, Lynda
Sent: Friday, November 16, 2007 2:40 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Text messaging and TCPA

We are planning a study that will sample cell phone numbers. Our protocol includes sending a text message before/after the 4th call if no one is reached on the first 3 calls. We planned to send these text messages individually using the internet interface for text messaging of each provider, but are wondering if this a violation of TCPA?

What is the best time to send a text message? Immediately before the call?

Thanks!

Lynda Voigt

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

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

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====
Date: Fri, 16 Nov 2007 11:55:43 -0800

Reply-To: Patrick Ehlen <ehlen@STANFORD.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Patrick Ehlen <ehlen@STANFORD.EDU>

Subject: Re: Text messaging and TCPA

Comments: To: "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@fhcrc.org>

Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu

In-Reply-To: <CB9F3CE8E5D4B24993423892B53AB4F912FF2B@ISIS.fhrc.org>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Disposition: inline

Lynda,

I'm not sure how this falls under TCPA, but you should be aware that some providers (like mine, Cingular) can charge between 10-25 cents apiece for messages *received...* If respondents are already failing to answer your calls, you may run the risk of alienating them even more.

Patrick

On 11/16/07, Voigt, Lynda <lvoigt@fhcrc.org> wrote:

>
> We are planning a study that will sample cell phone numbers. Our
> protocol includes sending a text message before/after the 4th call if no
> one is reached on the first 3 calls. We planned to send these text
> messages individually using the internet interface for text messaging of
> each provider, but are wondering if this a violation of TCPA?
>
> What is the best time to send a text message? Immediately before the
> call?
>
> Thanks!
>
> Lynda Voigt

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

> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

> aapornet-request@asu.edu

>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Date: Fri, 16 Nov 2007 14:19:16 -0600
Reply-To: lynn.stalone@IHR-RESEARCH.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Lynn Stalone <lynn.stalone@IHR-RESEARCH.COM>
Subject: Re: Text messaging and TCPA
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Lynda -

Further to Patrick's point, if the consumer incurs a cost, I believe you may be running a high risk of being out of compliance with TCPA. It seems the law takes into account very specifically the fact that if it costs the consumer money, you are in some sort of violation.

Perhaps CMOR can speak a bit more to this possibility.

Best regards,
Lynn

Lynn Stalone, PRC
Partner
I/H/R Research Group
Lynn.Stalone@ihr-research.com
(714) 368-1885 direct
(714) 368-1884 I/H/R Main
(714) 315-9453 mobile

On Fri, 16 Nov 2007 11:55:43 -0800, Patrick Ehlen <ehlen@STANFORD.EDU> wrote:

> Lynda,
>
> I'm not sure how this falls under TCPA, but you should be aware that some
> providers (like mine, Cingular) can charge between 10-25 cents apiece for
> messages *received...* If respondents are already failing to answer your
> calls, you may run the risk of alienating them even more.

> Patrick

> On 11/16/07, Voigt, Lynda <lvoigt@fhcrc.org> wrote:

>>
>> We are planning a study that will sample cell phone numbers. Our
>> protocol includes sending a text message before/after the 4th call if no
>> one is reached on the first 3 calls. We planned to send these text
>> messages individually using the internet interface for text messaging of
>> each provider, but are wondering if this a violation of TCPA?

>> What is the best time to send a text message? Immediately before the

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

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

Date: Fri, 16 Nov 2007 15:35:36 -0500
Reply-To: Howard Fienberg <hfienberg@CMOR.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Howard Fienberg <hfienberg@CMOR.ORG>
Subject: Re: Text messaging and TCPA
Comments: To: lynn.stalone@IHR-RESEARCH.COM, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <200711162019.1AGKJGL28108@smapp01.siteprotect.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Lynn, you raise an interesting point. The TCPA, in addition to requiring express prior consent for the use of automation to contact a cell phone, requires such consent before using automation to place a call for which the recipient is charged.

But ultimately, the dilemma remains the same. The ongoing dispute in the courts leads CMOR to recommend the most conservative posture: acquiring prior consent before sending a text message is the safest course we can recommend.

Cheers,
Howard Fienberg
Director of Government Affairs
CMOR

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Lynn Stalone
Sent: Friday, November 16, 2007 3:19 PM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: Text messaging and TCPA

Lynda -

Further to Patrick's point, if the consumer incurs a cost, I believe you may be running a high risk of being out of compliance with TCPA. It seems the law takes into account very specifically the fact that if it costs the consumer money, you are in some sort of violation.

Perhaps CMOR can speak a bit more to this possibility.

Best regards,
Lynn

Lynn Stalone, PRC
Partner
I/H/R Research Group
Lynn.Stalone@ihr-research.com
(714) 368-1885 direct
(714) 368-1884 I/H/R Main
(714) 315-9453 mobile

On Fri, 16 Nov 2007 11:55:43 -0800, Patrick Ehlen <ehlen@STANFORD.EDU>
wrote:

> Lynda,
>
> I'm not sure how this falls under TCPA, but you should be aware that
> some providers (like mine, Cingular) can charge between 10-25 cents
> apiece for messages *received...* If respondents are already failing
> to answer your calls, you may run the risk of alienating them even more.

> Patrick

> On 11/16/07, Voigt, Lynda <lvoigt@fhcrc.org> wrote:

>>
>> We are planning a study that will sample cell phone numbers. Our
>> protocol includes sending a text message before/after the 4th call
>> if no one is reached on the first 3 calls. We planned to send these
>> text messages individually using the internet interface for text
>> messaging of each provider, but are wondering if this a violation of
TCPA?

>> What is the best time to send a text message? Immediately before
>> the call?

>> Thanks!

>> Lynda Voigt

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

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

>

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

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

=====
Date: Fri, 16 Nov 2007 15:42:00 -0500
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: McCain Asks Probe of Anti-Romney Calls
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

McCain Asks Probe of Anti-Romney Calls

Nov 16 02:13 PM US/Eastern
By PHILIP ELLIOTT
Associated Press Writer

http://www.breitbart.com/print.php?id=D8SUTSH01&show_article=1

CONCORD, N.H. (AP) - Republican John McCain is asking the New Hampshire attorney general to investigate phone calls to voters that pretend to be polls but raise questions about rival candidate Mitt Romney and his Mormon faith-and make favorable statements about McCain.

McCain's campaign says it had nothing to do with the calls but fears voters will think it did.

The telephone effort "was made to appear to be friendly to Senator McCain, but we had nothing to do with the poll at the state or national level," campaign vice chairman Chuck Douglas wrote in a letter asking

the attorney general's office to investigate and tell the callers to stop.

McCain himself said Friday at a campaign stop in Colorado, "It is disgraceful, it is outrageous, and it is a violation, we believe, of New Hampshire law." He urged other candidates to join him in the legal action and referred to Romney as a "decent man."

SNIP

(most of the rest is a recap of the previous story)

--

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

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

Date: Fri, 16 Nov 2007 18:18:24 -0500
Reply-To: Pat Lewis <plewis@AAPOR.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Pat Lewis <plewis@AAPOR.ORG>
Subject: AAPOR Press Release Offering Clarification on "Push Poll" Issue
Comments: To: aapor net <aapornet@asu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Disposition: inline

Leading Research Organization Offers Clarification on 'Push Poll' Issue

WASHINGTON, Nov. 16 (AScribe Newswire) -- The American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR), the leading association of public opinion researchers, today issued a reminder that there are guidelines to help determine whether or not a poll is a valid survey. The reminder from AAPOR comes after a round of stories described telephone calls to Iowa and New Hampshire voters as "push polls" because they included harsh information about a candidate.

AAPOR defines a push poll as unethical political telemarketing, calls disguised as research that are designed to persuade large numbers of voters -- not to measure opinion.

"Negative or disturbing information about a candidate does not automatically make a survey a push poll," said AAPOR President Nancy Mathiowetz. "Message testing, when campaigns test the effectiveness of possible messages about opponents and even themselves, is very different; and it is a legitimate form of surveying."

"What's changed in the recent election cycles is that the practice of message testing, once largely invisible to the public, is now receiving a lot of scrutiny. Add to that a crowded, highly competitive field in the early primary and caucus states and there are going to be plenty of surveys to critique."

AAPOR offers guidelines (<http://www.aapor.org/aaporstatementonpushpolls>) on the difference between "push polls" and message testing. For example, in message-testing surveys, the call will contain more than a few questions; the organization or call center making the calls will be identified; and the survey will include questions about the respondents' demographic characteristics. Message testing is usually based on a random sample of voters, and the number of calls will fall within the range of legitimate surveys, typically between 400 and 1,500 interviews.

"Push polls" usually ask one or only a few questions about a single candidate or a single issue; the questions are uniformly strongly negative (or sometimes uniformly positive) descriptions of the candidate or issue; the organization or call center conducting the calls is not identified, or a phony name is used; and the calls are placed to large numbers of people.

"It can be tough for any one respondent to tell the difference since we identify 'push polls,' in part, by the number of people that are contacted within a relatively short time frame," Mathiowetz said. "In addition, it would be surprising to see a 'push poll' at this point in the election cycle since they are intended to persuade voters near the time of the election."

The speed at which we are learning about these calls -- and the number of stories on the subject -- do raise interesting questions for campaigns, she said. "Campaigns have traditionally been able to conduct message testing in relative privacy. Now that's changed."

More information on AAPOR: <http://www.aapor.org>

AAPOR "Push Poll" Statement:
<http://www.aapor.org/aaporstatementonpushpolls>

AAPOR Leadership Bios:
<http://www.aapor.org/executivecouncil>

The American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) is the leading professional organization of public opinion and survey research professionals in the U.S., with members from academia, media, government, the non-profit sector and private industry . AAPOR is committed to sound and ethical practices in the conduct and use of public opinion research and to improving public understanding of research methods and interpretation.

- - - -

--

Pat Lewis
Communications Director
American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR)
1405 North George Mason Drive
Arlington, Virginia
703.527-5245
cell 703.201.5070
www.aapor.org

AAPOR -- the leading association of public opinion and survey research professionals.

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

=====
Date: Sat, 17 Nov 2007 13:45:13 +0000
Reply-To: "mail@marketsharescorp.com" <mkshares@COMCAST.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "mail@marketsharescorp.com" <mkshares@COMCAST.NET>
Subject: Re: AAPOR Press Release Offering Clarification on "Push Poll"

Issue

Comments: To: Pat Lewis <plewis@AAPOR.ORG>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

This story is somewhat of a mystery. See below.

1. I don't think this is push-polling. Push-polling means thousands of short "interviews", enough contacts to influence the outcome of an election. In the story below, the interviews were described as lasting 20 minutes. A push poll

wouldn't waste 20 minutes planting a few negatives with thousands upon thousands of voters.

2. But I don't think it's message testing either. Would a campaign seriously be considering claims such as "Mormons believe the Book of Mormon is superior to the Bible" or "Romney's faith did not accept blacks as bishops into the 1970s".

This may be a stretch but even "At least seven people in the two early voting states received the calls, some as recently as Thursday" is curious. Who are those people and how did they know where to file a complaint so quickly? Past news reports about push-polling typically source only one or two recipients of such calls.

McCain's people may be on to something. This may a third variant, a poll conducted by a campaign to appear as a push poll in order to embarrass an opponent.

Nick Panagakis

From the Chicago Tribune: "As part of the poll, which began Sunday, callers have been asking voters in Iowa and New Hampshire whether they know that Romney is a Mormon, that his five sons did not serve in the military and that Mormons believe the Book of Mormon is superior to the Bible." "At the beginning of the 20-minute survey, voters are asked whether they are aware of McCain's decorated military service during Vietnam." "Aides to Sen. Judd Gregg (R-N.H.) also filed a complaint with the state's attorney general on behalf of the Romney campaign. Campaign officials said they are providing names of people who received the calls."

<http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/politics/chi-pushpoll17nov17,1,6830952.story>

From the Washington Post (AP): "The 20-minute calls started on Sunday in New Hampshire and Iowa. At least seven people in the two early voting states received the calls, some as recently as Thursday. Among the questions the caller asked was whether the person receiving the call knew Romney was a Mormon, that he received military deferments when he served as a Mormon missionary in France, that his five sons did not serve in the military, that Romney's faith did not accept blacks as bishops into the 1970s and that Mormons believe the Book of Mormon is superior to the Bible."

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/11/16/AR2007111600605.html?hpid=sec-religion>

----- Original message -----

From: Pat Lewis <plewis@AAPOR.ORG>

> Leading Research Organization Offers Clarification on 'Push
> Poll' Issue

>

> WASHINGTON, Nov. 16 (AScribe Newswire) -- The American
> Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR), the leading
> association of public opinion researchers, today issued a
> reminder that there are guidelines to help determine whether
> or not a poll is a valid survey. The reminder from AAPOR

> comes after a round of stories described telephone calls to
> Iowa and New Hampshire voters as "push polls" because they
> included harsh information about a candidate.
>
>
> AAPOR defines a push poll as unethical political
> telemarketing, calls disguised as research that are designed
> to persuade large numbers of voters -- not to measure
> opinion.
>
>
> "Negative or disturbing information about a candidate
> does not automatically make a survey a push poll," said
> AAPOR President Nancy Mathiowetz. "Message testing, when
> campaigns test the effectiveness of possible messages about
> opponents and even themselves, is very different; and it is
> a legitimate form of surveying."
>
>
> "What's changed in the recent election cycles is that the
> practice of message testing, once largely invisible to the
> public, is now receiving a lot of scrutiny. Add to that a
> crowded, highly competitive field in the early primary and
> caucus states and there are going to be plenty of surveys to
> critique."
>
>
> AAPOR offers guidelines
> (<http://www.aapor.org/aaporstatementonpushpolls>) on the
> difference between "push polls" and message testing. For
> example, in message-testing surveys, the call will contain
> more than a few questions; the organization or call center
> making the calls will be identified; and the survey will
> include questions about the respondents' demographic
> characteristics. Message testing is usually based on a
> random sample of voters, and the number of calls will fall
> within the range of legitimate surveys, typically between
> 400 and 1,500 interviews.
>
>
> "Push polls" usually ask one or only a few questions
> about a single candidate or a single issue; the questions
> are uniformly strongly negative (or sometimes uniformly
> positive) descriptions of the candidate or issue; the
> organization or call center conducting the calls is not
> identified, or a phony name is used; and the calls are
> placed to large numbers of people.
>
>
> "It can be tough for any one respondent to tell the
> difference since we identify 'push polls,' in part, by the
> number of people that are contacted within a relatively
> short time frame," Mathiowetz said. "In addition, it would
> be surprising to see a 'push poll' at this point in the

> election cycle since they are intended to persuade voters
> near the time of the election."
>
>
> The speed at which we are learning about these calls --
> and the number of stories on the subject -- do raise
> interesting questions for campaigns, she said. "Campaigns
> have traditionally been able to conduct message testing in
> relative privacy. Now that's changed."
>
>
> More information on AAPOR: <http://www.aapor.org>
>
>
> AAPOR "Push Poll" Statement:
> <http://www.aapor.org/aaporstatementonpushpolls>
>
>
> AAPOR Leadership Bios:
> <http://www.aapor.org/executivecouncil>
>
>
> The American Association for Public Opinion Research
> (AAPOR) is the leading professional organization of public
> opinion and survey research professionals in the U.S., with
> members from academia, media, government, the non-profit
> sector and private industry . AAPOR is committed to sound
> and ethical practices in the conduct and use of public
> opinion research and to improving public understanding of
> research methods and interpretation.
>
>
> - - - -
>
> --
> Pat Lewis
> Communications Director
> American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR)
> 1405 North George Mason Drive
> Arlington, Virginia
> 703.527-5245
> cell 703.201.5070
> www.aapor.org
>
> AAPOR -- the leading association of public opinion and survey research
> professionals.
>
> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

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

Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Date: Mon, 19 Nov 2007 10:05:52 -0700

Reply-To: megbostrom@PUBLIC-KNOWLEDGE.US

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Meg Bostrom <megbostrom@PUBLIC-KNOWLEDGE.US>

Subject: Re: AAPOR Press Release Offering Clarification on "Push Poll"

Issue

Comments: To: "mail@marketsharescorp.com" <mkshares@COMCAST.NET>

Comments: cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

In-Reply-To:

<111720071345.25198.473EF0690008F38C0000626E22007456729C0A9D0E089C0503@comcast.net>

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

There is another alternative -- message testing by a third party. A religious-based "independent" organization would absolutely test those two messages.

Meg Bostrom

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

From: "mail@marketsharescorp.com" <mkshares@COMCAST.NET>

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Sent: Sat, 17 Nov 2007 13:45:13 +0000

Subject: Re: AAPOR Press Release Offering Clarification on "Push Poll" Issue

> This story is somewhat of a mystery. See below.

>

> 1. I don't think this is push-polling. Push-polling means thousands of short "interviews", enough contacts to influence the outcome of an election. In the story below, the interviews were described as lasting 20 minutes. A push poll wouldn't waste 20 minutes planting a few negatives with thousands upon thousands of voters.

>

> 2. But I don't think it's message testing either. Would a campaign seriously be considering claims such as "Mormons believe the Book of Mormon is superior to the Bible" or "Romney's faith did not accept blacks as bishops into the 1970s".

>

> This may be a stretch but even "At least seven people in the two early voting states received the calls, some as recently as Thursday" is curious. Who are those people and how did they know where to file a complaint so quickly? Past news reports about push-polling typically source only one or two recipients of such calls.

>

> McCain's people may be on to something. This may a third variant, a poll

conducted by a campaign to appear as a push poll in order to embarrass an opponent.

>

> Nick Panagakis

>

> From the Chicago Tribune: "As part of the poll, which began Sunday, callers have been asking voters in Iowa and New Hampshire whether they know that Romney is a Mormon, that his five sons did not serve in the military and that Mormons believe the Book of Mormon is superior to the Bible." "At the beginning of the 20-minute survey, voters are asked whether they are aware of McCain's decorated military service during Vietnam." "Aides to Sen. Judd Gregg (R-N.H.) also filed a complaint with the state's attorney general on behalf of the Romney campaign. Campaign officials said they are providing names of people who received the calls."

> <http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/politics/chi-pushpoll17nov17,1,6830952.story>

>

> From the Washington Post (AP): "The 20-minute calls started on Sunday in New Hampshire and Iowa. At least seven people in the two early voting states received the calls, some as recently as Thursday. Among the questions the caller asked was whether the person receiving the call knew Romney was a Mormon, that he received military deferments when he served as a Mormon missionary in France, that his five sons did not serve in the military, that Romney's faith did not accept blacks as bishops into the 1970s and that Mormons believe the Book of Mormon is superior to the Bible."

> <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/11/16/AR2007111600605.html?hpid=sec-religion>

>

>

> ----- Original message -----

> From: Pat Lewis <plewis@AAPOR.ORG>

>> Leading Research Organization Offers Clarification on 'Push Poll' Issue

>> WASHINGTON, Nov. 16 (AScribe Newswire) -- The American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR), the leading association of public opinion researchers, today issued a reminder that there are guidelines to help determine whether or not a poll is a valid survey. The reminder from AAPOR comes after a round of stories described telephone calls to Iowa and New Hampshire voters as "push polls" because they included harsh information about a candidate.

>>

>> AAPOR defines a push poll as unethical political telemarketing, calls disguised as research that are designed to persuade large numbers of voters -- not to measure opinion.

>>

>>

>> "Negative or disturbing information about a candidate does not automatically make a survey a push poll," said AAPOR President Nancy Mathiowetz. "Message testing, when campaigns test the effectiveness of possible messages about

>> opponents and even themselves, is very different; and it is
>> a legitimate form of surveying."

>>
>>
>> "What's changed in the recent election cycles is that the
>> practice of message testing, once largely invisible to the
>> public, is now receiving a lot of scrutiny. Add to that a
>> crowded, highly competitive field in the early primary and
>> caucus states and there are going to be plenty of surveys to
>> critique."

>>
>>
>> AAPOR offers guidelines
>> (<http://www.aapor.org/aaporstatementonpushpolls>) on the
>> difference between "push polls" and message testing. For
>> example, in message-testing surveys, the call will contain
>> more than a few questions; the organization or call center
>> making the calls will be identified; and the survey will
>> include questions about the respondents' demographic
>> characteristics. Message testing is usually based on a
>> random sample of voters, and the number of calls will fall
>> within the range of legitimate surveys, typically between
>> 400 and 1,500 interviews.

>>
>>
>> "Push polls" usually ask one or only a few questions
>> about a single candidate or a single issue; the questions
>> are uniformly strongly negative (or sometimes uniformly
>> positive) descriptions of the candidate or issue; the
>> organization or call center conducting the calls is not
>> identified, or a phony name is used; and the calls are
>> placed to large numbers of people.

>>
>>
>> "It can be tough for any one respondent to tell the
>> difference since we identify 'push polls,' in part, by the
>> number of people that are contacted within a relatively
>> short time frame," Mathiowetz said. "In addition, it would
>> be surprising to see a 'push poll' at this point in the
>> election cycle since they are intended to persuade voters
>> near the time of the election."

>>
>>
>> The speed at which we are learning about these calls --
>> and the number of stories on the subject -- do raise
>> interesting questions for campaigns, she said. "Campaigns
>> have traditionally been able to conduct message testing in
>> relative privacy. Now that's changed."

>>
>>
>> More information on AAPOR: <http://www.aapor.org>

>>
>>
>> AAPOR "Push Poll" Statement:

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

>>

>>

>> AAPOR Leadership Bios:

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

>>

>>

>> The American Association for Public Opinion Research
>> (AAPOR) is the leading professional organization of public
>> opinion and survey research professionals in the U.S., with
>> members from academia, media, government, the non-profit
>> sector and private industry . AAPOR is committed to sound
>> and ethical practices in the conduct and use of public
>> opinion research and to improving public understanding of
>> research methods and interpretation.

