

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 LOG0902"

Date: Mon, 2 Feb 2009 11:49:46 -0500
Reply-To: David Roe <droe@SURVEYSCIENCES.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: David Roe <droe@SURVEYSCIENCES.COM>
Subject: Data Check in a Web Grid?
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

I recently viewed a self administered web survey where, in a multiple item grid, one of the "questions" was: "To help us check the data, please select 'I'm really not sure' here".

=20

Is anyone aware of any presentations or publications on the use of items where respondents are directed to choose a specific category in an attempt to check against non-optimal responses?

=20

Thanks!

=20

David J. Roe, M.A.

Survey Sciences Group, LLC

droe@surveysciences.com

734.213.4600 x105

=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: Mon, 2 Feb 2009 12:36:56 -0500
Reply-To: Howard Fienberg <howard.fienberg@MRA-NET.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Howard Fienberg <howard.fienberg@MRA-NET.ORG>
Subject: MRA Implores White House to Appoint New Director of the Census Bureau Immediately
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Marketing Research Association Implores White House to Appoint New Director of the Census Bureau Immediately

(Glastonbury, Conn.) Today the Marketing Research Association (MRA) called on the White House to swiftly appoint a new Director of the U.S. Bureau of the Census. In order to ensure a complete and accurate decennial Census, MRA feels that the Census Bureau needs an experienced director to assume immediate responsibility for this complex task.

Preparations for the 2010 Census are on an unalterable schedule. As MRA's Director of Government Affairs, Howard Fienberg, explained today in correspondence to White House Chief of Staff Rahm Emanuel, "MRA appreciates the challenges facing the Administration at the Department of Commerce, [but] the importance of the Director position outweighs the need to wait for the appointment of a Secretary of Commerce."

MRA feels that the Census Bureau needs strong, knowledgeable leadership and a steady hand so dauntingly close to the 2010 Census and called upon the White House to nominate a new Director immediately.

Read the letter:

http://www.mra-net.org/pdf/Letter_emanuel_census_director.pdf
<http://www.mra-net.org/pdf/Letter_emanuel_census_director.pdf>=20

###

The Marketing Research Association is the leading and largest association of the survey and opinion research profession. It promotes, advocates and protects the integrity of the survey and opinion research profession and strives to improve respondent cooperation in opinion research which is a multi-billion dollar a year industry dedicated to providing valuable information to guide decisions of companies, individuals and others. For more information, visit www.mra-net.org.

<http://www.mra-net.org/pdf/Letter_emanuel_census_director.pdf> =20
=20

Howard Fienberg
Director of Government Affairs
Marketing Research Association (MRA)
howard.fienberg@mra-net.org
1111 16th St. NW, Suite 120
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 775-5170
Fax: (202) 775-5172
<http://www.mra-net.org> <<http://www.mra-net.org>>=20

http://www.cmor.org
<http://www.cmorhttp://www.linkedin.com/in/howardfienberg.org>=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: Mon, 2 Feb 2009 12:57:35 -0500
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing
Subject: Re: Data Check in a Web Grid?
Comments: To: David Roe <droe@SURVEYSCIENCES.COM>
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To:
<3F59CB4687A2C34BBEC1465DC86A950313CC5F@corp01.surveysciences.local>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

In ye olde dayes, that kind of thing was done sometimes to catch data entry people getting out of sync in a complex questionnaire.

Not sure what the purpose might be for a self-administered web questionnaire. Could be a mistake.

Jan Werner

David Roe wrote:

> I recently viewed a self administered web survey where, in a multiple
> item grid, one of the "questions" was: "To help us check the data,
> please select 'I'm really not sure' here".
>
>
>
> Is anyone aware of any presentations or publications on the use of items
> where respondents are directed to choose a specific category in an
> attempt to check against non-optimal responses?
>
>
>
> Thanks!
>
>
>
> _____
>
> David J. Roe, M.A.
>
> Survey Sciences Group, LLC

>
> droe@surveysciences.com
>
> 734.213.4600 x105
>
>
>
>
> -----
> 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: Mon, 2 Feb 2009 10:11:14 -0800
Reply-To: Jennifer Franz <JDFranz@JDFRANZ.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jennifer Franz <JDFranz@JDFRANZ.COM>
Subject: Re: Data Check in a Web Grid?
Comments: To: David Roe <droe@SURVEYSCIENCES.COM>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To:
<3F59CB4687A2C34BBEC1465DC86A950313CC5F@corp01.surveysciences.local>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Only when I bought a new car and they told me how I should answer! And then obviously for highly unscientific reasons.