>>

>>

>> - - - -

>>

>> --

>> Pat Lewis

>> Communications Director

>> American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR)

>> 1405 North George Mason Drive

>> Arlington, Virginia

>> 703.527-5245

>> cell 703.201.5070

>> www.aapor.org

>>

>> AAPOR -- the leading association of public opinion and survey research
>> professionals.

>>

>> -----

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

>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

>

> -----

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

> Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:

> set aapornet nomail

> On your return send this: set aapornet mail

> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====
Date: Mon, 19 Nov 2007 16:09:50 -0500

Reply-To: ramirez@aacpor.org

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Carl Ramirez <ramirezc@AAPOR.ORG>
Subject: Survey of AAPOR members
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Current members for whom AAPOR's executive office has email addresses should have received email invitations from President Nancy Mathiowetz last week with passwords and a link to the the Survey Sciences Group survey website. If you didn't get that email, or didn't received a letter in the e mail with the survey invitation, please reply to let me know where to direct your survey! Also, if you have particularly strong spam filter, check that folder - maybe it ended up in there. Looking forward to hearing your opinions,
Carl Ramirez
Membership & Chapter Relations Chair
American Association for Public Opinion Research
Aramirezc@aapor.org
(202) 512-3721

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

Date: Tue, 20 Nov 2007 14:04:36 -0500
Reply-To: "Chase H. Harrison" <CHarrison@GOV.HARVARD.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Chase H. Harrison" <CHarrison@GOV.HARVARD.EDU>
Organization: Harvard University
Subject: Part Time Academic Election Survey Position Available in Boston Area
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Colleagues,

* *

I am posting a part-time position currently available in the Boston area (Cambridge) at MIT. Please pass this along to anyone you know who might be interested.

<http://sh.webhire.com/servlet/av/jd?ai=631&ji=2133764&sn=I>
<<http://sh.webhire.com/servlet/av/jd?ai=631&ji=2133764&sn=I>>*

Title: Technical Research Assistant
Req Number: mit-00004880
Department: Political Science, Department Of
Location(s): Cambridge MA
FT/PT: Part Time
Employment / Payroll Category: SRS (Research)
Work Shift: Schedule to be determined

TECHNICAL RESEARCH ASSISTANT, Political Science (temporary, part-time, 50%), to help guide and implement a year-long survey research project that will examine the quality of the election system in United States. Will assist in coordinating the construction of a survey instrument, obtaining bids from survey houses, and facilitating communication among the research survey team; draft reports that summarize the results of the survey; and generally facilitate communication about the progress of the grant to the funder.

REQUIREMENTS: experience with statistical software. Seek dynamic and experienced project manager with good writing and quantitative analysis skills. A bachelor's degree in the social sciences preferred. MIT-00004880

This is a temporary, one-year position. Half-time schedule to be determined.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Tue, 20 Nov 2007 16:57:21 -0500
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Sugging and Mugging in Canada
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Nov 19, 2007 12:53 ET
Telemarketing survey scams widespread, VoxPop survey finds
Four in 10 Canadians report being victimized by telemarketers posing as survey researchers

<http://www.marketwire.com/mw/release.do?id=794534>

Attention: Assignment Editor, Business/Financial Editor, City Editor, Lifestyle Editor, News Editor

TORONTO, ONTARIO, PRESS RELEASE--(Marketwire - Nov. 19, 2007) - Canadians are being victimized at an alarming rate by fraudulent telemarketers posing as survey researchers to sell products or raise money, and this illegal telemarketing practice threatens the goodwill people generally have for opinion research, according to a national survey from VoxPop, a campaign by the Marketing and Research Intelligence Association (MRIA) to give voice to Canadians and encourage participation in survey research. The MRIA governs and represents Canada's survey research industry.

The poll found that, over the past year, 41 percent of Canadian adults were contacted to participate in a research survey that actually turned out to be an attempt to sell them a product or service or ask for a donation.

"Legitimate survey researchers never, under any circumstances, sell or ask for money, and they always give the research company's name and information on the nature of the research at the beginning of the call," says VoxPop spokesperson, Brendan Wycks, Executive Director of MRIA.

"Any attempt to sell or raise money following a survey request is a scam. People who receive such calls should immediately report the company's name and, if possible, its phone number to PhoneBusters, a national anti-fraud call centre jointly operated by the Competition Bureau, Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the Ontario Provincial Police."

SNIP

--

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

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Wed, 21 Nov 2007 03:54:27 +0000
Reply-To: steehc@BELLSOUTH.NET
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Charlotte G. Steeh" <steehc@BELLSOUTH.NET>
Subject: Surveys conducted with public funds
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

All,
A reporter from a Philadelphia newspaper contacted me today. He would like to find out if and how many legislatures use public money to collect survey data--presumably on issues of public concern--and then refuse to release the data or any information about the methodology used in the survey. Apparently this has happened in Pennsylvania. If you know of other state legislatures that engage in such a practice, would you please send a message to Mario at this email address mcattabiani@phillynews.com. His deadline is Friday. I'm sure he will appreciate having whatever information you can provide.

Charlotte Steeh

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Tue, 20 Nov 2007 23:12:08 -0500
Reply-To: dgillin@cmor.org
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
Comments: RFC822 error: <W> Invalid RFC822 field - "I will be out of the office for the Thanksgiving Holiday startin=". Rest of header flushed.
From: Donna Gillin <dgillin@CMOR.ORG>
Subject: Thanksgiving Holiday
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

=0D=0AI will be out of the office for the Thanksgiving Holiday startin=
g Wed, Nov. 21st and returning to the office on Tuesday, Nov. 27th. I will =
respond to your email when I return to the office. Please note: all of=
the CMOR offices will be closed Wednesday afternoon, Thursday and Friday f=
or the Thanksgiving Holiday. =0D=0A=0D=0AIf you need immediate assistance o=
n Wednesday morning or on Monday, and have a question concerning a responde=
nt cooperation issue, please contact our Director of Respondent Cooperation=
, Patrick Glaser, at pglaser@cmor.org or via telephone at 212-480-24=
64. If your question concerns a government affairs issue, please contact ou=
r Director of Government Affairs, Howard Fienberg, at [mor.org](mailto:hfienberg@c=
<a href=) or via telephone at 202-775-5170. For any other CMOR issues, =
please contact CMOR headquarters at 860-657-1881. =0D=0A=0D=0A = ; =
=0D=0AThank you and Happy Thanksgiving. =0D=0A =0D=0A=0D=0ADonna =
Gillin =0D=0ADirector of Operations =0D=0ACMOR =0D=0A4011 Old Stone Rd. =
=0D=0ACharlotte, NC 28226 =0D=0Aph: 704-609-0448 =0D=0Afax: 704-341-1937 =
=0D=0Adgillin@cmor.org

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Tue, 20 Nov 2007 20:27:56 -0800
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>
Subject: religion and voting behavior
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi,
I was wondering if anyone has any references handy for how Americans vote based on their religion, especially concerning the so-called 'family values' kinds of issues.

Thanks
Leora

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

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Wed, 21 Nov 2007 07:46:03 -0600
Reply-To: Alisu@ResearchSupportServices.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: =?iso-8859-1?Q?Alis=FA_Schoua-Glusberg?=
<alisu@RESEARCHSUPPORTSERVICES.COM>
Organization: Research Support Services
Subject: Estimating administration time of web surveys
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Can anyone tell me if there is a rule of thumb or a range of how many questions respondents can answer in a web survey? I am thinking mostly of questions that don't require calculation or recall. Mostly attitude and experiences questions. Any help will be appreciated, on or off line. I will be glad to summarize responses for the list.

Thanks in advance,

Alisú

Alisú Schoua-Glusberg, PhD
General Partner
Research Support Services

906 Ridge Avenue
Evanston, Illinois 60202-1720
847.864.5677 - f: 847.556.6559
c: 847.971.9068
<mailto:Alisu@ResearchSupportServices.com>
Alisu@ResearchSupportServices.com
www.ResearchSupportServices.com

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Wed, 21 Nov 2007 10:51:10 -0500
Reply-To: Jonathan Brill <brillje@UMDNJ.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jonathan Brill <brillje@UMDNJ.EDU>
Subject: Re: Text messaging and TCPA
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU, Lynda Voigt <lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Disposition: inline

Lynda:

I think the use of text messaging is a really bad idea that falls within the category of what I consider unethical survey research practices.

If you hit my phone with a text message, I would incur a charge. At best, as a random person, I would be annoyed with the intrusion (since you are sticking me with a text message fee from my provider) and perhaps even angry that you presume the right to force me to incur a charge to receive your completely unsolicited appeal for survey appeal.

But as a survey research professional, I would be livid. Participation in research should always be costless to the prospective respondent, else you are engaging in commercial activity. Because texting charges are so prevalent among cell phone users, I would certainly complain immediately, reporting the behavior to the FCC, CASRO, and AAPOR. I regularly encourage people I know to complain when I see abuses of the survey research "code"; I judge this to be an abuse.

Years ago, when per call charges were the norm for cell phone usage, the use of cell phone sampling frames would have been abuse; indeed, I believe that cell phone research might have been prohibited at one time because of this reality. Today, however, this is not the case with cell phone surveys not involving texting communications since virtually all cell phone users these days have a minutes plan or unlimited calling plan, making the receipt of one or two connected calls requesting research participation almost/virtually costless to the cell phone

subscriber. So I am okay with cell phone sample frames for survey research, but I believe we should refrain from text messaging as a communication vehicle until such a time as it is an included service in virtually all wireless phone plans.

I certainly don't claim to be familiar with the law on this, but this is my thinking on the issue.

Regards,
Jonathan

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm) Panel Research Program
Associate Director, Research Call Center & 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
www.oranjbowl.info

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.

>>> "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG> 11/16/2007 2:39 PM >>>

We are planning a study that will sample cell phone numbers. Our protocol includes sending a text message before/after the 4th call if no one is reached on the first 3 calls. We planned to send these text messages individually using the internet interface for text messaging of each provider, but are wondering if this a violation of TCPA?

What is the best time to send a text message? Immediately before the call?

Thanks!

Lynda Voigt

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

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

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Wed, 21 Nov 2007 08:40:50 -0800
Reply-To: Dominic Lusinchi <dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Dominic Lusinchi <dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM>
Organization: Far West Research
Subject: Re: Text messaging and TCPA
Comments: To: Jonathan Brill <brillje@UMDNJ.EDU>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <s7440dad.029@smtpnpc.umdj.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Jonathan,

You state "virtually all cell phone users these days have a minutes plan or unlimited calling plan". Do we have figures on this anywhere? I'm just curious because I know people who do not have unlimited plans, so that they would incur a charge when they receive or make a call beyond what their plan call for. Of course, I would assume that these folks are not cell-phone only households; for the latter, I would guess that they are all (?) on unlimited plans.

Dominic

Dominic Lusinchi
Far West Research
Statistical Consulting
San Francisco, California
415-664-3032
www.farwestresearch.com

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jonathan Brill
Sent: Wednesday, November 21, 2007 7:51 AM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: Text messaging and TCPA

Lynda:

I think the use of text messaging is a really bad idea that falls within the category of what I consider unethical survey research practices.

If you hit my phone with a text message, I would incur a charge. At

best, as a random person, I would be annoyed with the intrusion (since you are sticking me with a text message fee from my provider) and perhaps even angry that you presume the right to force me to incur a charge to receive your completely unsolicited appeal for survey appeal.

But as a survey research professional, I would be livid. Participation in research should always be costless to the prospective respondent, else you are engaging in commercial activity. Because texting charges are so prevalent among cell phone users, I would certainly complain immediately, reporting the behavior to the FCC, CASRO, and AAPOR. I regularly encourage people I know to complain when I see abuses of the survey research "code"; I judge this to be an abuse.

Years ago, when per call charges were the norm for cell phone usage, the use of cell phone sampling frames would have been abuse; indeed, I believe that cell phone research might have been prohibited at one time because of this reality. Today, however, this is not the case with cell phone surveys not involving texting communications since virtually all cell phone users these days have a minutes plan or unlimited calling plan, making the receipt of one or two connected calls requesting research participation almost/virtually costless to the cell phone subscriber. So I am okay with cell phone sample frames for survey research, but I believe we should refrain from text messaging as a communication vehicle until such a time as it is an included service in virtually all wireless phone plans.

I certainly don't claim to be familiar with the law on this, but this is my thinking on the issue.

Regards,
Jonathan

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm) Panel Research Program
Associate Director, Research Call Center & 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
www.oranjbowl.info

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.

>>> "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG> 11/16/2007 2:39 PM >>>

We are planning a study that will sample cell phone numbers. Our protocol includes sending a text message before/after the 4th call if no one is reached on the first 3 calls. We planned to send these text messages individually using the internet interface for text messaging of each provider, but are wondering if this a violation of TCPA?

What is the best time to send a text message? Immediately before the call?

Thanks!

Lynda Voigt

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

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Wed, 21 Nov 2007 11:59:05 -0500
Reply-To: Jonathan Brill <brillje@UMDNJ.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jonathan Brill <brillje@UMDNJ.EDU>
Subject: Re: Text messaging and TCPA
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU, Dominic Lusinchi <dominic@farwestresearch.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Disposition: inline

Dominic:

I was perhaps too loose with this statement. It is not based on any formal study, but rather on information (opinions?) solicited from many colleagues who have been conducting telephone research for years and years and years. While there is surely an awareness of subscribers with

the old fashioned usage plans, the consensus seems to be that this is a small (under 10%) and ever- and rapidly-shrinking proportion of users.

The issue is not unimportant. I would think it wrong/unethical to contact cell phone subscribers with a plan featuring a per call charge - so the proportion of such subscribers in the sample population of cell phone subscribers should be very small before we accept the inevitable violation of "no cost" solicitations to participate in survey research principle.

My belief, based on widespread opinion of my peculiar set of colleagues, is that minutes/unlimited plans have hit the critical share of market penetration that puts cell phone sampling frame surveys near par with POTS sampling frame surveys. I would certainly be interested in learning about any evidence to the contrary, however, even if it is merely anecdotal.

Regards,
Jonathan

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm) Panel Research Program
Associate Director, Research Call Center & 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
www.oranjbowl.info

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.

>>> Dominic Lusinchi <dominic@farwestresearch.com> 11/21/2007 11:40 AM
>>>

Jonathan,

You state "virtually all cell phone users these days have a minutes plan or unlimited calling plan". Do we have figures on this anywhere? I'm just curious because I know people who do not have unlimited plans, so that they would incur a charge when they receive or make a call beyond what their

plan
call for. Of course, I would assume that these folks are not cell-phone
only
households; for the latter, I would guess that they are all (?) on
unlimited
plans.

Dominic

Dominic Lusinchi
Far West Research
Statistical Consulting
San Francisco, California
415-664-3032
www.farwestresearch.com

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jonathan Brill
Sent: Wednesday, November 21, 2007 7:51 AM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: Text messaging and TCPA

Lynda:

I think the use of text messaging is a really bad idea that falls
within the category of what I consider unethical survey research
practices.

If you hit my phone with a text message, I would incur a charge. At
best, as a random person, I would be annoyed with the intrusion (since
you are sticking me with a text message fee from my provider) and
perhaps even angry that you presume the right to force me to incur
a
charge to receive your completely unsolicited appeal for survey appeal.

But as a survey research professional, I would be livid.

Participation

in research should always be costless to the prospective respondent,
else you are engaging in commercial activity. Because texting charges
are so prevalent among cell phone users, I would certainly complain
immediately, reporting the behavior to the FCC, CASRO, and AAPOR. I
regularly encourage people I know to complain when I see abuses of the
survey research "code"; I judge this to be an abuse.

Years ago, when per call charges were the norm for cell phone usage,
the use of cell phone sampling frames would have been abuse; indeed, I
believe that cell phone research might have been prohibited at one
time
because of this reality. Today, however, this is not the case with
cell
phone surveys not involving texting communications since virtually all

cell phone users these days have a minutes plan or unlimited calling plan, making the receipt of one or two connected calls requesting research participation almost/virtually costless to the cell phone subscriber. So I am okay with cell phone sample frames for survey research, but I believe we should refrain from text messaging as a communication vehicle until such a time as it is an included service in virtually all wireless phone plans.

I certainly don't claim to be familiar with the law on this, but this is my thinking on the issue.

Regards,
Jonathan

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm) Panel Research Program
Associate Director, Research Call Center & 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
www.oranjbowl.info

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.

>>> "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG> 11/16/2007 2:39 PM >>>

We are planning a study that will sample cell phone numbers. Our protocol includes sending a text message before/after the 4th call if no one is reached on the first 3 calls. We planned to send these text messages individually using the internet interface for text messaging of each provider, but are wondering if this a violation of TCPA?

What is the best time to send a text message? Immediately before the call?

Thanks!

Lynda Voigt

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

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====

Date: Wed, 21 Nov 2007 09:31:13 -0800
Reply-To: Dominic Lusinchi <dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Dominic Lusinchi <dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM>
Organization: Far West Research
Subject: Re: Text messaging and TCPA
Comments: To: Jonathan Brill <brillje@umdnj.edu>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <s7441d93.052@smtppnc.umdnj.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Thanks, Jonathan, for that.

I am not involved in cell-phone based survey research - yet. But I was just curious to see if we have some statistics on these issues. I would think that folks who are sampling cell-phone users must have or would want to have the information on users (% that have which plan, etc.) - just like ~30 years ago we wanted to know that 96% of US households have a phone. But then in those days, gathering the relevant information on phone ownership rates was probably easier since there was only one company - or very few.

Dominic

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

From: Jonathan Brill [<mailto:brillje@umdnj.edu>]
Sent: Wednesday, November 21, 2007 8:59 AM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU; Dominic Lusinchi
Subject: RE: Text messaging and TCPA

Dominic:

I was perhaps too loose with this statement. It is not based on any formal study, but rather on information (opinions?) solicited from many colleagues who have been conducting telephone research for years and years and years. While there is surely an awareness of subscribers with the old fashioned usage plans, the consensus seems to be that this is a small (under 10%) and ever- and rapidly-shrinking proportion of users.

The issue is not unimportant. I would think it wrong/unethical to contact cell phone subscribers with a plan featuring a per call charge - so the proportion of such subscribers in the sample population of cell phone subscribers should be very small before we accept the inevitable violation of "no cost" solicitations to participate in survey research principle.

My belief, based on widespread opinion of my peculiar set of colleagues, is that minutes/unlimited plans have hit the critical share of market penetration that puts cell phone sampling frame surveys near par with POTS sampling frame surveys. I would certainly be interested in learning about any evidence to the contrary, however, even if it is merely anecdotal.

Regards,
Jonathan

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm) Panel Research Program
Associate Director, Research Call Center & 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
www.oranjbowl.info

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.

>>>> Dominic Lusinchi <dominic@farwestresearch.com> 11/21/2007 11:40 AM

>>>>

Jonathan,

You state "virtually all cell phone users these days have a minutes

plan or unlimited calling plan". Do we have figures on this anywhere? I'm just curious because I know people who do not have unlimited plans, so that they would incur a charge when they receive or make a call beyond what their plan call for. Of course, I would assume that these folks are not cell-phone only households; for the latter, I would guess that they are all (?) on unlimited plans.

Dominic

Dominic Lusinchi
Far West Research
Statistical Consulting
San Francisco, California
415-664-3032
www.farwestresearch.com

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jonathan Brill
Sent: Wednesday, November 21, 2007 7:51 AM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: Text messaging and TCPA

Lynda:

I think the use of text messaging is a really bad idea that falls within the category of what I consider unethical survey research practices.

If you hit my phone with a text message, I would incur a charge. At best, as a random person, I would be annoyed with the intrusion (since you are sticking me with a text message fee from my provider) and perhaps even angry that you presume the right to force me to incur a charge to receive your completely unsolicited appeal for survey appeal.

But as a survey research professional, I would be livid.

Participation

in research should always be costless to the prospective respondent, else you are engaging in commercial activity. Because texting charges are so prevalent among cell phone users, I would certainly complain immediately, reporting the behavior to the FCC, CASRO, and AAPOR. I regularly encourage people I know to complain when I see abuses of the survey research "code"; I judge this to be an abuse.

Years ago, when per call charges were the norm for cell phone usage, the use of cell phone sampling frames would have been abuse; indeed, I

believe that cell phone research might have been prohibited at one time because of this reality. Today, however, this is not the case with cell phone surveys not involving texting communications since virtually all cell phone users these days have a minutes plan or unlimited calling plan, making the receipt of one or two connected calls requesting research participation almost/virtually costless to the cell phone subscriber. So I am okay with cell phone sample frames for survey research, but I believe we should refrain from text messaging as a communication vehicle until such a time as it is an included service in virtually all wireless phone plans.

I certainly don't claim to be familiar with the law on this, but this is my thinking on the issue.

Regards,
Jonathan

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm) Panel Research Program
Associate Director, Research Call Center & 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
www.oranjbowl.info

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.

>>> "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG> 11/16/2007 2:39 PM >>>
We are planning a study that will sample cell phone numbers. Our protocol includes sending a text message before/after the 4th call if no one is reached on the first 3 calls. We planned to send these text messages individually using the internet interface for text messaging of

each provider, but are wondering if this a violation of TCPA?

What is the best time to send a text message? Immediately before the call?

Thanks!

Lynda Voigt

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

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Wed, 21 Nov 2007 12:39:42 -0500
Reply-To: Jonathan Brill <brillje@UMDNJ.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jonathan Brill <brillje@UMDNJ.EDU>
Subject: Re: Text messaging and TCPA
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU, Dominic Lusinchi <dominic@farwestresearch.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Disposition: inline

Dominic:

You are most welcome.

Like you, my interest in cell phone research is largely "academic". I don't engage in or worry about cell phone research (or keep awake at night worrying about cell phone only households) at this time. In my case, I can ignore cell phone surveys because of the sample populations that my organization studies ... always older adults where POTS/landline coverage remains very high and the incidence of cell phone only households remains negligible (and THIS time this statement is made based on knowledge of published studies like NHIS!!!).

Regards,
Jonathan

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm) Panel Research Program
Associate Director, Research Call Center & 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
www.oranjbowl.info

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.

>>> Dominic Lusinchi <dominic@farwestresearch.com> 11/21/2007 12:31 PM
>>>

Thanks, Jonathan, for that.

I am not involved in cell-phone based survey research - yet. But I was just curious to see if we have some statistics on these issues. I would think that folks who are sampling cell-phone users must have or would want to have the information on users (% that have which plan, etc.) - just like ~30 years ago we wanted to know that 96% of US households have a phone. But then in those days, gathering the relevant information on phone ownership rates was probably easier since there was only one company - or very few.

Dominic

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

From: Jonathan Brill [<mailto:brillje@umdnj.edu>]
Sent: Wednesday, November 21, 2007 8:59 AM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU; Dominic Lusinchi
Subject: RE: Text messaging and TCPA

Dominic:

I was perhaps too loose with this statement. It is not based on any

formal study, but rather on information (opinions?) solicited from many colleagues who have been conducting telephone research for years and years and years. While there is surely an awareness of subscribers with the old fashioned usage plans, the consensus seems to be that this is a small (under 10%) and ever- and rapidly-shrinking proportion of users.

The issue is not unimportant. I would think it wrong/unethical to contact cell phone subscribers with a plan featuring a per call charge - so the proportion of such subscribers in the sample population of cell phone subscribers should be very small before we accept the inevitable violation of "no cost" solicitations to participate in survey research principle.

My belief, based on widespread opinion of my peculiar set of colleagues, is that minutes/unlimited plans have hit the critical share of market penetration that puts cell phone sampling frame surveys near par with POTS sampling frame surveys. I would certainly be interested in learning about any evidence to the contrary, however, even if it is merely anecdotal.

Regards,
Jonathan

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm) Panel Research Program
Associate Director, Research Call Center & 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
www.oranjbowl.info

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.

>>> Dominic Lusinchi <dominic@farwestresearch.com> 11/21/2007 11:40 AM

>>>

Jonathan,

You state "virtually all cell phone users these days have a minutes plan or unlimited calling plan". Do we have figures on this anywhere? I'm just curious because I know people who do not have unlimited plans, so that they would incur a charge when they receive or make a call beyond what their plan call for. Of course, I would assume that these folks are not cell-phone only households; for the latter, I would guess that they are all (?) on unlimited plans.

Dominic

Dominic Lusinchi
Far West Research
Statistical Consulting
San Francisco, California
415-664-3032
www.farwestresearch.com

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

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

Sent: Wednesday, November 21, 2007 7:51 AM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: Re: Text messaging and TCPA

Lynda:

I think the use of text messaging is a really bad idea that falls within the category of what I consider unethical survey research practices.

If you hit my phone with a text message, I would incur a charge. At best, as a random person, I would be annoyed with the intrusion (since you are sticking me with a text message fee from my provider) and perhaps even angry that you presume the right to force me to incur a charge to receive your completely unsolicited appeal for survey appeal.

But as a survey research professional, I would be livid.
Participation

in research should always be costless to the prospective respondent, else you are engaging in commercial activity. Because texting charges are so prevalent among cell phone users, I would certainly complain immediately, reporting the behavior to the FCC, CASRO, and AAPOR. I regularly encourage people I know to complain when I see abuses of the survey research "code"; I judge this to be an abuse.

Years ago, when per call charges were the norm for cell phone usage, the use of cell phone sampling frames would have been abuse; indeed, I believe that cell phone research might have been prohibited at one time because of this reality. Today, however, this is not the case with cell phone surveys not involving texting communications since virtually all cell phone users these days have a minutes plan or unlimited calling plan, making the receipt of one or two connected calls requesting research participation almost/virtually costless to the cell phone subscriber. So I am okay with cell phone sample frames for survey research, but I believe we should refrain from text messaging as a communication vehicle until such a time as it is an included service in virtually all wireless phone plans.

I certainly don't claim to be familiar with the law on this, but this is my thinking on the issue.

Regards,
Jonathan

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm) Panel Research Program
Associate Director, Research Call Center & 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
www.oranjbowl.info

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.

>>> "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG> 11/16/2007 2:39 PM >>>

We are planning a study that will sample cell phone numbers. Our protocol includes sending a text message before/after the 4th call if no one is reached on the first 3 calls. We planned to send these text messages individually using the internet interface for text messaging of each provider, but are wondering if this a violation of TCPA?

What is the best time to send a text message? Immediately before the call?

Thanks!

Lynda Voigt

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

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Wed, 21 Nov 2007 18:21:22 -0000
Reply-To: Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Iain Noble <Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK>
Subject: High ratio screening surveys
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: A<6fea12f6a4d04c90b8f16123a94b4640@93deec6d614f42e8aebc1f3c11abafec>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I'm involved in a UK government inter-departmental group that's looking at the development of a survey of attitudes to take place next year.

The commissioning department is looking to achieve two samples of around 10,000 each with fieldwork spread across most of the year. One of these is general population and so a standard two stage design will suffice.

The other group is rather different being a small sub population, unevenly spread across England and Wales, and identifiable only through use of a doorstep screening interview, our best guess currently is that our overall screening ratio is going to be at least 14 (addresses screened) to 1 (eligible respondent identified).

Does any body here have any knowledge of or experience of surveys with such high ratios? If so I'd be grateful if you could get in touch with me off-list.

Iain Noble
Department for Children, Schools and Families
Young People Analysis Division - YCS and Next Steps Study,
W606, Moorfoot, Sheffield, S1 4PQ.
0114 259 1180

For information about the Next Steps Study go to
www.nextstepsstudy.org.uk or
<http://www.esds.ac.uk/longitudinal/access/lstype/>

The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intranet Anti-Virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2006/04/0007.) On leaving the GSi this email was certified virus free.

Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Wed, 21 Nov 2007 17:00:16 -0500
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing
Subject: Re: Text messaging and TCPA
Comments: To: Jonathan Brill <brillje@UMDNJ.EDU>
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <s7441d93.051@smtppnc.umdj.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

What on earth are you talking about?

Cell phone calls in this country are ALWAYS charged to the recipient's account with certain exceptions, usually unlimited calls at nights and on weekends, and sometimes to other subscribers to the same cell service or to a few preselected other numbers. "Night" is generally defined as 9:01 P.M. to 5:59 A.M., which effectively leaves only weekends available

for "unlimited" calls for most plan subscribers.

"Minutes" is just the amount of prepaid time included in a base monthly subscription price, but that cost is still born by recipients, and if the prepaid time is exceeded, the incremental fees are often punitive -- 45 cents/minute for some Verizon plans. The maximum Verizon plan in my area is 6000 minutes at \$199/month for a single user, which averages to about 5 hours per 15 hour daily peak period. Hardly unlimited!

The alternative to a monthly plan is to prepay for a specific number of minutes, a preferred choice among many lower income people as well as those who want a cell phone only for emergency use. Prepaid plans often don't include unlimited nights and weekend calls.

While Verizon does not offer unlimited voice calling, it does offer unlimited text messaging (SMS), but the high cost (\$20/month per user) limits that option to heavy SMS users like HS and college students.

The bottom line is that if you call a cell phone, you are incurring a cost to the person paying for that line, even if that cost is only a deduction against an allowance, and if you text message, you are more likely than not costing the user a fee.

Jan Werner

Jonathan Brill wrote:

> Dominic:

>

> I was perhaps too loose with this statement. It is not based on any
> formal study, but rather on information (opinions?) solicited from many
> colleagues who have been conducting telephone research for years and
> years and years. While there is surely an awareness of subscribers with
> the old fashioned usage plans, the consensus seems to be that this is a
> small (under 10%) and ever- and rapidly-shrinking proportion of users.

>

> The issue is not unimportant. I would think it wrong/unethical to
> contact cell phone subscribers with a plan featuring a per call charge -
> so the proportion of such subscribers in the sample population of cell
> phone subscribers should be very small before we accept the inevitable
> violation of "no cost" solicitations to participate in survey research
> principle.

>

> My belief, based on widespread opinion of my peculiar set of
> colleagues, is that minutes/unlimited plans have hit the critical share
> of market penetration that puts cell phone sampling frame surveys near
> par with POTS sampling frame surveys. I would certainly be interested
> in learning about any evidence to the contrary, however, even if it is
> merely anecdotal.

>

> Regards,
> Jonathan

>

> Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.

> General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm) Panel Research Program
> Associate Director, Research Call Center & 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
> www.oranjbowl.info

> 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.

>>>> Dominic Lusinchi <dominic@farwestresearch.com> 11/21/2007 11:40 AM

> Jonathan,
>
> You state "virtually all cell phone users these days have a minutes
> plan or
> unlimited calling plan". Do we have figures on this anywhere? I'm just
> curious because I know people who do not have unlimited plans, so that
> they
> would incur a charge when they receive or make a call beyond what their
> plan
> call for. Of course, I would assume that these folks are not cell-phone
> only
> households; for the latter, I would guess that they are all (?) on
> unlimited
> plans.

> Dominic
>
>
> Dominic Lusinchi
> Far West Research
> Statistical Consulting
> San Francisco, California
> 415-664-3032
> www.farwestresearch.com

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jonathan Brill
> Sent: Wednesday, November 21, 2007 7:51 AM
> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

> Subject: Re: Text messaging and TCPA

>

> Lynda:

>

> I think the use of text messaging is a really bad idea that falls
> within the category of what I consider unethical survey research
> practices.

>

> If you hit my phone with a text message, I would incur a charge. At
> best, as a random person, I would be annoyed with the intrusion (since
> you are sticking me with a text message fee from my provider) and
> perhaps even angry that you presume the right to force me to incur
> a
> charge to receive your completely unsolicited appeal for survey appeal.

>

>

>

> But as a survey research professional, I would be livid.

> Participation

> in research should always be costless to the prospective respondent,
> else you are engaging in commercial activity. Because texting charges
> are so prevalent among cell phone users, I would certainly complain
> immediately, reporting the behavior to the FCC, CASRO, and AAPOR. I
> regularly encourage people I know to complain when I see abuses of the
> survey research "code"; I judge this to be an abuse.

>

> Years ago, when per call charges were the norm for cell phone usage,
> the use of cell phone sampling frames would have been abuse; indeed, I
> believe that cell phone research might have been prohibited at one
> time

> because of this reality. Today, however, this is not the case with
> cell

> phone surveys not involving texting communications since virtually all
> cell phone users these days have a minutes plan or unlimited calling
> plan, making the receipt of one or two connected calls requesting
> research participation almost/virtually costless to the cell phone
> subscriber. So I am okay with cell phone sample frames for survey
> research, but I believe we should refrain from text messaging as a
> communication vehicle until such a time as it is an included service
> in

> virtually all wireless phone plans.

>

> I certainly don't claim to be familiar with the law on this, but this
> is my thinking on the issue.

>

> Regards,

> Jonathan

>

> Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.

> General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm) Panel Research Program

> Associate Director, Research Call Center & 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
> www.oranjbowl.info

>
> 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.

>>>> "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG> 11/16/2007 2:39 PM >>>>

> We are planning a study that will sample cell phone numbers. Our
> protocol includes sending a text message before/after the 4th call if
> no
> one is reached on the first 3 calls. We planned to send these text
> messages individually using the internet interface for text messaging
> of
> each provider, but are wondering if this a violation of TCPA?

> What is the best time to send a text message? Immediately before the
> call?

> Thanks!

> Lynda Voigt

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

> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> signoff aapornet
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> signoff aapornet
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>
>

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Wed, 21 Nov 2007 17:26:32 -0500
Reply-To: Jonathan Brill <brillje@UMDNJ.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jonathan Brill <brillje@UMDNJ.EDU>
Subject: Re: Text messaging and TCPA
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU, Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Disposition: inline

Jan:

The key to understanding what I and others have been talking about is the concept of being virtually costless, not absolutely costless. If you pay \$40 a month for 1000 minutes, taking 1 minute or less to solicit research participation is virtually costless (well under a penny) to the individual being solicited. I am not sure if anyone with a lot of monthly minutes (especially those with flex plans) will care; those with more modest minute allotments (e.g., 100 minutes a month) probably would care. If you pay for unlimited service, there is no marginal cost at all (just like receiving a telephone call via your POTS service). But nothing is free even when there is no marginal economic cost; there always are the costs of burden (being disturbed, taking time to answer, feeling social pressure even if one refuses, consumption of battery life, etc.). There is no such thing as an absolutely free lunch. Ethical practice in any endeavor, including research, is virtually always matter of degree, never an absolute.

Still, the point that there is seemingly endless variability in how cell service plan charges are configured only underscores my primary concern that there is an ethical issue with using cell sampling frames for research. While it appears that most researchers feel that the level of penetration of cell phone service with large monthly usage allocations has reached a sufficiently high level to make the use of cell phone sampling frames ethically okay, the economic impact of survey activity only grows exponentially when one factors text messaging into the protocol. For this reason, I remain unconvinced that it is within the spirit of keeping survey participation virtually costless to those we wish to study to allow text messaging to enter into the picture at this time.

Regards,
Jonathan

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm) Panel Research Program
Associate Director, Research Call Center & 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
www.oranjbowl.info

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.

>>> Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM> 11/21/2007 5:00 PM >>>
What on earth are you talking about?

Cell phone calls in this country are ALWAYS charged to the recipient's

account with certain exceptions, usually unlimited calls at nights and

on weekends, and sometimes to other subscribers to the same cell service

or to a few preselected other numbers. "Night" is generally defined as

9:01 P.M. to 5:59 A.M., which effectively leaves only weekends available

for "unlimited" calls for most plan subscribers.

"Minutes" is just the amount of prepaid time included in a base monthly

subscription price, but that cost is still born by recipients, and if the prepaid time is exceeded, the incremental fees are often punitive

--

45 cents/minute for some Verizon plans. The maximum Verizon plan in my

area is 6000 minutes at \$199/month for a single user, which averages to

about 5 hours per 15 hour daily peak period. Hardly unlimited!

The alternative to a monthly plan is to prepay for a specific number of

minutes, a preferred choice among many lower income people as well as those who want a cell phone only for emergency use. Prepaid plans often don't include unlimited nights and weekend calls.

While Verizon does not offer unlimited voice calling, it does offer unlimited text messaging (SMS), but the high cost (\$20/month per user) limits that option to heavy SMS users like HS and college students.

The bottom line is that if you call a cell phone, you are incurring a cost to the person paying for that line, even if that cost is only a deduction against an allowance, and if you text message, you are more likely than not costing the user a fee.

Jan Werner

Jonathan Brill wrote:

> Dominic:

>

> I was perhaps too loose with this statement. It is not based on any
> formal study, but rather on information (opinions?) solicited from
many

> colleagues who have been conducting telephone research for years and
> years and years. While there is surely an awareness of subscribers
with

> the old fashioned usage plans, the consensus seems to be that this is
a

> small (under 10%) and ever- and rapidly-shrinking proportion of
users.

>

> The issue is not unimportant. I would think it wrong/unethical to
> contact cell phone subscribers with a plan featuring a per call
charge -

> so the proportion of such subscribers in the sample population of
cell

> phone subscribers should be very small before we accept the
inevitable

> violation of "no cost" solicitations to participate in survey
research

> principle.

>

> My belief, based on widespread opinion of my peculiar set of
> colleagues, is that minutes/unlimited plans have hit the critical
share

> of market penetration that puts cell phone sampling frame surveys
near

> par with POTS sampling frame surveys. I would certainly be
interested

> in learning about any evidence to the contrary, however, even if it
is

> merely anecdotal.

>

> Regards,
> Jonathan
>
> Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
> General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm) Panel Research Program
> Associate Director, Research Call Center & 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
> www.oranjbowl.info
>
> 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.

>
>
>>>> Dominic Lusinchi <dominic@farwestresearch.com> 11/21/2007 11:40
AM

>>>>
> Jonathan,
>
> You state "virtually all cell phone users these days have a minutes
> plan or
> unlimited calling plan". Do we have figures on this anywhere? I'm
just
> curious because I know people who do not have unlimited plans, so
that
> they
> would incur a charge when they receive or make a call beyond what
their
> plan
> call for. Of course, I would assume that these folks are not
cell-phone
> only
> households; for the latter, I would guess that they are all (?) on
> unlimited

> plans.
>
> Dominic
>
>
> Dominic Lusinchi
> Far West Research
> Statistical Consulting
> San Francisco, California
> 415-664-3032
> www.farwestresearch.com
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jonathan Brill
> Sent: Wednesday, November 21, 2007 7:51 AM
> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
> Subject: Re: Text messaging and TCPA
>
> Lynda:
>
> I think the use of text messaging is a really bad idea that falls
> within the category of what I consider unethical survey research
> practices.
>
> If you hit my phone with a text message, I would incur a charge. At
> best, as a random person, I would be annoyed with the intrusion
> (since
> you are sticking me with a text message fee from my provider) and
> perhaps even angry that you presume the right to force me to to
> incur
> a
> charge to receive your completely unsolicited appeal for survey
> appeal.
>
>
>
> But as a survey research professional, I would be livid.
> Participation
> in research should always be costless to the prospective respondent,
> else you are engaging in commercial activity. Because texting
> charges
> are so prevalent among cell phone users, I would certainly complain
> immediately, reporting the behavior to the FCC, CASRO, and AAPOR. I
> regularly encourage people I know to complain when I see abuses of
> the
> survey research "code"; I judge this to be an abuse.
>
> Years ago, when per call charges were the norm for cell phone usage,
> the use of cell phone sampling frames would have been abuse; indeed,
> I
> believe that cell phone research might have been prohibited at one
> time
> because of this reality. Today, however, this is not the case with
> cell

> phone surveys not involving texting communications since virtually all
> cell phone users these days have a minutes plan or unlimited calling
> plan, making the receipt of one or two connected calls requesting
> research participation almost/virtually costless to the cell phone
> subscriber. So I am okay with cell phone sample frames for survey
> research, but I believe we should refrain from text messaging as a
> communication vehicle until such a time as it is an included service
> in
> virtually all wireless phone plans.
>
> I certainly don't claim to be familiar with the law on this, but
this
> is my thinking on the issue.
>
> Regards,
> Jonathan
>
> Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
> General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm) Panel Research Program
> Associate Director, Research Call Center & 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
> www.oranjbowl.info
>
> 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.
>
>
>>>> "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@FHRC.ORG> 11/16/2007 2:39 PM >>>>
> We are planning a study that will sample cell phone numbers. Our
> protocol includes sending a text message before/after the 4th call
if
> no

> one is reached on the first 3 calls. We planned to send these text
> messages individually using the internet interface for text
messaging
> of
> each provider, but are wondering if this a violation of TCPA?
>
> What is the best time to send a text message? Immediately before
the
> call?
>
> Thanks!
>
> Lynda Voigt

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

> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> signoff aapornet
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> signoff aapornet
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Wed, 21 Nov 2007 18:20:00 -0800
Reply-To: Doug Rivers <doug@POLIMETRIX.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Doug Rivers <doug@POLIMETRIX.COM>
Subject: Re: Text messaging and TCPA
Comments: To: Jonathan Brill <brillje@UMDNJ.EDU>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

\$40 for 1000 minutes is \$.04/minute.=20
=20

From: AAPORNET on behalf of Jonathan Brill
Sent: Wed 11/21/2007 2:26 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: Text messaging and TCPA

Jan:

The key to understanding what I and others have been talking about is the concept of being virtually costless, not absolutely costless. If you pay \$40 a month for 1000 minutes, taking 1 minute or less to solicit research participation is virtually costless (well under a penny) to the individual being solicited. I am not sure if anyone with a lot of monthly minutes (especially those with flex plans) will care; those with more modest minute allotments (e.g., 100 minutes a month) probably would care. If you pay for unlimited service, there is no marginal cost at all (just like receiving a telephone call via your POTS service). But nothing is free even when there is no marginal economic cost; there always are the costs of burden (being disturbed, taking time to answer, feeling social pressure even if one refuses, consumption of battery life, etc.). There is no such thing as an absolutely free lunch. Ethical practice in any endeavor, including research, is virtually always matter of degree, never an absolute.

Still, the point that there is seemingly endless variability in how cell service plan charges are configured only underscores my primary concern that there is an ethical issue with using cell sampling frames for research. While it appears that most researchers feel that the level of penetration of cell phone service with large monthly usage allocations has reached a sufficiently high level to make the use of cell phone sampling frames ethically okay, the economic impact of survey activity only grows exponentially when one factors text messaging into the protocol. For this reason, I remain unconvinced that it is within the spirit of keeping survey participation virtually costless to those we wish to study to allow text messaging to enter into the picture at this time.

Regards,
Jonathan

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm) Panel Research Program
Associate Director, Research Call Center & 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
www.oranjbowl.info

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.

>>> Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM> 11/21/2007 5:00 PM >>>
What on earth are you talking about?

Cell phone calls in this country are ALWAYS charged to the recipient's

account with certain exceptions, usually unlimited calls at nights and

on weekends, and sometimes to other subscribers to the same cell service

or to a few preselected other numbers. "Night" is generally defined as

9:01 P.M. to 5:59 A.M., which effectively leaves only weekends available

for "unlimited" calls for most plan subscribers.

"Minutes" is just the amount of prepaid time included in a base monthly

subscription price, but that cost is still born by recipients, and if the prepaid time is exceeded, the incremental fees are often punitive

--
45 cents/minute for some Verizon plans. The maximum Verizon plan in my

area is 6000 minutes at \$199/month for a single user, which averages to

about 5 hours per 15 hour daily peak period. Hardly unlimited!