Jennifer D. Franz, Ph.D.
President
JD Franz Research, Inc.
(916) 614-8777 Phone
(916) 614-8765 Fax

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of David Roe
Sent: Monday, February 02, 2009 8:50 AM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Data Check in a Web Grid?

I recently viewed a self administered web survey where, in a multiple item grid, one of the "questions" was: "To help us check the data, please select 'I'm really not sure' here".

Is anyone aware of any presentations or publications on the use of items

where respondents are directed to choose a specific category in an attempt to check against non-optimal responses?

Thanks!

David J. Roe, M.A.

Survey Sciences Group, LLC

droe@surveysciences.com

734.213.4600 x105

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: Mon, 2 Feb 2009 13:23:12 -0500

Reply-To: David Roe <droe@SURVEYSCIENCES.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: David Roe <droe@SURVEYSCIENCES.COM>

Subject: Re: Data Check in a Web Grid?

Comments: To: jwerner@jwdp.com

Comments: cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

My assumption is that it was done in order to identify possible "straight-lining".

David J. Roe, M.A.

Survey Sciences Group, LLC

droe@surveysciences.com

734.213.4600 x105

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

From: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com]
Sent: Monday, February 02, 2009 12:58 PM
To: David Roe
Cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: Data Check in a Web Grid?

In ye olde dayes, that kind of thing was done sometimes to catch data entry people getting out of sync in a complex questionnaire.

Not sure what the purpose might be for a self-administered web questionnaire. Could be a mistake.

Jan Werner

David Roe wrote:

> I recently viewed a self administered web survey where, in a multiple
> item grid, one of the "questions" was: "To help us check the data,
> please select 'I'm really not sure' here".

>

>

>

> Is anyone aware of any presentations or publications on the use of
items

> where respondents are directed to choose a specific category in an
> attempt to check against non-optimal responses?

>

>

>

> Thanks!

>

>

>

>

>

> _____
> David J. Roe, M.A.

>

> Survey Sciences Group, LLC

>

> droe@surveysciences.com

>

> 734.213.4600 x105

>

>

>

>

>

> -----
> 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: Mon, 2 Feb 2009 14:53:02 -0500
Reply-To: "Beach, Scott Richard" <scottb@PITT.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Beach, Scott Richard" <scottb@PITT.EDU>
Subject: Web surveys with embedded sound files
Comments: To: "AAPORNET@asu.edu" <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

AAPOR Colleagues:

Does anyone have any experience with conducting web surveys with embedded sound files that can be played to simulate audio computer-assisted self-interviewing (A-CASI)? The instructions would need to explain that the respondent should wear headphones when doing the survey. A client is interested in trying this with a teenage/young adult population for a fairly sensitive topic.

Any experiences or relevant references would be appreciated.

Thanks.

Scott Beach, Ph.D.
Director, Survey Research Program
University Center for Social & Urban Research
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA (GO STEELERS!)

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, 2 Feb 2009 15:35:22 -0500
Reply-To: "Butterworth, Michael" <MXB@CBSNEWS.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Butterworth, Michael" <MXB@CBSNEWS.COM>
Subject: Re: Data Check in a Web Grid?
Comments: To: David Roe <droe@SURVEYSCIENCES.COM>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <3F59CB4687A2C34BBEC1465DC86A950313CC92@corp01.surveysciences.local>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

It could be a Turing test - to prevent AIs from taking the survey.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of David Roe
Sent: Monday, February 02, 2009 1:23 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: Data Check in a Web Grid?

My assumption is that it was done in order to identify possible "straight-lining".