The alternative to a monthly plan is to prepay for a specific number of

minutes, a preferred choice among many lower income people as well as those who want a cell phone only for emergency use. Prepaid plans often

don't include unlimited nights and weekend calls.

While Verizon does not offer unlimited voice calling, it does offer unlimited text messaging (SMS), but the high cost (\$20/month per user)

limits that option to heavy SMS users like HS and college students.

The bottom line is that if you call a cell phone, you are incurring a cost to the person paying for that line, even if that cost is only a deduction against an allowance, and if you text message, you are more likely than not costing the user a fee.

Jan Werner

Jonathan Brill wrote:

> Dominic:

>

> I was perhaps too loose with this statement. It is not based on any
> formal study, but rather on information (opinions?) solicited from
many

> colleagues who have been conducting telephone research for years and
> years and years. While there is surely an awareness of subscribers
with

> the old fashioned usage plans, the consensus seems to be that this is
a

> small (under 10%) and ever- and rapidly-shrinking proportion of
users.

>

> The issue is not unimportant. I would think it wrong/unethical to
> contact cell phone subscribers with a plan featuring a per call
charge -

> so the proportion of such subscribers in the sample population of
cell

> phone subscribers should be very small before we accept the
inevitable

> violation of "no cost" solicitations to participate in survey
research

> principle.=20

>

> My belief, based on widespread opinion of my peculiar set of
> colleagues, is that minutes/unlimited plans have hit the critical
share

> of market penetration that puts cell phone sampling frame surveys
near

> par with POTS sampling frame surveys. I would certainly be
interested

> in learning about any evidence to the contrary, however, even if it
is

> merely anecdotal.

>

> Regards,

> Jonathan

>

> Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.

> General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm) Panel Research Program

> Associate Director, Research Call Center & 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
> www.oranjbowl.info

>
> 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.

>
>
>>>> Dominic Lusinchi <dominic@farwestresearch.com> 11/21/2007 11:40
AM

>>>>

> Jonathan,

>
> You state "virtually all cell phone users these days have a minutes
> plan or
> unlimited calling plan". Do we have figures on this anywhere? I'm
just
> curious because I know people who do not have unlimited plans, so
that
> they
> would incur a charge when they receive or make a call beyond what
their
> plan
> call for. Of course, I would assume that these folks are not
cell-phone
> only
> households; for the latter, I would guess that they are all (?) on
> unlimited
> plans.

>

> Dominic

>

>

> Dominic Lusinchi

> Far West Research

> Statistical Consulting
> San Francisco, California
> 415-664-3032
> www.farwestresearch.com
>=20

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jonathan Brill
> Sent: Wednesday, November 21, 2007 7:51 AM
> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
> Subject: Re: Text messaging and TCPA

>

> Lynda:

>

> I think the use of text messaging is a really bad idea that falls
> within the category of what I consider unethical survey research
> practices.

>

> If you hit my phone with a text message, I would incur a charge. At
> best, as a random person, I would be annoyed with the intrusion
> (since
> you are sticking me with a text message fee from my provider) and
> perhaps even angry that you presume the right to force me to to
> incur

> a

> charge to receive your completely unsolicited appeal for survey
> appeal.

>

>

>

> But as a survey research professional, I would be livid.

> Participation

> in research should always be costless to the prospective respondent,
> else you are engaging in commercial activity. Because texting
> charges

> are so prevalent among cell phone users, I would certainly complain
> immediately, reporting the behavior to the FCC, CASRO, and AAPOR. I
> regularly encourage people I know to complain when I see abuses of
> the

> survey research "code"; I judge this to be an abuse.

>

> Years ago, when per call charges were the norm for cell phone usage,
> the use of cell phone sampling frames would have been abuse; indeed,

I

> believe that cell phone research might have been prohibited at one
> time

> because of this reality. Today, however, this is not the case with

> cell

> phone surveys not involving texting communications since virtually
> all

> cell phone users these days have a minutes plan or unlimited calling

> plan, making the receipt of one or two connected calls requesting

> research participation almost/virtually costless to the cell phone

> subscriber. So I am okay with cell phone sample frames for survey

> research, but I believe we should refrain from text messaging as a

> communication vehicle until such a time as it is an included service
> in
> virtually all wireless phone plans.
>
> I certainly don't claim to be familiar with the law on this, but
this
> is my thinking on the issue.
>
> Regards,
> Jonathan
>
> Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
> General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm) Panel Research Program
> Associate Director, Research Call Center & 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
> www.oranjbowl.info
>
> 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.
>
>
>>>> "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG> 11/16/2007 2:39 PM >>>
> We are planning a study that will sample cell phone numbers. Our
> protocol includes sending a text message before/after the 4th call
if
> no
> one is reached on the first 3 calls. We planned to send these text
> messages individually using the internet interface for text
messaging
> of
> each provider, but are wondering if this a violation of TCPA?
>
> What is the best time to send a text message? Immediately before

the
> call?
>
> Thanks!
>
> Lynda Voigt
>

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

> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> signoff aapornet
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>

> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> signoff aapornet
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>

>

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Wed, 21 Nov 2007 22:57:40 -0500
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing
Subject: Re: Text messaging and TCPA
Comments: To: Doug Rivers <doug@POLIMETRIX.COM>

Comments: cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

In-Reply-To:

<016D23FB66B59D45A107C4741789271AE129A0@washington.polimetrix.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I'd guess that most users pay far more than \$.04/minute for cell calls.

Rates may be lower in NYC or LA, but in New England, where I live, Verizon Wireless (the dominant carrier here), wants \$40 a month before taxes for their cheapest basic plan, which includes 450 "anytime" minutes (\$.45 for each additional minute!) and no free SMS or data.

That's \$.09 a minute for the first 450 minutes, which is hardly cheap, but the supplemental rates are pure extortion.

One would have to take a 4000 minute plan from Verizon at \$150 a month to get a \$.04/minute rate, and still pay \$.25 for additional minutes.

The only reason telephone interviewing became possible in the first place was that, while Ma Bell and its progeny charged for outgoing calls, incoming calls were always free. That is most definitely NOT true for cell phones in the US today.

What is more, even if one could arrange with the cell operators not to charge recipients for polling calls (which is technically feasible), there would be no way for a respondent to know that a call was free before answering.

It's hard to think of a better way to alienate the public against all survey research than to conduct cell-phone polls.

Jan Werner

Doug Rivers wrote:

> \$40 for 1000 minutes is \$.04/minute.

>

> _____

>

> From: AAPORNET on behalf of Jonathan Brill

> Sent: Wed 11/21/2007 2:26 PM

> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

> Subject: Re: Text messaging and TCPA

>

>

>

> Jan:

>

> The key to understanding what I and others have been talking about is

> the concept of being virtually costless, not absolutely costless. If

> you pay \$40 a month for 1000 minutes, taking 1 minute or less to solicit

> research participation is virtually costless (well under a penny) to the

> individual being solicited. I am not sure if anyone with a lot of
> monthly minutes (especially those with flex plans) will care; those with
> more modest minute allotments (e.g., 100 minutes a month) probably would
> care. If you pay for unlimited service, there is no marginal cost at
> all (just like receiving a telephone call via your POTS service). But
> nothing is free even when there is no marginal economic cost; there
> always are the costs of burden (being disturbed, taking time to answer,
> feeling social pressure even if one refuses, consumption of battery
> life, etc.). There is no such thing as an absolutely free lunch.
> Ethical practice in any endeavor, including research, is virtually
> always matter of degree, never an absolute.

>
> Still, the point that there is seemingly endless variability in how
> cell service plan charges are configured only underscores my primary
> concern that there is an ethical issue with using cell sampling frames
> for research. While it appears that most researchers feel that the
> level of penetration of cell phone service with large monthly usage
> allocations has reached a sufficiently high level to make the use of
> cell phone sampling frames ethically okay, the economic impact of survey
> activity only grows exponentially when one factors text messaging into
> the protocol. For this reason, I remain unconvinced that it is within
> the spirit of keeping survey participation virtually costless to those
> we wish to study to allow text messaging to enter into the picture at
> this time.

>
> Regards,
> Jonathan

>
>
>
> Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
> General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm) Panel Research Program
> Associate Director, Research Call Center & 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
> www.oranjbowl.info

>
> 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.

>
>

>>>> Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM> 11/21/2007 5:00 PM >>>>

> What on earth are you talking about?

>

> Cell phone calls in this country are ALWAYS charged to the recipient's

>

> account with certain exceptions, usually unlimited calls at nights and

>

> on weekends, and sometimes to other subscribers to the same cell

> service

> or to a few preselected other numbers. "Night" is generally defined as

>

> 9:01 P.M. to 5:59 A.M., which effectively leaves only weekends

> available

> for "unlimited" calls for most plan subscribers.

>

> "Minutes" is just the amount of prepaid time included in a base monthly

>

> subscription price, but that cost is still born by recipients, and if

> the prepaid time is exceeded, the incremental fees are often punitive

> --

> 45 cents/minute for some Verizon plans. The maximum Verizon plan in my

>

> area is 6000 minutes at \$199/month for a single user, which averages to

>

> about 5 hours per 15 hour daily peak period. Hardly unlimited!

>

> The alternative to a monthly plan is to prepay for a specific number of

>

> minutes, a preferred choice among many lower income people as well as

> those who want a cell phone only for emergency use. Prepaid plans often

>

> don't include unlimited nights and weekend calls.

>

> While Verizon does not offer unlimited voice calling, it does offer

> unlimited text messaging (SMS), but the high cost (\$20/month per user)

>

> limits that option to heavy SMS users like HS and college students.

>

> The bottom line is that if you call a cell phone, you are incurring a

> cost to the person paying for that line, even if that cost is only a

> deduction against an allowance, and if you text message, you are more

> likely than not costing the user a fee.

>

> Jan Werner

> _____

>

> Jonathan Brill wrote:

>> Dominic:

>>

>> I was perhaps too loose with this statement. It is not based on any

>> formal study, but rather on information (opinions?) solicited from

>> many

>> colleagues who have been conducting telephone research for years and

>> years and years. While there is surely an awareness of subscribers

> with
>> the old fashioned usage plans, the consensus seems to be that this is
> a
>> small (under 10%) and ever- and rapidly-shrinking proportion of
> users.
>> The issue is not unimportant. I would think it wrong/unethical to
>> contact cell phone subscribers with a plan featuring a per call
> charge -
>> so the proportion of such subscribers in the sample population of
> cell
>> phone subscribers should be very small before we accept the
> inevitable
>> violation of "no cost" solicitations to participate in survey
> research
> principle.
>>
>> My belief, based on widespread opinion of my peculiar set of
>> colleagues, is that minutes/unlimited plans have hit the critical
> share
>> of market penetration that puts cell phone sampling frame surveys
> near
>> par with POTS sampling frame surveys. I would certainly be
> interested
>> in learning about any evidence to the contrary, however, even if it
> is
>> merely anecdotal.
>>
>> Regards,
>> Jonathan
>>
>> Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
>> General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm) Panel Research Program
>> Associate Director, Research Call Center & 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
>> www.oranjbowl.info
>>
>> 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.
>>
>>
>>>>> Dominic Lusinchi <dominic@farwestresearch.com> 11/21/2007 11:40

> AM
>> Jonathan,
>>
>> You state "virtually all cell phone users these days have a minutes
>> plan or
>> unlimited calling plan". Do we have figures on this anywhere? I'm
> just
>> curious because I know people who do not have unlimited plans, so
> that
>> they
>> would incur a charge when they receive or make a call beyond what
> their
>> plan
>> call for. Of course, I would assume that these folks are not
> cell-phone
>> only
>> households; for the latter, I would guess that they are all (?) on
>> unlimited
>> plans.

>>
>> Dominic
>>
>>
>> Dominic Lusinchi
>> Far West Research
>> Statistical Consulting
>> San Francisco, California
>> 415-664-3032
>> www.farwestresearch.com
>>

>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jonathan Brill
>> Sent: Wednesday, November 21, 2007 7:51 AM
>> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
>> Subject: Re: Text messaging and TCPA

>>
>> Lynda:
>>
>> I think the use of text messaging is a really bad idea that falls
>> within the category of what I consider unethical survey research
>> practices.
>>
>> If you hit my phone with a text message, I would incur a charge. At
>> best, as a random person, I would be annoyed with the intrusion
> (since
>> you are sticking me with a text message fee from my provider) and

>> perhaps even angry that you presume the right to force me to to
> incur
>> a
>> charge to receive your completely unsolicited appeal for survey
> appeal.
>>
>>
>> But as a survey research professional, I would be livid.
>> Participation
>> in research should always be costless to the prospective respondent,
>> else you are engaging in commercial activity. Because texting
> charges
>> are so prevalent among cell phone users, I would certainly complain
>> immediately, reporting the behavior to the FCC, CASRO, and AAPOR. I
>> regularly encourage people I know to complain when I see abuses of
> the
>> survey research "code"; I judge this to be an abuse.
>>
>> Years ago, when per call charges were the norm for cell phone usage,
>> the use of cell phone sampling frames would have been abuse; indeed,
> I
>> believe that cell phone research might have been prohibited at one
>> time
>> because of this reality. Today, however, this is not the case with
>> cell
>> phone surveys not involving texting communications since virtually
> all
>> cell phone users these days have a minutes plan or unlimited calling
>> plan, making the receipt of one or two connected calls requesting
>> research participation almost/virtually costless to the cell phone
>> subscriber. So I am okay with cell phone sample frames for survey
>> research, but I believe we should refrain from text messaging as a
>> communication vehicle until such a time as it is an included service
>> in
>> virtually all wireless phone plans.
>>
>> I certainly don't claim to be familiar with the law on this, but
> this
>> is my thinking on the issue.
>>
>> Regards,
>> Jonathan
>>
>> Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
>> General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm) Panel Research Program
>> Associate Director, Research Call Center & 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

>> www.oranjbowl.info
>>
>> 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.

>>
>>
>>>>> "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@FHRC.ORG> 11/16/2007 2:39 PM >>>>>

>> We are planning a study that will sample cell phone numbers. Our
>> protocol includes sending a text message before/after the 4th call
> if
>> no
>> one is reached on the first 3 calls. We planned to send these text
>> messages individually using the internet interface for text
> messaging
>> of
>> each provider, but are wondering if this a violation of TCPA?

>>
>> What is the best time to send a text message? Immediately before
> the
>> call?

>>
>> Thanks!

>>
>> Lynda Voigt

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

>>
>> -----
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>> Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
>> signoff aapornet
>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>>
>> -----
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>> Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:

>> signoff aapornet
>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>>
>>
>
> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> signoff aapornet
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>
> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> signoff aapornet
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>
>
>
> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> signoff aapornet
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>
>

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Wed, 21 Nov 2007 23:25:56 -0500
Reply-To: dgillin@cmor.org
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
Comments: RFC822 error: <W> Invalid RFC822 field - "I will be out of the office for the Thanksgiving Holiday startin=". Rest of header flushed.
From: Donna Gillin <dgillin@CMOR.ORG>
Subject: Thanksgiving Holiday
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

=0D=0AI will be out of the office for the Thanksgiving Holiday startin=g Wed, Nov. 21st and returning to the office on Tuesday, Nov. 27th. I will = respond to your email when I return to the office. Please note: all of= the CMOR offices will be closed Wednesday afternoon, Thursday and Friday f= or the Thanksgiving Holiday. =0D=0A=0D=0AIf you need immediate assistance o= n Wednesday morning or on Monday, and have a question concerning a responde= nt cooperation issue, please contact our Director of Respondent Cooperation= , Patrick Glaser, at pglaser@cmor.org or via telephone at 212-480-24=

64. If your question concerns a government affairs issue, please contact our Director of Government Affairs, Howard Fienberg, at hfienberg@cmor.org or via telephone at 202-775-5170. For any other CMOR issues, please contact CMOR headquarters at 860-657-1881. Thank you and Happy Thanksgiving. Donna Gillin, Director of Operations, CMOR, 4011 Old Stone Rd., Charlotte, NC 28226. Phone: 704-609-0448. Fax: 704-341-1937. dgillin@cmor.org

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Thu, 22 Nov 2007 07:36:21 -0500
Reply-To: Paul J Lavrakas PhD <pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Paul J Lavrakas PhD <pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET>
Subject: Re: Text messaging and TCPA
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <4744FE34.2090804@jwdp.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

For what it's worth to this discussion, here are some sections from a forthcoming "wrap-up" article (Lavrakas, Shuttles, Steeh and Fienberg; "The State of Surveying Cell Phone Numbers in the U.S.: 2007 and Beyond") in the special issue of POQ on Cell Phone Surveying due out in a couple of weeks. There also will be a report that AAPOR Council will release in early 2008 from an AAPOR Task Force charged with addressing a broad array of issues concerning Call Phone Surveys in the U.S.:

On Text Messaging --

...An additional legal concern for those planning a telephone survey in the U.S. that includes cell phone numbers concerns the use of text messaging. Researchers who might be considering using text messages sent to cell phones as part of their survey protocols (e.g., using them similar to an advance contact letter), in addition to the TCPA restrictions on sending a text message via any automated mechanism without express prior consent, could be subject to the CAN-SPAM Act (16 CFR Part 316), which regulates commercial email (spam). Although this rule is under dispute following several court cases, telephone researchers should consider including opt-out notices in text messages as a precaution or avoid sending text messages entirely.

On Reimbursement and Incentives to Respondents --

...Second, because of the cost structure of cell phone billing currently in the U. S., there likely will be a financial burden upon the respondent for

an incoming survey call to a cell phone - something that does not occur when being sampled and interviewed on a landline phone. Therefore, when appropriate, survey respondents reached on their cell phone should be offered proper remuneration for their time on a research call. This reimbursement should be viewed as a good will gesture on the part of the survey organization - one that is separate from any incentive that the researchers may choose to offer cell phone respondents to increase their response propensity. However, it may turn out that many respondents will not claim reimbursement, because they need to provide contact information to receive the remuneration and they may prefer not to do so.

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

Date: Thu, 22 Nov 2007 23:14:24 -0500
Reply-To: dgillin@cmor.org
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
Comments: RFC822 error: <W> Invalid RFC822 field - "I will be out of the office for the Thanksgiving Holiday startin=". Rest of header flushed.
From: Donna Gillin <dgillin@CMOR.ORG>
Subject: Thanksgiving Holiday
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

=0D=0AI will be out of the office for the Thanksgiving Holiday startin=
g Wed, Nov. 21st and returning to the office on Tuesday, Nov. 27th. I will =
respond to your email when I return to the office. Please note: all of=
the CMOR offices will be closed Wednesday afternoon, Thursday and Friday f=
or the Thanksgiving Holiday. =0D=0A=0D=0AIf you need immediate assistance o=
n Wednesday morning or on Monday, and have a question concerning a responde=
nt cooperation issue, please contact our Director of Respondent Cooperation=
, Patrick Glaser, at pglaser@cmor.org or via telephone at 212-480-24=
64. If your question concerns a government affairs issue, please contact ou=
r Director of Government Affairs, Howard Fienberg, at [hfienberg@c=
mor.org](mailto:hfienberg@cmor.org) or via telephone at 202-775-5170. For any other CMOR issues, =
please contact CMOR headquarters at 860-657-1881. =0D=0A=0D=0A =
=0D=0AThank you and Happy Thanksgiving. =0D=0A =0D=0A=0D=0ADonna =
Gillin =0D=0ADirector of Operations =0D=0ACMOR =0D=0A4011 Old Stone Rd. =
=0D=0ACharlotte, NC 28226 =0D=0Aph: 704-609-0448 =0D=0Afax: 704-341-1937 =
=0D=0Adgillin@cmor.org

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

Date: Fri, 23 Nov 2007 10:10:34 -0500
Reply-To: howard.schuman@UMICH.EDU
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: howard schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>
Subject: Ronald Freedman
Comments: To: aapor <aapornet@asu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The following message from the Chair of the University of Michigan's Sociology Department may be of interest to AAPOR members. Ron Freedman was known primarily as a leading social demographer, and he pioneered cross-national studies of attitudes and behaviors related to reproduction. He was also the first Director of Michigan's Detroit Area Study, and I believe the creator and certainly a mainstay of Michigan's Population Studies Center.

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

Subject: Ron Freedman
Date: Wed, 21 Nov 2007 19:06:33 -0500
From: Kimeldorf, Howard <hkimel@umich.edu>
To: <Sociology.Announcements@umich.edu>

I am saddened to report that Ron Freedman, a distinguished emeritus faculty member in Sociology who helped build our department in the decades following World War II and beyond, passed away this morning. He had been in declining health for some time. For those who did not know Ron, he was not only a first-rate researcher, but also a generous, fair-minded, and supportive colleague. We have lost a great scholar, colleague, and friend.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Fri, 23 Nov 2007 11:44:47 -0500
Reply-To: stephanie@berganalytics.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Stephanie Berg <stephanie@BERGANALYTICS.COM>
Organization: bergAnalytics
Subject: Surveys to cell phones
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

There's been a lot of discussion recently about dialing and/or texting cell phones. However, I'd like clarification about a specific issue. I'm involved with a few customer surveys and have recently encountered instances where

the contact phone number provided by the customer is a cell phone number. So while there is a pre-existing business relationship, and market research calls are typically exempt anyway, I'm still concerned about the cost issue for the respondent. Does the fact that a customer provided his cell phone number (as a primary contact number) exempt the researcher from the cost issue? In most of the cases it was not known in advance - nor was it possible to know - that the number was a cell phone number. Could someone from CMOR comment?

stephanie berg
p 301.537.0817
f 703.940.4815
stephanie@berganalytics.com

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Sun, 25 Nov 2007 19:16:07 -0800

Reply-To: Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>
Subject: job opportunity for a graduate
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Forwarded by request.

-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
Yahoo Messenger: leora_lawton

From: Maximo Salera [mailto:MaximoS@enamix.com]

My name is Maximo and I am recruiting for a strategic marketing client in Santa Monica, CA. located near UCLA that is owned by a team of Strategists Scientists and PhD's with a distinguished track record of leveraging strategy, science and innovations for global brands. They utilize talented Econometricians that apply quantitative analytical techniques and use eViews, SAS, and SPSS software to provide proprietary competitive advantages for their customers like Google, Schwab Bank, Washington Mutual, Mercedes Benz, Coca Cola, Wachovia, and Wells Fargo just to name a few.

Duties performed:

Conduct data management, statistical analysis on data using SAS & SPSS.

Great to have solid Excel, VBA, VB, SQL, and MS Access experience.

Data Scrubbing, Cleansing, and creating Models, generate listings, tables, and graphs are a plus. MUST have SAS Programming experience and be able to start within 2 weeks from an offer.

Resumes should be sent in Word format.

Thank you,

Maximo Salera

Technical Recruiter

eNamix Inc

AN EDGE ABOVE....Information Technology Staffing

27042 Towne Centre Dr., Ste 270

Foothill Ranch, CA. 92610

(949) 540-0461 ext. 170

(949) 540-0467 fax

www.eNamix.com

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Date: Mon, 26 Nov 2007 09:38:51 -0500

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

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Jonathan Brill <brillje@UMDNJ.EDU>

Subject: Re: Surveys to cell phones

Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU, Stephanie Berg <stephanie@berganalytics.com>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Disposition: inline

Stephanie:

If a R provided the research interviewer with a cell phone number, then the R invited the research organization to call him/her at that number.

Assuming there were no promises made not to call other than in predefined circumstances, the respondent's decision to provide the cell phone number would appear to constitute permission/consent to be recontacted at that cell phone number. In my view, therefore, it is not only okay to call the respondent at that cell number, but it would be wrong to attempt to recontact the respondent through any other manner/means not specifically consented to by the respondent.

Regards,
Jonathan

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm) Panel Research Program
Associate Director, Research Call Center & 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
www.oranjbowl.info

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.

>>> Stephanie Berg <stephanie@BERGANALYTICS.COM> 11/23/2007 11:44 AM

>>>

There's been a lot of discussion recently about dialing and/or texting cell phones. However, I'd like clarification about a specific issue. I'm involved with a few customer surveys and have recently encountered instances where the contact phone number provided by the customer is a cell phone number. So while there is a pre-existing business relationship, and market research calls are typically exempt anyway, I'm still concerned about the cost issue for the respondent. Does the fact that a customer provided his cell phone number (as a primary contact number) exempt the researcher from the cost issue? In most of the cases it was not known in advance - nor was it possible to know - that the number was a cell phone number. Could someone from CMOR comment?

stephanie berg

p 301.537.0817
f 703.940.4815
stephanie@berganalytics.com

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 26 Nov 2007 09:45:19 -0500
Reply-To: stephanie@berganalytics.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Stephanie Berg <stephanie@BERGANALYTICS.COM>

Organization: bergAnalytics
Subject: Re: Surveys to cell phones
Comments: To: Jonathan Brill <brillje@UMDNJ.EDU>
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <s74a943e.070@smtpnpc.umdj.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

It makes sense at first, but I know too many lawyers. Permission to do something that is not allowed by law does not automatically make it legal. I.e., I can give you permission to plagiarize something I've published but that does not make it legal. I'm not a lawyer, so I don't know how permissions are treated in this case.

stephanie berg
p 301.537.0817
f 703.940.4815
stephanie@berganalytics.com

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jonathan Brill
Sent: Monday, November 26, 2007 9:39 AM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: Surveys to cell phones

Stephanie:

If a R provided the research interviewer with a cell phone number, then the R invited the research organization to call him/her at that number. Assuming there were no promises made not to call other than in predefined circumstances, the respondent's decision to provide the cell phone number would appear to constitute permission/consent to be recontacted at that cell phone number. In my view, therefore, it is not only okay to call the respondent at that cell number, but it would be wrong to attempt to recontact the respondent through any other manner/means not specifically consented to by the respondent.

Regards,
Jonathan

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm) Panel Research Program
Associate Director, Research Call Center & 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
www.oranjbowl.info

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.

>>> Stephanie Berg <stephanie@BERGANALYTICS.COM> 11/23/2007 11:44 AM
>>>

There's been a lot of discussion recently about dialing and/or texting cell phones. However, I'd like clarification about a specific issue. I'm involved with a few customer surveys and have recently encountered instances where the contact phone number provided by the customer is a cell phone number. So while there is a pre-existing business relationship, and market research calls are typically exempt anyway, I'm still concerned about the cost issue for the respondent. Does the fact that a customer provided his cell phone number (as a primary contact number) exempt the researcher from the cost issue? In most of the cases it was not known in advance - nor was it possible to know - that the number was a cell phone number. Could someone from CMOR comment?

stephanie berg
p 301.537.0817
f 703.940.4815
stephanie@berganalytics.com

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 26 Nov 2007 10:08:39 -0500
Reply-To: Benjamin Phillips <bphillips@BRANDEIS.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Benjamin Phillips <bphillips@BRANDEIS.EDU>
Organization: Brandeis University
Subject: Re: Text messaging and TCPA
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

In-Reply-To: <000601c82d04\$49d9aaa0\$28916041@NYCNMRLAVRAKPB>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Has there been any investigation of the possibility of purchasing the end-user charges from the cell phone carrier so that the researcher is billed for both dialing the call/sending the text message and the respondent's receipt of the call or text message?

From a carrier's perspective, this might be an attractive option because they would effectively get to "double charge" for calls received on their network. Subscribers already pay for a bucket of minutes that, in many cases, would not be pushed over into additional charges by the call. Charging for these calls would add revenue where none would have otherwise been generated. While the initial volume of cell phone surveys is likely to be low, it will certainly increase considerably over time, especially if the charging issue can be resolved, potentially making this a source of revenue.

It would be considerably easier just to assume the incoming call charges and add "you are not being charged for this call" to the usual "we are not asking for money or selling anything" than to arrange for reimbursement.

Paul J Lavrakas PhD wrote:

>
>
>
> On Reimbursement and Incentives to Respondents --
>
> ...Second, because of the cost structure of cell phone billing currently in
> the U. S., there likely will be a financial burden upon the respondent for
> an incoming survey call to a cell phone - something that does not occur when
> being sampled and interviewed on a landline phone. Therefore, when
> appropriate, survey respondents reached on their cell phone should be
> offered proper remuneration for their time on a research call. This
> reimbursement should be viewed as a good will gesture on the part of the
> survey organization - one that is separate from any incentive that the
> researchers may choose to offer cell phone respondents to increase their
> response propensity. However, it may turn out that many respondents will
> not claim reimbursement, because they need to provide contact information to
> receive the remuneration and they may prefer not to do so.
>
>

--

Benjamin Phillips, Ph.D.
Associate Research Scientist
Steinhardt Social Research Institute and
Cohen Center for Modern Jewish Studies
Brandeis University MS014
415 South Street

Waltham, MA 02454-9110
(ph) 781-736-3855 (fax) 781-736-3929
<http://www.brandeis.edu/cmjs/Person.cfm?idstaff=42>
Email: bphillips@brandeis.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 26 Nov 2007 11:44:06 -0500
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Survey: Most prefer 'Merry Christmas'
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Survey: Most prefer 'Merry Christmas'
Washington Times

<http://washingtontimes.com/article/20071124/NATION/111240033/1001>
or
<http://tinyurl.com/34lo5c>

Retailers shouldn't be shy about wishing customers a "Merry Christmas."

A new survey found that 67 percent of American adults prefer the holiday-specific greeting in seasonal advertising, while only 26 percent want to see "Happy Holidays."

There wasn't a gender gap in the answers: Both men and women like seeing "Merry Christmas" in store windows, according to Scott Rasmussen, president of Rasmussen Reports, an independent polling company.

But from a political perspective, there was a sleighful of difference: 88 percent of Republicans wanted to see "Merry Christmas," while just 57 percent of Democrats favored it.

SNIP

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

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Mon, 26 Nov 2007 19:43:59 +0100
Reply-To: Edith de Leeuw <edithl@XS4ALL.NL>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Edith de Leeuw <edithl@XS4ALL.NL>
Subject: Re: Survey: Most prefer 'Merry Christmas'
Comments: To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <3248A9B21DD5574785FE5E2C8E52168499427F@exchange.local.arts.cience.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

As European outlier, I still prefer the tongue in cheek "happy whatsoever"

And to end with an old BBC end-of-broadcast wish: "May whichever god you believe in bless you"

In friendship, Edith

At 11:44 AM 11/26/2007 -0500, Leo Simonetta wrote:

>Survey: Most prefer 'Merry Christmas'

>Washington Times

>

><http://washingtontimes.com/article/20071124/NATION/111240033/1001>

>or

><http://tinyurl.com/34lo5c>

>

>Retailers shouldn't be shy about wishing customers a "Merry Christmas."

>

>A new survey found that 67 percent of American adults prefer the

>holiday-specific greeting in seasonal advertising, while only 26 percent

>want to see "Happy Holidays."

>

>T--

>Leo G. Simonetta

>Director of Research

>Art & Science Group, LLC

>6115 Falls Road, Suite 101

>Baltimore MD 21209

>

>--

Dr. Edith D. de Leeuw, Methodika

Plantage Doklaan 40, NL-1018 CN Amsterdam

tel + 31 20 622 34 38 fax + 31 20 330 25 97

e-mail edithl@xs4all.nl

Hope is like a small light in the dark
It keeps the nightmares away till the dawn of a new world

http://i.euniverse.com/funpages/cms_content/2529/4candles.swf

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 26 Nov 2007 14:13:14 -0500
Reply-To: Steven Kull <skull@PIPA.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Steven Kull <skull@PIPA.ORG>
Subject: Re: Survey: Most prefer 'Merry Christmas'
Comments: To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <3248A9B21DD5574785FE5E2C8E52168499427F@exchange.local.artscience.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The critical question from the point of view of retailers is how many shoppers would be more likely to avoid an establishment that says Merry Xmas or Happy Holidays. While those who prefer Merry Xmas may be a greater number, the distribution among those who might adjust their choice of outlets may be quite different.

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta
Sent: Monday, November 26, 2007 11:44 AM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Survey: Most prefer 'Merry Christmas'

Survey: Most prefer 'Merry Christmas'
Washington Times

<http://washingtontimes.com/article/20071124/NATION/111240033/1001>
or
<http://tinyurl.com/34lo5c>

Retailers shouldn't be shy about wishing customers a "Merry Christmas."

A new survey found that 67 percent of American adults prefer the holiday-specific greeting in seasonal advertising, while only 26 percent want to see "Happy Holidays."

There wasn't a gender gap in the answers: Both men and women like seeing "Merry Christmas" in store windows, according to Scott Rasmussen, president of Rasmussen Reports, an independent polling company.

But from a political perspective, there was a sleighful of difference:

88 percent of Republicans wanted to see "Merry Christmas," while just 57 percent of Democrats favored it.

SNIP

--

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

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Mon, 26 Nov 2007 14:48:26 -0500
Reply-To: Jonathan Brill <brillje@UMDNJ.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jonathan Brill <brillje@UMDNJ.EDU>
Subject: Re: Survey: Most prefer 'Merry Christmas'
Comments: To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Disposition: inline

While this is an entertaining finding, it seems of little value to retailers because the holiday greeting preferred by a majority of shoppers is not the truly relevant question affecting their businesses.

What should have been the point of such a study is what proportion of the retail shopping population finds a non-secular greeting sufficiently undesirable (offensive) that they might consider (or would) change their patronage spending practices in an undesirable way. Survey items to get at that issue would be useful in weighing the risk of having store employees say "Merry Christmas" or other non-secular alternative greetings to shoppers.

Assuming that the story's failure to mention such data is a reliable

indicator that the relevant issue was not investigated by the study, I would suggest that the reporter has little sound basis for reaching the conclusion that study demonstrates that "Retailers shouldn't be shy about wishing customers a "Merry Christmas.""

Regards,
Jonathan

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm) Panel Research Program
Associate Director, Research Call Center & 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
www.oranjbowl.info

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.

>>> Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM> 11/26/2007 11:44 AM >>>
Survey: Most prefer 'Merry Christmas'
Washington Times

<http://washingtontimes.com/article/20071124/NATION/111240033/1001>
or
<http://tinyurl.com/34lo5c>

Retailers shouldn't be shy about wishing customers a "Merry Christmas."

A new survey found that 67 percent of American adults prefer the holiday-specific greeting in seasonal advertising, while only 26 percent want to see "Happy Holidays."

There wasn't a gender gap in the answers: Both men and women like seeing "Merry Christmas" in store windows, according to Scott Rasmussen, president of Rasmussen Reports, an independent polling company.

But from a political perspective, there was a sleighful of difference:

88 percent of Republicans wanted to see "Merry Christmas," while just 57 percent of Democrats favored it.

SNIP

--

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

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 26 Nov 2007 15:01:35 -0500
Reply-To: stephanie@berganalytics.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Stephanie Berg <stephanie@BERGANALYTICS.COM>
Organization: bergAnalytics
Subject: Re: Survey: Most prefer 'Merry Christmas'
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To:
<3248A9B21DD5574785FE5E2C8E52168499427F@exchange.local.artsience.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I've never been fond of this question because it only asks about preference, not "resentment". While Merry Christmas is preferred by two-thirds, maybe Happy Holidays is acceptable to all. Though I believe previous polls have released data saying that some resent Happy Holidays since they believe it is Anti-Christmas. However, as someone in marketing research rather than public opinion - which appears to put me in the minority of AAPOR members - retail companies might do well to go with the least offensive holiday term rather than the most preferred. A term that is resented might alter purchase behavior, while a preferred term probably will not.

stephanie berg
p 301.537.0817
f 703.940.4815
stephanie@berganalytics.com

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta
Sent: Monday, November 26, 2007 11:44 AM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Survey: Most prefer 'Merry Christmas'

Survey: Most prefer 'Merry Christmas'
Washington Times

<http://washingtontimes.com/article/20071124/NATION/111240033/1001>
or
<http://tinyurl.com/34lo5c>

Retailers shouldn't be shy about wishing customers a "Merry Christmas."

A new survey found that 67 percent of American adults prefer the holiday-specific greeting in seasonal advertising, while only 26 percent want to see "Happy Holidays."

There wasn't a gender gap in the answers: Both men and women like seeing "Merry Christmas" in store windows, according to Scott Rasmussen, president of Rasmussen Reports, an independent polling company.

But from a political perspective, there was a sleighful of difference: 88 percent of Republicans wanted to see "Merry Christmas," while just 57 percent of Democrats favored it.

SNIP

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

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

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

Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Date: Mon, 26 Nov 2007 15:24:36 -0500

Reply-To: "Michael D. Cohen" <mcohen@COHENRESEARCHGROUP.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Michael D. Cohen" <mcohen@COHENRESEARCHGROUP.COM>

Subject: Re: Survey: Most prefer 'Merry Christmas'

Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

In-Reply-To: <s74adcc3.078@smtppnpc.umdnj.edu>

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII; format=flowed; delsp=yes

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Mime-Version: 1.0 (Apple Message framework v915)

With apologies to Rasmussen and The Washington Times, this is about as useful as saying that Christians like Christmas and Jews like Hanukkah.

The interesting finding would be how non-Christians respond to being greeted with "Merry Christmas." The salient demographic is religious affiliation, not political affiliation or gender.

It would be nice if Scott would share with us what he found. It's likely he gave them the religious affiliation stat and the reporter didn't find it interesting, which is a shame.

Michael D. Cohen, Ph.D.
Cohen Research Group
10 G Street, NE, Suite 601
Washington, DC 20002
(202) 558-6300 Phone
(202) 558-6301 Fax

On Nov 26, 2007, at 2:48 PM, Jonathan Brill wrote:

> While this is an entertaining finding, it seems of little value to
> retailers because the holiday greeting preferred by a majority of
> shoppers is not the truly relevant question affecting their
> businesses.

>

>

> What should have been the point of such a study is what proportion of
> the retail shopping population finds a non-secular greeting
> sufficiently
> undesirable (offensive) that they might consider (or would) change
> their
> patronage spending practices in an undesirable way. Survey items to

> get
> at that issue would be useful in weighing the risk of having store
> employees say "Merry Christmas" or other non-secular alternative
> greetings to shoppers.
>
> Assuming that the story's failure to mention such data is a reliable
> indicator that the relevant issue was not investigated by the study, I
> would suggest that the reporter has little sound basis for reaching
> the
> conclusion that study demonstrates that "Retailers shouldn't be shy
> about wishing customers a "Merry Christmas.""
>
> Regards,
> Jonathan
>
> Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
> General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm) Panel Research Program
> Associate Director, Research Call Center & 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
> www.oranjbowl.info
>
> 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.
>
>
>>>> Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM> 11/26/2007 11:44 AM >>>>
> Survey: Most prefer 'Merry Christmas'
> Washington Times
>
> <http://washingtontimes.com/article/20071124/NATION/111240033/1001>
> or
> <http://tinyurl.com/34lo5c>
>
> Retailers shouldn't be shy about wishing customers a "Merry
> Christmas."
>
> A new survey found that 67 percent of American adults prefer the

> holiday-specific greeting in seasonal advertising, while only 26
> percent
> want to see "Happy Holidays."
>
> There wasn't a gender gap in the answers: Both men and women like
> seeing
> "Merry Christmas" in store windows, according to Scott Rasmussen,
> president of Rasmussen Reports, an independent polling company.
>
> But from a political perspective, there was a sleighful of difference:
> 88 percent of Republicans wanted to see "Merry Christmas," while just
> 57
> percent of Democrats favored it.

>
> SNIP

>
>
> --

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

>
> -----

> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> set aapornet nomail
> On your return send this: set aapornet mail
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
> aapornet-request@asu.edu

>
> -----

> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> set aapornet nomail
> On your return send this: set aapornet mail
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

>
> -----

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 26 Nov 2007 15:39:06 -0500
Reply-To: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>

Subject: Re: Survey: Most prefer 'Merry Christmas'
Comments: To: Stephanie Berg <stephanie@berganalytics.com>
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <000301c83067\$26fb3060\$6600a8c0@gallows.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII; format=flowed

The application of this research is obvious:

1. Make 'Merry Christmas' the default greeting.
2. For every third customer, substitute 'Happy Holidays.'

But seriously, folks, the problem with the Washington Times story is that journalists overgeneralize from the referendum model. I don't know where they get that. They certainly don't learn it in this journalism school.

Happy Christmas,
Phil

Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Voice: 919 962-4085 Fax: 919 962-1549
Cell: 919 906-3425 URL: www.unc.edu/~pmeyer

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 26 Nov 2007 20:48:10 +0000
Reply-To: jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Organization: J.P. MURPHY & COMPANY
Subject: Re: Survey: Most prefer 'Merry Christmas'
Comments: To: "Michael D. Cohen" <mcohen@COHENRESEARCHGROUP.COM>,
AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

It's 'premium content.' (I looked.)
\$19.95 monthly buys access to crosstabs on all their studies. Not unreasonable, but more than Gallup, which generally publishes crosstabs with every release and gives you access to a lot more for about \$100 annually. (Somebody please correct me if either of these statements is in error.)
James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
J.P. MURPHY & COMPANY

Post Office Box 150
Princeton, NJ 08542
610 408 8800
www.jpmmurphy.com

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

From: Michael D. Cohen [mailto:mcohen@COHENRESEARCHGROUP.COM]
Sent: Monday, November 26, 2007 03:24 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: Survey: Most prefer 'Merry Christmas'

With apologies to Rasmussen and The Washington Times, this is about as useful as saying that Christians like Christmas and Jews like Hanukkah.

The interesting finding would be how non-Christians respond to being greeted with "Merry Christmas." The salient demographic is religious affiliation, not political affiliation or gender.

It would be nice if Scott would share with us what he found. It's likely he gave them the religious affiliation stat and the reporter didn't find it interesting, which is a shame.

Michael D. Cohen, Ph.D.
Cohen Research Group
10 G Street, NE, Suite 601
Washington, DC 20002
(202) 558-6300 Phone
(202) 558-6301 Fax

On Nov 26, 2007, at 2:48 PM, Jonathan Brill wrote:

- > While this is an entertaining finding, it seems of little value to
- > retailers because the holiday greeting preferred by a majority of
- > shoppers is not the truly relevant question affecting their
- > businesses.
- >
- >
- > What should have been the point of such a study is what proportion of
- > the retail shopping population finds a non-secular greeting
- > sufficiently
- > undesirable (offensive) that they might consider (or would) change
- > their
- > patronage spending practices in an undesirable way. Survey items to
- > get
- > at that issue would be useful in weighing the risk of having store
- > employees say "Merry Christmas" or other non-secular alternative
- > greetings to shoppers.
- >
- > Assuming that the story's failure to mention such data is a reliable
- > indicator that the relevant issue was not investigated by the study, I
- > would suggest that the reporter has little sound basis for reaching
- > the
- > conclusion that study demonstrates that "Retailers shouldn't be shy
- > about wishing customers a "Merry Christmas.""