David J. Roe, M.A.
Survey Sciences Group, LLC
droe@surveysciences.com
734.213.4600 x105

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

From: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com]
Sent: Monday, February 02, 2009 12:58 PM
To: David Roe
Cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: Data Check in a Web Grid?

In ye olde dayes, that kind of thing was done sometimes to catch data entry people getting out of sync in a complex questionnaire.

Not sure what the purpose might be for a self-administered web questionnaire. Could be a mistake.

Jan Werner

David Roe wrote:

> I recently viewed a self administered web survey where, in a multiple
> item grid, one of the "questions" was: "To help us check the data,
> please select 'I'm really not sure' here".

>

>

>

> Is anyone aware of any presentations or publications on the use of
> items

> where respondents are directed to choose a specific category in an
> attempt to check against non-optimal responses?

>

>

>

> Thanks!

>

>

>

>

>

> David J. Roe, M.A.

>

> Survey Sciences Group, LLC

>
> droe@surveysciences.com

>
> 734.213.4600 x105

>
>
>
>
> -----
> 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: Mon, 2 Feb 2009 15:45:11 -0500
Reply-To: "Painter, John S." <PainterJS@VMI.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Painter, John S." <PainterJS@VMI.EDU>
Subject: reducing over survey and increasing response rates
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: A<D751154249FA5F46AEA4158526596897CE5E8F@mraexch.mra-dom.mra-net.org>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Dear members,

A colleague recently posed the following question / issue at an assessment listserv. This is indeed an increasingly urgent issue for many colleges and universities. Any advice?

"As I'm sure many are, we at [a U.S. public university] are struggling with declining response rates for surveys we conduct for assessment purposes, as well as the over surveying of our students--two related but distinct issues.

We are thinking of ways to improve coordination and to establish some policies or guidelines for the conduct of academic and institutional survey research. We see these two types of research as requiring somewhat distinct approaches. Does anyone have established

policies/guidelines concerning the use of University distribution lists that would address the issues of improving coordination and reducing the number of surveys your students fill out each semester? Thanks in advance"

Thanks,
John

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, 2 Feb 2009 15:33:14 -0500
Reply-To: Mike Donatello <mike@DONATELLO.US>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Donatello <mike@DONATELLO.US>
Subject: Job opening
Comments: To: "AAPORNET@asu.edu" <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

FYI, below. Please reply to the address given, not to me. Thanks.

=====
Senior Research Analyst, USA TODAY

The Senior Research Analyst helps position USA TODAY as a leader in the marketplace. Will use syndicated, proprietary and internal resources to understand all aspects of the USA TODAY audience, including demographics, psychographics and buying behaviors, across all business platforms. Emphasis on support of advertising and circulation sales categories and worldwide sales force. Candidate should be a high-energy, strategic thinker who will build and maintain relationships with internal and external customers to heighten impact of research findings. Strong analytical and PC skills a must. Familiarity with media/advertising environment is mandatory, and experience in primary research is a plus. Minimum requirements are a college degree; seven years relevant experience; excellent communication, organizational, interpersonal and time-management skills; and the ability to work effectively in a fast-paced, data-intensive, multi-project environment. Must have extensive working experience with online/off-line media data retrieval systems and syndicated research services such as MRI, MMR, CMR, etc.

This position is located at our corporate headquarters in McLean, VA (Washington, D.C. area). For consideration, please email resume and cover letter to: jobs@usatoday.com and mention AAPORnet as your source in the email.

=====

Mike Donatello
703.582.5680
mike@donatello.us

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, 2 Feb 2009 16:30:18 -0500
Reply-To: "Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D."
<jonathan.brill.wh82@wharton.upenn.edu>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D."
<jonathan.brill.wh82@WHARTON.UPENN.EDU>
Subject: Re: Web surveys with embedded sound files
Comments: To: "Beach, Scott Richard" <scottb@PITT.EDU>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; format=flowed; charset="iso-8859-1";
reply-type=original
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Scott,

I am very interested in this subject and would like to know what you learn from the AAPORNET community and your investigations.