>
> Regards,
> Jonathan
>
> Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
> General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm) Panel Research Program
> Associate Director, Research Call Center & 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
> www.oranjbowl.info
>
> 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.
>
>
>>>> Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM> 11/26/2007 11:44 AM >>>
> Survey: Most prefer 'Merry Christmas'
> Washington Times
>
> <http://washingtontimes.com/article/20071124/NATION/111240033/1001>
> or
> <http://tinyurl.com/34lo5c>
>
> Retailers shouldn't be shy about wishing customers a "Merry
> Christmas."
>
> A new survey found that 67 percent of American adults prefer the
> holiday-specific greeting in seasonal advertising, while only 26
> percent
> want to see "Happy Holidays."
>
> There wasn't a gender gap in the answers: Both men and women like
> seeing
> "Merry Christmas" in store windows, according to Scott Rasmussen,
> president of Rasmussen Reports, an independent polling company.
>
> But from a political perspective, there was a sleighful of difference:
> 88 percent of Republicans wanted to see "Merry Christmas," while just

> 57

> percent of Democrats favored it.

>

> SNIP

>

>

> --

> Leo G. Simonetta

> Director of Research

> Art & Science Group, LLC

> 6115 Falls Road, Suite 101

> Baltimore MD 21209

>

> -----

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

> Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:

> set aapornet nomail

> On your return send this: set aapornet mail

> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

> aapornet-request@asu.edu

>

> -----

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

> Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:

> set aapornet nomail

> On your return send this: set aapornet mail

> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

du

>

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

Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

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

Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====
Date: Mon, 26 Nov 2007 16:34:49 -0500

Reply-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Subject: median spending plans
Comments: To: aapornet aapornet <aapornet@asu.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0 (Apple Message framework v752.2)
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII; delsp=yes; format=flowed

I just had a very unsatisfactory emails exchange with some people at Gallup about this, so maybe someone can tell me if I'm off base on this.

Gallup has a history of its holiday spending intentions at:

<<http://www.gallup.com/poll/102865/Christmas-Spending-Projection-Still-Looks-Positive.aspx#3>>.

The latest mean is \$866, up from \$826 last year. (No breakdown on how much is Merry Christmas and how much is Happy Holidays spending.) The median is \$500 this year - and \$500 in 2006. And 2005. And 2004. In fact, it's been \$500 for ten consecutive observations. When I queried this using the web form, I got this response:

> Here is the answer form one of the editors:

>

> "I don't understand why he thinks it's impossible. That's what the
> data have shown based on how people answer the question. I think
> we'd need to understand more why he thinks it's not possible in
> order to address his question."

When I said that sounded totally implausible, I got back this response:

> Lots of people give \$500 estimates, and this large group hovers
> near the middle of the distribution, so it will take a lot to move
> the median off \$500.

This sound like a mode, not a median, but still. How can this be possible?

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
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/radio-feed.php>>
iTunes: <<http://phobos.apple.com/WebObjects/MZStore.woa/wa/viewPodcast?id=73801817>>

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

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Mon, 26 Nov 2007 17:35:06 -0500
Reply-To: lindeman@BARD.EDU
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark Lindeman <lindeman@BARD.EDU>
Subject: Re: median spending plans
Comments: To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <A3F14ED8-A3FF-4C10-9998-43FC7F874F5C@panix.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; DelSp="Yes"; format="flowed"
Content-Disposition: inline
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Doug, I'm not sure what is fazing you, but \$500 can be very sticky as a median regardless of whether it is the mode (although it may well be). Maybe nine years ago that answer comprised the 48th through 56th percentiles, and now it's the 42nd through 51st percentiles. Or maybe there hasn't even been such a shift. I seem to have heard some stories about high-end income going up while most other people get squeezed.... [But I know nothing about this distro -- my example is just an illustration.]

For the mean, of course, the sky is the limit.

Mark Lindeman
Bard College

Quoting Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>:

> I just had a very unsatisfactory emails exchange with some people at
> Gallup about this, so maybe someone can tell me if I'm off base on this.
>
> Gallup has a history of its holiday spending intentions at:
>
> <<http://www.gallup.com/poll/102865/Christmas-Spending-Projection-Still-Looks-Positive.aspx#3>>.
>
> The latest mean is \$866, up from \$826 last year. (No breakdown on how
> much is Merry Christmas and how much is Happy Holidays spending.) The
> median is \$500 this year - and \$500 in 2006. And 2005. And 2004. In

> fact, it's been \$500 for ten consecutive observations. When I queried
> this using the web form, I got this response:
>
>> Here is the answer form one of the editors:
>>
>> "I don't understand why he thinks it's impossible. That's what the
>> data have shown based on how people answer the question. I think
>> we'd need to understand more why he thinks it's not possible in
>> order to address his question."
>
> When I said that sounded totally implausible, I got back this response:
>
>> Lots of people give \$500 estimates, and this large group hovers
>> near the middle of the distribution, so it will take a lot to move
>> the median off \$500.
>
> This sound like a mode, not a median, but still. How can this be possible?
>
>
> Doug Henwood
> Left Business Observer
> 38 Greene St - 4th fl.
> New York NY 10013-2505 USA
> <dhenwood@panix.com>
> <<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>>

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 26 Nov 2007 18:08:00 -0500
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Subject: Re: median spending plans
Comments: To: aapornet aapornet <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
In-Reply-To: <20071126173506.67awnwk5ws48w04k@webmail.bard.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0 (Apple Message framework v752.3)
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII; delp=yes; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

On Nov 26, 2007, at 5:35 PM, lindeman@bard.edu wrote:

> Doug, I'm not sure what is fazing you, but \$500 can be very sticky
> as a median regardless of whether it is the mode (although it may
> well be). Maybe nine years ago that answer comprised the 48th
> through 56th percentiles, and now it's the 42nd through 51st
> percentiles. Or maybe there hasn't even been such a shift. I seem
> to have heard some stories about high-end income going up while
> most other people get squeezed.... [But I know nothing about this

> distro -- my example is just an illustration.]
>
> For the mean, of course, the sky is the limit.

I can't think of a single other economic variable where the median would be unchanged for 10 consecutive observations, esp at a round number like \$500. It makes no sense at all. The Census Bureau's retail series is one of the most volatile of all economic indicators, with low serial correlation (unlike employment, which has a high serial correlation). Consumer confidence is also very volatile - the ABC/WP weekly measure is often up and down many points over the course of a few weeks while going essentially nowhere. Mode I can almost believe, but median - impossible.

Doug

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 26 Nov 2007 18:43:51 -0500
Reply-To: lindeman@BARD.EDU
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark Lindeman <lindeman@BARD.EDU>
Subject: Re: median spending plans
Comments: To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <6BE391C6-8B0D-4A41-8CCE-23949D8390C5@PANIX.COM>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; DelSp="Yes"; format="flowed"
Content-Disposition: inline
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Doug, I'm not thinking of this as an "economic variable" in the sense that you apparently are. I'm sure actual median spending varies, but I imagine that many respondents have only a very shadowy sense of what they 'intend' to spend on gifts. (For many people, "gift budget" is a rather nasty oxymoron.) Probably many would need some careful prompting after the fact even to give a decent retrospective estimate.

But at this point I'll defer to people with more relevant expertise!

Mark Lindeman
Bard College

Quoting Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>:

> I can't think of a single other economic variable where the median
> would be unchanged for 10 consecutive observations, esp at a round
> number like \$500. It makes no sense at all. The Census Bureau's retail

> series is one of the most volatile of all economic indicators, with low
> serial correlation (unlike employment, which has a high serial
> correlation). Consumer confidence is also very volatile - the ABC/WP
> weekly measure is often up and down many points over the course of a
> few weeks while going essentially nowhere. Mode I can almost believe,
> but median - impossible.
>
> Doug

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

Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====
Date: Mon, 26 Nov 2007 18:59:42 -0500

Reply-To: Mike Swiontkowski <mswiontkowski@GMAIL.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Mike Swiontkowski <mswiontkowski@GMAIL.COM>

Subject: Re: median spending plans

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

In-Reply-To: <6BE391C6-8B0D-4A41-8CCE-23949D8390C5@PANIX.COM>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Disposition: inline

Doug,

My guess is that it's probably both the median and mode for all of those years. The heaping at \$500 must be large and potentially due to self-reported rounding, but I could certainly see this occurring in the data if perhaps around 15% or more (a guesstimate) of the respondents said they spend \$500 each year, which doesn't seem particularly odd. It looks like \$500 is consistently in the minds of many Americans as the appropriate or socially desirable amount to spend. Significant rounding behavior is also likely occurring. Several of the economic surveys are indexes and/or involve respondents looking at financial statements, receipts, etc. for more exact numbers to report, thus hopefully reducing the impact of human measurement error due to rounding or various other contributors to measurement error. It seems likely that respondents were not asked to look at receipts from past years or something similar since it was a phone interview and they were projecting their spending for the upcoming season.

Heaping effects in survey data are common across a variety of questionnaire topics (others on AAPORnet probably have some examples to share), but my inclination is that for a hypothetical financial projection of Holiday shopping in a quick phone interview, significant rounding behavior is likely to occur. Considering that any questions related to income in a survey often results in a high percentage of refusals, the rounding behavior could be even further increased since people may want to disguise the disposable income and/or want to report a socially desirable response.

Perhaps Gallup could share the percentage and/or count of respondents reporting exactly \$500 over the past few years to help better explain the consistent medians?

---Mike

On Nov 26, 2007 6:08 PM, Doug Henwood <dhenwood@panix.com> wrote:

> On Nov 26, 2007, at 5:35 PM, lindeman@bard.edu wrote:

>
>> Doug, I'm not sure what is fazing you, but \$500 can be very sticky
>> as a median regardless of whether it is the mode (although it may
>> well be). Maybe nine years ago that answer comprised the 48th
>> through 56th percentiles, and now it's the 42nd through 51st
>> percentiles. Or maybe there hasn't even been such a shift. I seem
>> to have heard some stories about high-end income going up while
>> most other people get squeezed.... [But I know nothing about this
>> distro -- my example is just an illustration.]

>>

>> For the mean, of course, the sky is the limit.

>
> I can't think of a single other economic variable where the median
> would be unchanged for 10 consecutive observations, esp at a round
> number like \$500. It makes no sense at all. The Census Bureau's
> retail series is one of the most volatile of all economic indicators,
> with low serial correlation (unlike employment, which has a high
> serial correlation). Consumer confidence is also very volatile - the
> ABC/WP weekly measure is often up and down many points over the
> course of a few weeks while going essentially nowhere. Mode I can
> almost believe, but median - impossible.

>
> Doug

>
> -----

> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> set aapornet nomail
> On your return send this: set aapornet mail
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Mon, 26 Nov 2007 16:30:36 -0800
Reply-To: Robert S Ross <rross@CSUCHICO.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Robert S Ross <rross@CSUCHICO.EDU>
Subject: Re: median spending plans
Comments: To: AAPOR <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
Mime-Version: 1.0 (Apple Message framework v752.3)
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII; delsp=yes; format=flowed

My memory from psychology statistics is that with more than one case with the median value, then the proper computation would be the number of cases below the median value minus the number of cases above the median value divided by 2 times the number of cases with the median value, then adding that value to the median value. I think this computation was developed by Scripture in the late 19th century.

Thus, the value of 500 given by Gallup would only be an approximation; the true median would be plus or minus that number depending on the distribution and the unit of measure. -Bob

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Mon, 26 Nov 2007 22:13:51 -0500
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing
Subject: Re: median spending plans
Comments: To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <A3F14ED8-A3FF-4C10-9998-43FC7F874F5C@panix.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

As Carnac the Magnificent might have told you, the answer doesn't mean much unless you know what the question was.

The results and the explanation given would make perfect sense if Gallup is asking something along the lines of:

How much do you intend to spend for the holidays this year?

- Less than \$500
- About \$500
- More than \$500

(If more than \$500) Would that be more than \$750? etc....

Of course, the answer to this kind of question has more entertainment value than utility as social science, but that is true of a lot of the

numbers spewed forth by Gallup and others.

Jan Werner

Doug Henwood wrote:

> I just had a very unsatisfactory emails exchange with some people at
> Gallup about this, so maybe someone can tell me if I'm off base on this.

>
> Gallup has a history of its holiday spending intentions at:

>
> <<http://www.gallup.com/poll/102865/Christmas-Spending-Projection-Still-Looks-Positive.aspx#3>>.

>
>
> The latest mean is \$866, up from \$826 last year. (No breakdown on how
> much is Merry Christmas and how much is Happy Holidays spending.) The
> median is \$500 this year - and \$500 in 2006. And 2005. And 2004. In
> fact, it's been \$500 for ten consecutive observations. When I queried
> this using the web form, I got this response:

>
>> Here is the answer form one of the editors:

>>
>> "I don't understand why he thinks it's impossible. That's what the
>> data have shown based on how people answer the question. I think we'd
>> need to understand more why he thinks it's not possible in order to
>> address his question."

>
> When I said that sounded totally implausible, I got back this response:

>
>> Lots of people give \$500 estimates, and this large group hovers near
>> the middle of the distribution, so it will take a lot to move the
>> median off \$500.

>
> This sound like a mode, not a median, but still. How can this be possible?

>
>
> 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
> 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/radio-feed.php>>
> iTunes:
> <<http://phobos.apple.com/WebObjects/MZStore.woa/wa/viewPodcast?id=73801817>>

>

> -----
>
> download my book Wall Street (for free!) at
> <<http://www.wallstreetthebook.com>>
>
> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> set aapornet nomail
> On your return send this: set aapornet mail
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>
>

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 26 Nov 2007 19:25:44 -0800
Reply-To: "Darling, Jill" <Jill.Darling@LATIMES.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Darling, Jill" <Jill.Darling@LATIMES.COM>
Subject: PAPER conference San Francisco Dec 6, 7
Comments: To: AAPORnet Listserv <aapornet@asu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

There is still (barely!) time to pre-register for the 2007 Annual PAPER conference in San Francisco December 6-7.

The Pacific chapter conference looks to be a terrific one this year. It starts off on Thursday morning with a short course titled "The Impact of Cell Phones on Survey Research" prepared by LaToya R. Lang of CMOR and Linda Piekarski of SSI.

Thursday evening join us for dinner and networking after an exciting plenary on the topic of the intersection of polling and political campaigns which features Los Angeles Times political reporter Mark Z. Barabak along with Democratic and Republican pollsters Ben Tulchin and Dick Dresner.

Panel topics on Thursday and Friday include Survey Design and Methodology, Health Policy Issues, National Elections, and the lively and interesting Western States Roundtable. We encourage advance registration by TOMORROW November 27th, but you can also register on-site. For more information, including sponsorship opportunities and registration information, visit PAPOR.org.

The conference will be in the Sir Francis Drake Hotel near Union Square. It is

a charming boutique hotel in the heart of the holiday-bedecked city. Come for the conference, stay for the weekend and do your holiday shopping. Hotel website: www.sirfrancisdrake.com

See you there!

Jill Darling, L.A. Times Poll
2007 PAPOR Conference Chair
jill.darling@latimes.com

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Tue, 27 Nov 2007 09:50:39 -0000
Reply-To: Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Iain Noble <Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK>
Subject: Re: Survey: Most prefer 'Merry Christmas'
Comments: To: edithl@XS4ALL.NL, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: A<5.1.0.14.2.20071126194309.017317b0@pop.xs4all.nl>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Actually, a slightly inaccurate rendering of the truly great Irish comedian Dave Allen's closing line 'And may your God go with you'. Asked about his own religion Allen described himself as 'a practising atheist'.

See: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dave_Allen_\(comedian\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dave_Allen_(comedian))

Iain Noble
Department for Children, Schools and Families
Young People Analysis Division - YCS and Next Steps Study,
W606, Moorfoot, Sheffield, S1 4PQ.
0114 259 1180
For information about the Next Steps Study go to
www.nextstepsstudy.org.uk or
<http://www.esds.ac.uk/longitudinal/access/lstype/>

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

>From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Edith de Leeuw

>Sent: 26 November 2007 18:44

>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

>Subject: Re: Survey: Most prefer 'Merry Christmas'

>

>As European outlier, I still prefer the tongue in cheek "happy whatsoever"

>

>And to end with an old BBC end-of-broadcast wish: "May whichever god
you
>believe in bless you"
>
>In friendship, Edith
>At 11:44 AM 11/26/2007 -0500, Leo Simonetta wrote:
>>Survey: Most prefer 'Merry Christmas'
>>Washington Times
>>
>><http://washingtontimes.com/article/20071124/NATION/111240033/1001>
>>or
>><http://tinyurl.com/34lo5c>
>>
>>Retailers shouldn't be shy about wishing customers a "Merry
Christmas."
>>
>>A new survey found that 67 percent of American adults prefer the
>>holiday-specific greeting in seasonal advertising, while only 26
percent
>>want to see "Happy Holidays."
>>
>>T--
>>Leo G. Simonetta
>>Director of Research
>>Art & Science Group, LLC
>>6115 Falls Road, Suite 101
>>Baltimore MD 21209
>>
>>--
>
>Dr. Edith D. de Leeuw, MethodikA
>Plantage Doklaan 40, NL-1018 CN Amsterdam
>tel + 31 20 622 34 38 fax + 31 20 330 25 97
>e-mail edithl@xs4all.nl
>-----
>Hope is like a small light in the dark
> It keeps the nightmares away till the dawn of a new world
>
> http://i.euniverse.com/funpages/cms_content/2529/4candles.swf
>
>-----
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
>set aapornet nomail
>On your return send this: set aapornet mail
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu
>
>This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the Government
Secure
>Intranet Anti-Virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless in partnership
with MessageLabs.
>(CCTM Certificate Number 2006/04/0007.) In case of problems, please

call your
>organisation's IT Helpdesk.
>Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored
and/or recorded for
>legal purposes.

The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intranet Anti-Virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2006/04/0007.) On leaving the GSi this email was certified virus free.

Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Tue, 27 Nov 2007 06:56:42 -0500
Reply-To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>
Subject: Re: median spending plans
Comments: To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: A<A3F14ED8-A3FF-4C10-9998-43FC7F874F5C@panix.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Doug,
If you have five numbers, 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, the mean and median each equal 3. But if you substitute 50, the median stays the same, but the mean becomes 60/5, or 12.
So there are about the same number of people above and below the median figure of 500, but the average goes up because there are more people in the top category, and while the bottom category is zero, by necessity, the top category is probably more than 1,000. That creates what one would call a skewed distribution.
Another example: the CEO of a company makes \$10,000,000, and 100 workers make \$50,000 each, then the median is \$50,000, and the mean is \$15,000,000/101, or \$148,515.

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: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Doug Henwood

Sent: Monday, November 26, 2007 4:35 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: median spending plans

I just had a very unsatisfactory emails exchange with some people at Gallup about this, so maybe someone can tell me if I'm off base on this.

Gallup has a history of its holiday spending intentions at:

<<http://www.gallup.com/poll/102865/Christmas-Spending-Projection-Still-Looks-Positive.aspx#3>>.

The latest mean is \$866, up from \$826 last year. (No breakdown on how much is Merry Christmas and how much is Happy Holidays spending.) The median is \$500 this year - and \$500 in 2006. And 2005. And 2004. In fact, it's been \$500 for ten consecutive observations. When I queried this using the web form, I got this response:

> Here is the answer form one of the editors:

>
> "I don't understand why he thinks it's impossible. That's what the
> data have shown based on how people answer the question. I think
> we'd need to understand more why he thinks it's not possible in
> order to address his question."

When I said that sounded totally implausible, I got back this response:

> Lots of people give \$500 estimates, and this large group hovers
> near the middle of the distribution, so it will take a lot to move
> the median off \$500.

This sound like a mode, not a median, but still. How can this be possible?

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
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/radio-feed.php>>
iTunes: <<http://phobos.apple.com/WebObjects/MZStore.woa/wa/viewPodcast?id=73801817>>

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

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Tue, 27 Nov 2007 10:32:05 -0600
Reply-To: "Jeffrey M. Jones" <jmj8@VERIZON.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Jeffrey M. Jones" <jmj8@VERIZON.NET>
Subject: median spending plans from Gallup
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=UTF-8
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

To provide some background and clarification on this thread:

The question wording of our Christmas spending item is:

51. Roughly, how much money do you think you, personally, will spend on Christmas gifts this year?

It is open-ended -- respondents can give any dollar amount they choose. We also accept responses of "Do not celebrate Christmas".

Assuming it goes through aapornet, I've attached the full distribution of results for the polls in which we observed the low and high means. We provided this to Doug yesterday afternoon, but are providing for others who are interested in digging into the data. If for some reason you don't get the attachment but would like to see the results, write back to me and I can forward them to you.

The analysis of our most recent results on Christmas spending is here:

<http://www.gallup.com/poll/102865/Christmas-Spending-Projection-Still-Looks-Positive.aspx>

Jeffrey M. Jones, PhD
Managing Editor, The Gallup Poll

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Tue, 27 Nov 2007 12:12:58 -0500
Reply-To: Howard Fienberg <hfienberg@CMOR.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Howard Fienberg <hfienberg@CMOR.ORG>
Subject: Surveys to cell phones + Text messaging and TCPA
Comments: To: Jonathan Brill <brillje@UMDNJ.EDU>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU, stephanie@BERGANALYTICS.COM, Benjamin Phillips <bpillips@BRANDEIS.EDU>
In-Reply-To: <s74a943e.070@smtppnc.umdnc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

To clarify, autodialed calls (and possibly automated text messages) to cell phones without express prior consent are prohibited by federal law - the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA). This DOES apply to survey and opinion research. Pre-existing business relationships do not have any impact.

To Stephanie's point, however, in many cases, if the respondent provides their cell phone number as their contact number, such provision is usually deemed to equal prior consent to call (for survey and opinion research purposes, not necessarily for telemarketing).

As for arrangements whereby the researcher ensures that the respondent is never billed or charged in any way for the call, this would certainly be a good move. It could also be a more respondent-friendly arrangement than providing some kind of compensation for their lost minutes. However, researchers would still need express prior consent to contact respondents on their cell phones, unless the contacts were made through manual dialing.

Sincerely,
Howard Fienberg
Director of Government Affairs
CMOR: Promoting & Advocating Survey & Opinion Research
hfienberg@cmor.org
1111 16th St. NW, Suite 120
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 775-5170
Fax: (202) 775-5172
<http://www.cmor.org>
<http://www.youropinioncounts.org>

Disclaimer: The information provided in this message is for guidance and

informational purposes only. It is not intended to be a substitute for legal advice. CMOR advises all parties to consult with private legal counsel regarding the interpretation and application of any laws to your business.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jonathan Brill
Sent: Monday, November 26, 2007 9:39 AM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: Surveys to cell phones

Stephanie:

If a R provided the research interviewer with a cell phone number, then the R invited the research organization to call him/her at that number. Assuming there were no promises made not to call other than in predefined circumstances, the respondent's decision to provide the cell phone number would appear to constitute permission/consent to be recontacted at that cell phone number. In my view, therefore, it is not only okay to call the respondent at that cell number, but it would be wrong to attempt to recontact the respondent through any other manner/means not specifically consented to by the respondent.

Regards,
Jonathan

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm) Panel Research Program Associate Director,
Research Call Center & 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
www.oranjbowl.info

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.

>>> Stephanie Berg <stephanie@BERGANALYTICS.COM> 11/23/2007 11:44 AM

>>>

There's been a lot of discussion recently about dialing and/or texting cell

phones. However, I'd like clarification about a specific issue. I'm involved with a few customer surveys and have recently encountered instances where the contact phone number provided by the customer is a cell phone number. So while there is a pre-existing business relationship, and market research calls are typically exempt anyway, I'm still concerned about the cost issue for the respondent. Does the fact that a customer provided his cell phone number (as a primary contact number) exempt the researcher from the cost issue? In most of the cases it was not known in advance - nor was it possible to know - that the number was a cell phone number. Could someone from CMOR comment?

stephanie berg
p 301.537.0817
f 703.940.4815
stephanie@berganalytics.com

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:

aapornet-request@asu.edu

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

Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Tue, 27 Nov 2007 12:50:39 -0600

Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>

Subject: Re: Surveys to cell phones + Text messaging and TCPA

Comments: cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

In-Reply-To: <[011201c83118\\$c3ac1530\\$6501a8c0@mradom.mranet.org](mailto:011201c83118$c3ac1530$6501a8c0@mradom.mranet.org)>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

1. Cell phone only now exceeds 10% of all households. My experience is that cell phone usage begins in teenage or even pre-teen years. By the time these kids finish college, they never go back. My guess is these folks probably have abundant "anytime" minutes. They are billed for (say) 1000 minutes of outbound and inbound minutes whether they use them or not.

2. Phone number portability to wireless from landline (wireline) phones is available in some areas according to the FCC. This means telephone prefixes (exchanges) are no longer unique between wireline and wireless carriers. The future according to the FCC: "Pursuant to a court-ordered stay, most small wireline carriers currently are not required to port numbers to wireless carriers until the FCC completes and publishes a study about the effect of the porting rules on small carriers". And SSI's RDD phone samples can include both "dedicated" and "shared/mixed" wireline/wireless service prefixes.

3. Many states ask for phone numbers when people register to vote. This means RBS samples include both wireline and wireless phone numbers. Prior consent?

Are phone surveys already including some cell phone users without even knowing it? Might be worth adding wireline or wireless phone contact as a demographic.

Nick Panagakis

Howard Fienberg wrote:

>To clarify, autodialed calls (and possibly automated text messages) to cell
>phones without express prior consent are prohibited by federal law - the
>Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA). This DOES apply to survey and
>opinion research. Pre-existing business relationships do not have any
>impact.

>
>To Stephanie's point, however, in many cases, if the respondent provides
>their cell phone number as their contact number, such provision is usually
>deemed to equal prior consent to call (for survey and opinion research
>purposes, not necessarily for telemarketing).

>
>As for arrangements whereby the researcher ensures that the respondent is
>never billed or charged in any way for the call, this would certainly be a
>good move. It could also be a more respondent-friendly arrangement than
>providing some kind of compensation for their lost minutes. However,
>researchers would still need express prior consent to contact respondents on
>their cell phones, unless the contacts were made through manual dialing.

>
>Sincerely,
>Howard Fienberg
>Director of Government Affairs
>CMOR: Promoting & Advocating Survey & Opinion Research
>hfienberg@cmor.org
>1111 16th St. NW, Suite 120
>Washington, DC 20036
>(202) 775-5170
>Fax: (202) 775-5172
><http://www.cmor.org>
><http://www.youropinioncounts.org>

>
>Disclaimer: The information provided in this message is for guidance and
>informational purposes only. It is not intended to be a substitute for legal
>advice. CMOR advises all parties to consult with private legal counsel
>regarding the interpretation and application of any laws to your business.

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

>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jonathan Brill
>Sent: Monday, November 26, 2007 9:39 AM
>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
>Subject: Re: Surveys to cell phones

>
>Stephanie:

>
>If a R provided the research interviewer with a cell phone number, then the
>R invited the research organization to call him/her at that number.
>Assuming there were no promises made not to call other than in predefined
>circumstances, the respondent's decision to provide the cell phone number
>would appear to constitute permission/consent to be recontacted at that cell
>phone number. In my view, therefore, it is not only okay to call the

>respondent at that cell number, but it would be wrong to attempt to
>recontact the respondent through any other manner/means not specifically
>consented to by the respondent.

>
>Regards,
>Jonathan

>
>Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
>General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm) Panel Research Program Associate Director,
>Research Call Center & 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
>www.oranjbowl.info

>
>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.

>
>
>
>
>>>>Stephanie Berg <stephanie@BERGANALYTICS.COM> 11/23/2007 11:44 AM

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

>There's been a lot of discussion recently about dialing and/or texting cell
>phones. However, I'd like clarification about a specific issue. I'm involved
>with a few customer surveys and have recently encountered instances where
>the contact phone number provided by the customer is a cell phone number. So
>while there is a pre-existing business relationship, and market research
>calls are typically exempt anyway, I'm still concerned about the cost issue
>for the respondent. Does the fact that a customer provided his cell phone
>number (as a primary contact number) exempt the researcher from the cost
>issue? In most of the cases it was not known in advance - nor was it
>possible to know - that the number was a cell phone number. Could someone
>from CMOR comment?

>
>
>
>stephanie berg
>p 301.537.0817
>f 703.940.4815
>stephanie@berganalytics.com

>

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
=====

Date: Wed, 28 Nov 2007 10:05:29 -0500
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Recent Zogby matchup poll
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Mark Penn: Buckling Under the Pressure of an Unfavorable Poll

All is fair in love and war, the centuries-old proverb states. Politics is not included, but given the way the game is played in modern-day America, maybe it should be. That's the sense I had again this morning watching Mark Penn, the chief political strategist for Democrat Hillary Clinton, denigrate our latest Zogby Interactive survey simply because it showed his client in a bad light ([Link to Latest Poll Number](#)). Penn made the contention on the MSNBC morning news program hosted by Joe Scarborough ([Link to Video](#))

SNIP

<http://www.zogby.com/news/ReadNews.dbm?ID=1394>

The Mystery Pollster has a article on the Zogby results

Zogby Internet Poll Trial Heats are Odd

A new Zogby Interactive poll, conducted using volunteers over the internet, has produced some odd results for trial heats involving Senator Clinton against all four top Republican opponents. What makes this especially odd is that the results are not equally unusual for Obama.

SNIP

http://www.pollster.com/blogs/zogby_internet_poll_trial_heat.php

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Director of Research
Art & Science Group, LLC

6115 Falls Road, Suite 101
Baltimore MD 21209

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

Date: Wed, 28 Nov 2007 12:01:05 -0500
Reply-To: Tresa Udem <tudem@LAKERESEARCH.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Tresa Udem <tudem@LAKERESEARCH.COM>
Subject: Recent Zogby matchup poll
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Hi All,

Is AAPOR weighing in on this? Does AAPOR have that capacity? This = morning I received the following from a colleague (Daily Kos - liberal = blogger) this morning. I haven't had time to fact check it, but if it is = indeed true I hope we can work to address this - either now or in the = upcoming months:

"...according to Google News right now, the "Hillary loses against all = Republicans in the general" poll has been cited by over 200 media, while = the far more respectable Gallup effort which shows that Hillary in fact = beats them all has been far less reported....The Zogby survey was = covered repeatedly on CNN, earned coverage from MSNBC, Fox News, and = Reuters and was covered by multiple other smaller outlets." (see full = entry below)

-Tresa

Tresa Udem
Vice President
Lake Research Partners
1726 M ST NW, Suite 500
WDC, 20036
202.776.9066

Zogby "interactive" polls are junk <?xml:namespace prefix =3D o ns =3D =
"urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:office" />

by kos <<http://kos.dailykos.com/>> =20

Wed Nov 28, 2007 at 06:53:47 AM PST

I know Hillary's opponents are jumping on Zogby Interactive's latest = poll showing Hillary doing substantially poorer than her opponents in = head-to-head matchups than her opponents.

Let me make this as clear as possible: Zogby interactive polls are JUNK. =
They are about as solid as the Daily Kos cattle call polls would be if =
we were trying to claim the community represented all Democrats.

Witness this little bit of disclaimer =

<http://news.yahoo.com/s/nm/20071126/pl_nm/usa_politics_poll_dc_1> :

The poll of 9,355 people had a margin of error of plus or minus one =
percentage point. The interactive poll surveys individuals who have =
registered to take part in online polls.=20

How a poll that is essentially a web poll can be considered credible is =
beyond me. But you don't have to take my word for it. Look at how =
<http://online.wsj.com/public/article/SB116360961928023945-NgMgbTwNTEbcTx=_C47luM8eH8IM_20071115.html?mod=3Dblogs> poorly the Zogby interactive =
poll performed in 2006 (after a disastrous debut in 2004):

I opted to use Mr. Mitofsky's method in my own number crunching. I =
looked at five pollsters that were among the most prolific: Rasmussen, =
SurveyUSA, Zogby (which releases separate telephone and online polls) =
and Washington, D.C.-based Mason-Dixon. For all but the latter, I used =
the numbers posted on the organizations' own Web sites. For Mason-Dixon, =
which keeps some of its poll data behind a subscriber wall, I used =
Pollster.com to find polls from the two weeks before the election. I =
checked the results against vote counts as of this Tuesday [...]

On to the results: In the Senate races, the average error on the margin =
of victory was tightly bunched for all the phone polls. Rasmussen (25 =
races) and Mason-Dixon (15) each were off by an average of fewer than =
four points on the margin. Zogby's phone polls (10) and SurveyUSA (18) =
each missed by slightly more than four points. Just four of the 68 phone =
polls missed by 10 points or more, with the widest miss at 18 points.

But the performance of Zogby Interactive, the unit that conducts surveys =
online, demonstrates the dubious value of judging polls only by whether =
they pick winners correctly. As Zogby noted in a press release, its =
online polls identified 18 of 19 Senate winners correctly. But its =
predictions missed by an average of 8.6 percentage points in those polls =
-- at least twice the average miss of four other polling operations I =
examined. Zogby predicted a nine-point win for Democrat Herb Kohl in =
Wisconsin; he won by 37 points. Democrat Maria Cantwell was expected to =
win by four points in Washington; she won by 17 [...]

The picture was similar in the gubernatorial races (where Zogby polled =
only online, not by phone). Mason-Dixon's average error was under 3.4 =
points in 14 races. Rasmussen missed by an average of 3.8 points in 30 =
races; SurveyUSA was off by 4.4 points, on average, in 18 races. But =
Zogby's online poll missed by an average of 8.3 points, erring on six =
races by more than 15 points.=20

Seriously, Zogby polls suck. Yet according to Google News right now, the =
"Hillary loses against all Republicans in the general" poll has been =
cited by over 200 media, while the far more respectable Gallup effort =
which shows that Hillary in fact beats them all has =

<http://www.talkingpointsmemo.com/horsemouth/2007/11/media_lavishes.php>=
been far less reported.

The Zogby survey was covered repeatedly on CNN, earned coverage from =
MSNBC, Fox News, and Reuters and was covered by multiple other smaller =
outlets.

By contrast, I can't find a single example of any reporter or =
commentator on the major networks or news outlets referring to the =
Gallup poll at all, with the lone exception of UPI. While the Zogby poll =
was mentioned by multiple reporters and pundits, the only mentions the =
Gallup poll got on TV were from Hillary advisers who had to bring it up =
themselves on the air in order to inject it into the conversation.

You could argue that the Zogby poll got all the coverage it did =
precisely because it is out of sync with multiple other polls, and thus =
is news. But the truth is that the reporters and editors at the major =
nets know full well that the Zogby poll is bunk -- yet they breathlessly =
covered it anyway.

Worse, the Zogby poll was covered with few mentions either of its =
dubious methodology or of the degree to which its findings don't jibe =
with other surveys. Bottom line: The Zogby poll was considered big news =
because many in the political press are heavily invested in the =
Hillary-is-unelectable narrative for all kinds of reasons that have =
little to do with a desire to, you know, practice journalism.=20

The media has its agenda, which right now is the "Hillary is fading" =
narrative. The hard core supporters of the other Democratic primary =
candidates have their agenda -- to raise bullshit "electability" =
arguments against Hillary.

And those of us who remain reality-based and dispassionate throughout =
this all can only shake our heads at the credence being put in a =
discredited skill of a "pollster".

Update: Pollster.com =
<http://www.pollster.com/blogs/zogby_internet_poll_trial_heat.php> :

It is reasonable that the people who volunteer to take political polls =
over the internet are considerably more interested in politics (and =
likely more strongly partisan) than is a random sample of likely voters. =
That should be expected to lead to fewer people with "don't know" =
responses as better informed and more partisan respondents are likely to =
both know more about the candidates and to have made up their minds =
sooner than a proper random sample. That helps explain why Zogby's 2006 =
internet polls looked as they did.

But this does no good in Clinton's case.=20

Actually, it's a perfect explanation. You see Hillary's results =
<<http://www.dailykos.com/storyonly/2007/10/22/153814/28>> in the dKos =
straw poll? In all internet polls she far underperforms her "real world" =
numbers.

Update II: Steve Singiser had similar thoughts =
<<http://www.dailykos.com/story/2007/11/27/204423/12>> last night.

=20

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta
Sent: Wednesday, November 28, 2007 10:05 AM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Recent Zogby matchup poll

Mark Penn: Buckling Under the Pressure of an Unfavorable Poll

All is fair in love and war, the centuries-old proverb states. Politics is not included, but given the way the game is played in modern-day America, maybe it should be. That's the sense I had again this morning watching Mark Penn, the chief political strategist for Democrat Hillary Clinton, denigrate our latest Zogby Interactive survey simply because it showed his client in a bad light (Link to Latest Poll Number). Penn made the contention on the MSNBC morning news program hosted by Joe Scarborough (Link to Video)

SNIP

<http://www.zogby.com/news/ReadNews.dbm?ID=3D1394>

The Mystery Pollster has a article on the Zogby results

Zogby Internet Poll Trial Heats are Odd

A new Zogby Interactive poll, conducted using volunteers over the internet, has produced some odd results for trial heats involving Senator Clinton against all four top Republican opponents. What makes this especially odd is that the results are not equally unusual for Obama.

SNIP

http://www.pollster.com/blogs/zogby_internet_poll_trial_heat.php

--

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

Baltimore MD 21209

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

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

Date: Wed, 28 Nov 2007 09:52:08 -0800
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>
Subject: internet versus FTC survey
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The SF Chronicle (www.sfgate.com) has an article today about identity theft where they report an FTC survey as placing the rate is 3.7% and then a Gartner Internet poll as twice as high. The journalist wrote:

...the Gartner report was based on responses by 5,000 adults who took part in an Internet survey - leaving open the question of which estimate is closer to the facts, and whether the phone or Internet survey is superior.

I wrote to journalist and explained that the FTC survey was a far superior methodology (RDD national probability sample) and the internet survey method would bias with a higher proportion of high SES people, and exactly those at greater risk for identity theft. Then I invited him to attend PAPOR :-).

-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
Yahoo Messenger: leora_lawton

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

Date: Wed, 28 Nov 2007 12:52:26 -0500

Reply-To: Tresa Udem <tudem@LAKERESEARCH.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Tresa Udem <tudem@LAKERESEARCH.COM>
Subject: Re: Recent Zogby matchup poll
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

p.s. I mis-phrased that - Kos is not my colleague. I received his entry from a colleague.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Tresa Udem
Sent: Wednesday, November 28, 2007 12:01 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Recent Zogby matchup poll

Hi All,

Is AAPOR weighing in on this? Does AAPOR have that capacity? This morning I received the following from a colleague (Daily Kos - liberal blogger) this morning. I haven't had time to fact check it, but if it is indeed true I hope we can work to address this - either now or in the upcoming months:

"...according to Google News right now, the "Hillary loses against all Republicans in the general" poll has been cited by over 200 media, while the far more respectable Gallup effort which shows that Hillary in fact beats them all has been far less reported....The Zogby survey was covered repeatedly on CNN, earned coverage from MSNBC, Fox News, and Reuters and was covered by multiple other smaller outlets." (see full entry below)

-Tresa

Tresa Udem
Vice President
Lake Research Partners
1726 M ST NW, Suite 500
WDC, 20036
202.776.9066

Zogby "interactive" polls are junk <?xml:namespace prefix = o ns =
"urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:office" />

by kos <<http://kos.dailykos.com/>>

Wed Nov 28, 2007 at 06:53:47 AM PST

I know Hillary's opponents are jumping on Zogby Interactive's latest poll showing Hillary doing substantially poorer than her opponents in head-to-head matchups than her opponents.

Let me make this as clear as possible: Zogby interactive polls are JUNK. They

are about as solid as the Daily Kos cattle call polls would be if we were trying to claim the community represented all Democrats.

Witness this little bit of disclaimer

<http://news.yahoo.com/s/nm/20071126/pl_nm/usa_politics_poll_dc_1> :

The poll of 9,355 people had a margin of error of plus or minus one percentage point. The interactive poll surveys individuals who have registered to take part in online polls.

How a poll that is essentially a web poll can be considered credible is beyond me. But you don't have to take my word for it. Look at how

<http://online.wsj.com/public/article/SB116360961928023945-NgMgbTwNTEbcTx_C47luM8eH8IM_20071115.html?mod=blogs> poorly the Zogby interactive poll performed in 2006 (after a disastrous debut in 2004):

I opted to use Mr. Mitofsky's method in my own number crunching. I looked at five pollsters that were among the most prolific: Rasmussen, SurveyUSA, Zogby (which releases separate telephone and online polls) and Washington, D.C.-based Mason-Dixon. For all but the latter, I used the numbers posted on the organizations' own Web sites. For Mason-Dixon, which keeps some of its poll data behind a subscriber wall, I used Pollster.com to find polls from the two weeks before the election. I checked the results against vote counts as of this Tuesday [...]

On to the results: In the Senate races, the average error on the margin of victory was tightly bunched for all the phone polls. Rasmussen (25 races) and Mason-Dixon (15) each were off by an average of fewer than four points on the margin. Zogby's phone polls (10) and SurveyUSA (18) each missed by slightly more than four points. Just four of the 68 phone polls missed by 10 points or more, with the widest miss at 18 points.

But the performance of Zogby Interactive, the unit that conducts surveys online, demonstrates the dubious value of judging polls only by whether they pick winners correctly. As Zogby noted in a press release, its online polls identified 18 of 19 Senate winners correctly. But its predictions missed by an average of 8.6 percentage points in those polls -- at least twice the average miss of four other polling operations I examined. Zogby predicted a nine-point win for Democrat Herb Kohl in Wisconsin; he won by 37 points. Democrat Maria Cantwell was expected to win by four points in Washington; she won by 17 [...]

The picture was similar in the gubernatorial races (where Zogby polled only online, not by phone). Mason-Dixon's average error was under 3.4 points in 14 races. Rasmussen missed by an average of 3.8 points in 30 races; SurveyUSA was off by 4.4 points, on average, in 18 races. But Zogby's online poll missed by an average of 8.3 points, erring on six races by more than 15 points.

Seriously, Zogby polls suck. Yet according to Google News right now, the "Hillary loses against all Republicans in the general" poll has been cited by over 200 media, while the far more respectable Gallup effort which shows that Hillary in fact beats them all has

<http://www.talkingpointsmemo.com/horsesmouth/2007/11/media_lavishes.php> been far less reported.

The Zogby survey was covered repeatedly on CNN, earned coverage from MSNBC, Fox News, and Reuters and was covered by multiple other smaller outlets.

By contrast, I can't find a single example of any reporter or commentator on the major networks or news outlets referring to the Gallup poll at all, with the lone exception of UPI. While the Zogby poll was mentioned by multiple reporters and pundits, the only mentions the Gallup poll got on TV were from Hillary advisers who had to bring it up themselves on the air in order to inject it into the conversation.

You could argue that the Zogby poll got all the coverage it did precisely because it is out of sync with multiple other polls, and thus is news. But the truth is that the reporters and editors at the major nets know full well that the Zogby poll is bunk -- yet they breathlessly covered it anyway.

Worse, the Zogby poll was covered with few mentions either of its dubious methodology or of the degree to which its findings don't jibe with other surveys. Bottom line: The Zogby poll was considered big news because many in the political press are heavily invested in the Hillary-is-unelectable narrative for all kinds of reasons that have little to do with a desire to, you know, practice journalism.

The media has its agenda, which right now is the "Hillary is fading" narrative. The hard core supporters of the other Democratic primary candidates have their agenda -- to raise bullshit "electability" arguments against Hillary.

And those of us who remain reality-based and dispassionate throughout this all can only shake our heads at the credence being put in a discredited shill of a "pollster".

Update: Pollster.com

<http://www.pollster.com/blogs/zogby_internet_poll_trial_heat.php> :

It is reasonable that the people who volunteer to take political polls over the internet are considerably more interested in politics (and likely more strongly partisan) than is a random sample of likely voters. That should be expected to lead to fewer people with "don't know" responses as better informed and more partisan respondents are likely to both know more about the candidates and to have made up their minds sooner than a proper random sample. That helps explain why Zogby's 2006 internet polls looked as they did.

But this does no good in Clinton's case.

Actually, it's a perfect explanation. You see Hillary's results <<http://www.dailykos.com/storyonly/2007/10/22/153814/28>> in the dKos straw poll? In all internet polls she far underperforms her "real world" numbers.

Update II: Steve Singiser had similar thoughts

<<http://www.dailykos.com/story/2007/11/27/204423/12>> last night.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta

Sent: Wednesday, November 28, 2007 10:05 AM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: Recent Zogby matchup poll

Mark Penn: Buckling Under the Pressure of an Unfavorable Poll

All is fair in love and war, the centuries-old proverb states. Politics is not included, but given the way the game is played in modern-day America, maybe it should be. That's the sense I had again this morning watching Mark Penn, the chief political strategist for Democrat Hillary Clinton, denigrate our latest Zogby Interactive survey simply because it showed his client in a bad light (Link to Latest Poll Number). Penn made the contention on the MSNBC morning news program hosted by Joe Scarborough (Link to Video)

SNIP

<http://www.zogby.com/news/ReadNews.dbm?ID=1394>

The Mystery Pollster has a article on the Zogby results

Zogby Internet Poll Trial Heats are Odd

A new Zogby Interactive poll, conducted using volunteers over the internet, has produced some odd results for trial heats involving Senator Clinton against all four top Republican opponents. What makes this especially odd is that the results are not equally unusual for Obama.

SNIP

http://www.pollster.com/blogs/zogby_internet_poll_trial_heat.php

--

Leo G. Simonetta

Director of Research

Art & Science Group, LLC

6115 Falls Road, Suite 101

Baltimore MD 21209

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

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

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

=====
Date: Wed, 28 Nov 2007 13:22:04 -0800
Reply-To: "P. Moy" <pmoy@U.WASHINGTON.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "P. Moy" <pmoy@U.WASHINGTON.EDU>
Subject: Reminder: 1 Dec deadline, WAPOR call for papers
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: MULTIPART/MIXED; BOUNDARY="-1903391476-18080680-1196284924=:19789"

This message is in MIME format. The first part should be readable text,
while the remaining parts are likely unreadable without MIME-aware tools.

---1903391476-18080680-1196284924=:19789
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=CP1252; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: QUOTED-PRINTABLE

61st ANNUAL CONFERENCE: "Polls for the Public Good"
New Orleans, Louisiana, USA

A joint meeting with the American Association for Public Opinion Research
WAPOR: Tuesday, May 13 to Thursday, May 15, 2008
AAPOR: Thursday, May 15 to Sunday, May 18, 2008

CALL FOR PAPERS

The World Association for Public Opinion Research will hold its annual=20
conference May 13-15, 2008 in New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, in conjunction=
=20
with the annual meeting of the American Association for Public Opinion=20
Research (AAPOR). WAPOR seeks proposals for original research papers to be=
=20
presented at this conference. We welcome proposals on the conference theme=
=20
"Polls for the Public Good," the themes below, as well as other topics=20
that may be of interest to WAPOR members:

Polls and policy
Public opinion on social, economic and political issues
Citizens and government
Comparative international research
Public opinion theory

Media and public opinion
Trust in government
Internet surveys
Recent elections around the world
Survey research in emerging democracies
Research methodology
Communication research

Individual proposals should include a general, 300-word description of the
research paper (research topic, specific research questions or hypotheses,
methods and results), as well as full contact information (mailing
address, e-mail address and telephone number) for each co-author or
participant on a separate sheet. Similarly, panel proposals should include
a 300-word description of each presentation as well as full contact
information for each panelist.

All proposals should be submitted electronically (Word, WordPerfect, or
text document; please, no PDF files). All submissions must be received by
December 1, 2007. Submitters will be notified of the Conference
Committee's decisions the week of December 17, 2007. If your proposal
is accepted, we expect the text of the full paper by April 15, 2008.

Please email proposals by December 1, 2007 to the conference chair:

Alejandro Moreno
Department of Political Science
Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México
Rio Hondo No. 1, Tizapan-San Ángel
Mexico D.F., 01000, Mexico
Telephone: (52) 5628-4000 ext. 3760 or 3702
Fax: (52) 5490-4672
Email: wapor2008@itam.mx

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

---1903391476-18080680-1196284924=:19789--

=====
Date: Thu, 29 Nov 2007 13:37:57 -0500
Reply-To: Allan Rivlin <arivlin@HARTRESEARCH.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Allan Rivlin <arivlin@HARTRESEARCH.COM>
Subject: Statewide Omnibus Surveys NY CO MA
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Anyone know of (or do) any omnibus polls of voters or adults within states?
Particularly NY, CO and MA?

We have a client with just a few questions to ask and want to find them a
good value.

Allan Rivlin
Partner, Peter D. Hart Research
1724 Connecticut Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20009
(202) 234-5570

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Thu, 29 Nov 2007 13:42:39 -0500
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: English Usage among Hispanics in the United States
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

English Usage among Hispanics in the United States
Pew Hispanic Center

<http://pewresearch.org/pubs/644/english-language-usage-hispanics>

Nearly all Hispanic adults born in the United States of immigrant parents report they are fluent in English. By contrast, only a small minority of their parents describe themselves as skilled English speakers. This finding of a dramatic increase in English-language ability from one generation of Hispanics to the next emerges from a new analysis of six Pew Hispanic Center surveys conducted this decade among a total of more than 14,000 Latino adults.¹ The surveys show that fewer than one-in-four (23%) Latino immigrants report being able to speak English very well. However, fully 88% of their U.S.-born adult children report that they speak English very well. Among later generations of Hispanic adults, the figure rises to 94%. Reading ability in English shows a similar trend.²

SNIP

--

Leo G. Simonetta

Director of Research
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road, Suite 101
Baltimore MD 21209

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Thu, 29 Nov 2007 14:20:09 -0500
Reply-To: Howard Fienberg <hfienberg@CMOR.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Howard Fienberg <hfienberg@CMOR.ORG>
Subject: Re: Surveys to cell phones + Text messaging and TCPA
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Comments: cc: "Richard C. Rockwell" <richard.rockwell@uconn.edu>
In-Reply-To: <[011201c83118\\$c3ac1530\\$6501a8c0@mradom.mranet.org](mailto:011201c83118$c3ac1530$6501a8c0@mradom.mranet.org)>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Richard kindly asked me to clarify one more thing regarding the TCPA restrictions on contacting cell phones with automated telephone dialing systems:

"could you speak to the question of whether a person's providing a phone number --- whether land line or wireless -- for the purpose of voter registration would constitute prior consent to be contacted for research? I just don't see that, and I think it is a dangerous argument to make, because it opens the door to declaring that anytime a person puts down a phone number somewhere, that person is consenting to be contacted."

Richard is correct: just because someone consented to having their information on a list does NOT mean that ANYONE getting their hands on that list automatically has permission (legal or ethical) to contact said respondent at that address/phone number. Consent would only easily apply to the entity that requested it in the first place.

In the case of a voter registration list, Average Joe Researcher would NOT be presumed to have express prior consent to use an autodialer to contact a voter on the cell phone number that voter provided in registering.

Sincerely,
Howard Fienberg
Director of Government Affairs
CMOR: Promoting & Advocating Survey & Opinion Research
hfienberg@cmor.org
1111 16th St. NW, Suite 120
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 775-5170

Fax: (202) 775-5172
<http://www.cmor.org>
<http://www.youropinioncounts.org>

Disclaimer: The information provided in this message is for guidance and informational purposes only. It is not intended to be a substitute for legal advice. CMOR advises all parties to consult with private legal counsel regarding the interpretation and application of any laws to your business.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Howard Fienberg
Sent: Tuesday, November 27, 2007 12:13 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Surveys to cell phones + Text messaging and TCPA

To clarify, autodialed calls (and possibly automated text messages) to cell phones without express prior consent are prohibited by federal law - the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA). This DOES apply to survey and opinion research. Pre-existing business relationships do not have any impact.

To Stephanie's point, however, in many cases, if the respondent provides their cell phone number as their contact number, such provision is usually deemed to equal prior consent to call (for survey and opinion research purposes, not necessarily for telemarketing).

As for arrangements whereby the researcher ensures that the respondent is never billed or charged in any way for the call, this would certainly be a good move. It could also be a more respondent-friendly arrangement than providing some kind of compensation for their lost minutes. However, researchers would still need express prior consent to contact respondents on their cell phones, unless the contacts were made through manual dialing.

Sincerely,
Howard Fienberg
Director of Government Affairs
CMOR: Promoting & Advocating Survey & Opinion Research hfienberg@cmor.org
1111 16th St. NW, Suite 120
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 775-5170
Fax: (202) 775-5172
<http://www.cmor.org>
<http://www.youropinioncounts.org>

Disclaimer: The information provided in this message is for guidance and informational purposes only. It is not intended to be a substitute for legal advice. CMOR advises all parties to consult with private legal counsel regarding the interpretation and application of any laws to your business.

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

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

Sent: Monday, November 26, 2007 9:39 AM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: Re: Surveys to cell phones

Stephanie:

If a R provided the research interviewer with a cell phone number, then the R invited the research organization to call him/her at that number.

Assuming there were no promises made not to call other than in predefined circumstances, the respondent's decision to provide the cell phone number would appear to constitute permission/consent to be recontacted at that cell phone number. In my view, therefore, it is not only okay to call the respondent at that cell number, but it would be wrong to attempt to recontact the respondent through any other manner/means not specifically consented to by the respondent.

Regards,
Jonathan

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.

General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm) Panel Research Program Associate Director,
Research Call Center & 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

www.oranjbowl.info

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.

>>> Stephanie Berg <stephanie@BERGANALYTICS.COM> 11/23/2007 11:44 AM

>>>

There's been a lot of discussion recently about dialing and/or texting cell phones. However, I'd like clarification about a specific issue. I'm involved with a few customer surveys and have recently encountered instances where the contact phone number provided by the customer is a cell phone number. So while there is a pre-existing business relationship, and market research calls are typically exempt anyway, I'm still concerned about the cost issue for the respondent. Does the fact that a customer provided his cell phone number (as a primary contact number) exempt the researcher from the cost

issue? In most of the cases it was not known in advance - nor was it possible to know - that the number was a cell phone number. Could someone from CMOR comment?

stephanie berg
p 301.537.0817
f 703.940.4815
stephanie@berganalytics.com

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail Please ask authors before

Richard C. ROCKWELL

Professor of Sociology &

Associate Head

Department of Sociology

University of Connecticut

344 Mansfield Rd.

Storrs, CT 06269-2068

U.S.A.

richard.rockwell@uconn.edu

Office: +1.860.486.0086

Office fax: +1.860.486.6356

=20

=20

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

From: Howard Fienberg [mailto:hfienberg@cmor.org]=20

Sent: Thursday, November 29, 2007 2:20 PM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Cc: Rockwell, Richard

Subject: [!! SPAM] RE: Surveys to cell phones + Text messaging and TCPA

=20

Richard kindly asked me to clarify one more thing regarding the TCPA

restrictions on contacting cell phones with automated telephone dialing

systems:

=20

"could you speak to the question of whether a person's providing a phone

number --- whether land line or wireless -- for the purpose of voter

registration would constitute prior consent to be contacted for
research? I

just don't see that, and I think it is a dangerous argument to make,
because

it opens the door to declaring that anytime a person puts down a phone

number somewhere, that person is consenting to be contacted."

=20

Richard is correct: just because someone consented to having their information on a list does NOT mean that ANYONE getting their hands on that list automatically has permission (legal or ethical) to contact said respondent at that address/phone number. Consent would only easily apply to the entity that requested it in the first place.

=20

In the case of a voter registration list, Average Joe Researcher would NOT be presumed to have express prior consent to use an autodialer to contact a voter on the cell phone number that voter provided in registering.

=20

Sincerely,

Howard Fienberg =20

Director of Government Affairs

CMOR: Promoting & Advocating Survey & Opinion Research

hfienberg@cmor.org

1111 16th St. NW, Suite 120

Washington, DC 20036

(202) 775-5170

Fax: (202) 775-5172

<http://www.cmor.org>

<http://www.youopinioncounts.org>

=20

Disclaimer: The information provided in this message is for guidance and

informational purposes only. It is not intended to be a substitute for legal

advice. CMOR advises all parties to consult with private legal counsel

regarding the interpretation and application of any laws to your business.

=20

=20

=20

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

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

Sent: Tuesday, November 27, 2007 12:13 PM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: Surveys to cell phones + Text messaging and TCPA

=20

To clarify, autodialed calls (and possibly automated text messages) to cell

phones without express prior consent are prohibited by federal law - the

Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA). This DOES apply to survey and

opinion research. Pre-existing business relationships do not have any

impact.

=20

To Stephanie's point, however, in many cases, if the respondent provides

their cell phone number as their contact number, such provision is usually

deemed to equal prior consent to call (for survey and opinion research

purposes, not necessarily for telemarketing).

=20

As for arrangements whereby the researcher ensures that the respondent is

never billed or charged in any way for the call, this would certainly be
a

good move. It could also be a more respondent-friendly arrangement than
providing some kind of compensation for their lost minutes. However,

researchers would still need express prior consent to contact
respondents on

their cell phones, unless the contacts were made through manual dialing.

=20

Sincerely,

Howard Fienberg =20

Director of Government Affairs

CMOR: Promoting & Advocating Survey & Opinion Research
hfienberg@cmor.org

1111 16th St. NW, Suite 120

Washington, DC 20036

(202) 775-5170

Fax: (202) 775-5172

<http://www.cmor.org>

<http://www.youopinioncounts.org>

=20

Disclaimer: The information provided in this message is for guidance and

informational purposes only. It is not intended to be a substitute for
legal

advice. CMOR advises all parties to consult with private legal counsel

regarding the interpretation and application of any laws to your
business.

=20

=20

=20

=20

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

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

Sent: Monday, November 26, 2007 9:39 AM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: Re: Surveys to cell phones

=20

Stephanie:

=20

If a R provided the research interviewer with a cell phone number, then the

R invited the research organization to call him/her at that number.=20

Assuming there were no promises made not to call other than in predefined

circumstances, the respondent's decision to provide the cell phone number

would appear to constitute permission/consent to be recontacted at that cell

phone number. In my view, therefore, it is not only okay to call the

respondent at that cell number, but it would be wrong to attempt to

recontact the respondent through any other manner/means not specifically

consented to by the respondent.

=20

Regards,

Jonathan

=20

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.

General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm) Panel Research Program Associate
Director,

Research Call Center & 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

www.oranjbowl.info

=20

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.

=20

=20

>>> Stephanie Berg <stephanie@BERGANALYTICS.COM> 11/23/2007 11:44 AM

>>>=20

There's been a lot of discussion recently about dialing and/or texting
cell

phones. However, I'd like clarification about a specific issue. I'm involved

with a few customer surveys and have recently encountered instances where

the contact phone number provided by the customer is a cell phone number. So

while there is a pre-existing business relationship, and market research

calls are typically exempt anyway, I'm still concerned about the cost issue

for the respondent. Does the fact that a customer provided his cell phone

number (as a primary contact number) exempt the researcher from the cost

issue? In most of the cases it was not known in advance - nor was it

possible to know - that the number was a cell phone number. Could someone

from CMOR comment?

=20

=20

=20

stephanie berg

p 301.537.0817

f 703.940.4815

stephanie@berganalytics.com=20

=20

=20

=20

=20

=20

=20

=20

On your return send this: set aapornet mail Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

aapornet-request@asu.edu

=20

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

Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

aapornet-request@asu.edu

=20

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=20

=20

=20

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

Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Date: Thu, 29 Nov 2007 22:02:31 -0500

Reply-To: Michael Bocian <michael_bocian@HOTMAIL.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Michael Bocian <michael_bocian@HOTMAIL.COM>
Subject: job postings
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <CB9825001B72084D9199A352C35CBFCE0163D8C5@EXCHANGE.B.mgmt.ad.uconn.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="Windows-1252"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research is posting a few job openings:

=20
Director of Programming

=20
Greenberg Quinlan Rosner is a global leader in public opinion research and strategic consulting. Please visit our website at www.greenbergresearch.com to learn more.

=20
Our Survey Programmers translate survey questionnaires written by analysts into the ASKIA data software program for use by telephone interviewers and then manipulate the data collected into usable formats for analysts. They ensure that accurate data is provided to the firm's analytical teams and clients, and that the questionnaire is consistent with GQRR standards and remains compatible with the previous surveys.

=20
The Director is responsible for the people and projects within the programming department, ensuring accurate and efficient creation, manipulation and output of survey data. He/she will collaborate effectively with analytical teams to manage the data collected; understand and utilize effective management techniques and tools to ensure a highly productive department; and identify, document and disseminate survey research programming knowledge to the department and all staff.

=20
This position requires a minimum of three years survey programming experience on ASKIA or a similar program and experience managing staff and projects. Public opinion polling and/or political experience preferred.

=20
Please submit resumes with salary requirements via email to jobs@gqrr.com.

=20
Greenberg Quinlan Rosner is an Equal Opportunity Employer.

=20
=20
Survey Programmer

=20
Greenberg Quinlan Rosner is an internationally recognized public opinion research firm specializing in work around the world for progressive political campaigns and parties, public interest organizations and foundations as well as corporate crisis management and positioning. You can learn more about GQR at www.greenbergresearch.com
Responsibilities: Utilize software package (similar to SAS and SPSS) to create and process survey datasets and tabulate results; program, review and test survey instruments (computer-assisted interviewing programs); ensure data

ta accuracy.Candidate profile: Problem solver with experience in computer a= applications and ability to learn new software. Detail oriented and technica= lly inclined person with good communication skills. Team player. Experience= with Microsoft Windows and Office required. Experience with databases, cam= paigns and/or survey research a strong plus.Submit cover letter, resume and= salary requirements to: jobs@gqrr.com
Greenberg Quinlan Rosner is an Equal Opportunity Employer.

Put your friends on the big screen with Windows Vista=AE + Windows Live=99.
http://www.microsoft.com/windows/shop/specialoffers.mspx?ocid=3DTEXT_TAGLM_C=PC_MediaCtr_bigscreen_102007=

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Fri, 30 Nov 2007 09:56:40 -0500
Reply-To: Doug Usher <Doug.Usher@WIDMEYER.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Doug Usher <Doug.Usher@WIDMEYER.COM>
Subject: Job Opening -- DC -- Deputy Research Director
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Please use contact info below, or contact me directly off-list at doug.usher@widmeyer.com.

=20

VP/Deputy Research Director

=20

Widmeyer Communications' growing research and polling practice is looking for a deputy director. Primary responsibilities will be qualitative research, though quantitative skills are also necessary. Our clients include non-profit organizations, government agencies and corporations. Fast-paced (but sane) work environment. =20

=20

The ideal candidate will also have experience managing employees, and leading business development efforts. This is a terrific position for an experienced researcher, combining rigorous analytical skills with entrepreneurial opportunities.

=20

Responsibilities include:

=20

- * Representing Research internally and externally
- * Project and team management
- * Identifying new business opportunities
- * Developing research plans and proposals=20
- * Designing research instruments
- * Moderating focus groups and interviews
- * Providing data analysis=20
- * Writing reports and strategic recommendations
- * Presenting findings to clients

=20

Qualifications include:

=20

- * Minimum 5 years experience in public opinion research.=20
- * Master's degree (or higher) in social science or related discipline preferred=20
- * Excellent writing, verbal and analytical skills=20
- * Demonstrated experience in developing communications strategies=20
- * Ability to manage multiple projects simultaneously=20
- * Communications agency experience a plus=20

=20

=20

=20

Please fax or email resumes to:

Widmeyer Communications

Attn: Human Resources

Reference: Research

jobs@widmeyer.com

=20

=20

Doug Usher

Senior Vice President

Widmeyer Communications

202.667.0901 x141

=20

www.widmeyer.com <<http://www.widmeyer.com/>>=20

=20

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Fri, 30 Nov 2007 16:45:18 -0500
Reply-To: Jonathan Brill <brillje@UMDNJ.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jonathan Brill <brillje@UMDNJ.EDU>
Subject: serendipitous sampling experience
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Disposition: inline

I am in the process of running a research study in which respondent recruitment is being done using list-assisted RDD methods. One of the sample cases turned out to be my next door neighbor's home - I serendipitously learned the household had been called when my neighbor happened to mention the event while we were supervising our kids at play together. As it happened, one of my interviewers had determined through administration of screening questions with an adult informant that one member of the household is eligible to participate in the study. (The informant was not the eligible respondent.) Unfortunately, however, the eligible individual has a crazy schedule which, even after several subsequent call attempts, had the effect of losing the household according to our case management protocol programmed into our CATI system.

My eligible neighbor has indicated an interest in participating in the research and, of course, I would want him to participate in order to maximize coverage and sample representational validity.

However, it has occurred to me that, if I manually override the final disposition code to refresh the case in order to allow my neighbor to be

recruited into the study, the sample case represented by his household's telephone number would be treated differently than all other cases are.

Questions:

1. Would this special handling of the case - i.e., the creation of a second (and therefore greater) opportunity to participate in the research - violate the Belmont Report's principle of justice?
2. Would this special handling of the case introduce any methodologically compromising sampling issues (either practical or theoretical, even if inconsequential in practice)?

Regards,
Jonathan

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm) Panel Research Program
Associate Director, Research Call Center & 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
www.oranjbowl.info

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.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.