To start you out on the road to discovery about ACASI, however, I can tell you that I am aware of two products.

One is QDS, which has ACASI capability. Nova Research is the vendor.

The other product I know of is offered by Tera Tech through Audio Data Systems. ADS can be reached at 888-238-9911 or 704-523-6204.

I also know that Alice Tang at Tufts University has been using an ACASI system for interviewing HIV respondents. Her phone number is 617.636.2140 if you wish to follow-up and learn what she is using.

Regards,
Jonathan

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
SBU Head, Marketing Research Consulting & Operations
Satyam Computer Services Ltd.
3 Oak Ridge Court
Voorhees, NJ 08043

Telephone: 856.772-9030
Fax: 775.898-2651
Business cell: 856.673-8092
Business e-mail: Jonathan_Brill@satyam.com
Alternate e-mail: jonathan.brill.wh82@wharton.upenn.edu

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

From: "Beach, Scott Richard" <scottb@PITT.EDU>
To: <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
Sent: Monday, February 02, 2009 2:53 PM
Subject: Web surveys with embedded sound files

AAPOR Colleagues:

Does anyone have any experience with conducting web surveys with embedded sound files that can be played to simulate audio computer-assisted self-interviewing (A-CASI)? The instructions would need to explain that the respondent should wear headphones when doing the survey. A client is interested in trying this with a teenage/young adult population for a fairly sensitive topic.

Any experiences or relevant references would be appreciated.

Thanks.

Scott Beach, Ph.D.
Director, Survey Research Program
University Center for Social & Urban Research
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA (GO STEELERS!)

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: Mon, 2 Feb 2009 15:48:53 -0800
Reply-To: Melinda Jackson <mjackson@EMAIL.SJSU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Melinda Jackson <mjackson@EMAIL.SJSU.EDU>
Subject: Re: reducing over survey and increasing response rates
Comments: To: "Painter, John S." <PainterJS@VMI.EDU>
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <1A5D283567B2B847AF7F34E7B32F709FFDF0FC@EMAIL.vmi.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

John,

Here at San Jose State we have a new policy on surveys of students. The relevant portion reads:

Requests from researchers for surveys of students will be evaluated by the IDMC [Institutional Data Management Council] in collaboration with other units as appropriate to determine the institutional impact of surveying students, e.g., to ensure that students are not asked to participate in an inappropriately high number of surveys. Requests for student contact data from researchers wishing to survey students may be approved or denied based on recommendations from the review team, and in accord with campus priorities for data request fulfillment.

The full policy is available at:

<http://www.sjsu.edu/president/directives/pd0802/>

This IDMC committee is run out of our Office of Institutional Research. It seems to be working fine so far. The Survey and Policy Research Institute on campus was able to secure approval for a pre-election online survey of SJSU students and alumni last fall under this new policy.

Best,

Melinda Jackson

Research Director, Survey and Policy Research Institute

Assistant Professor, Dept. of Political Science

San Jose State University

Painter, John S. wrote:

> Dear members,

>

> A colleague recently posed the following question / issue at an
> assessment listserv. This is indeed an increasingly urgent issue for
> many colleges and universities. Any advice?

>

> "As I'm sure many are, we at [a U.S. public university] are struggling
> with declining response rates for surveys we conduct for assessment
> purposes, as well as the over surveying of our students--two related but
> distinct issues.

>

> We are thinking of ways to improve coordination and to establish some
> policies or guidelines for the conduct of academic and institutional
> survey research. We see these two types of research as requiring
> somewhat distinct approaches. Does anyone have established
> policies/guidelines concerning the use of University distribution lists
> that would address the issues of improving coordination and reducing the
> number of surveys your students fill out each semester? Thanks in
> advance"

>
>
> Thanks,
> John
>
> -----
> 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
>
>
>

--
Melinda Jackson
Assistant Professor, Dept. of Political Science
Research Director, Survey and Policy Research Institute
San Jose State University
One Washington Square
San Jose, CA 95192-0119
408-924-5293

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, 3 Feb 2009 09:37:10 -0500
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: How a Self-Fulfilling Stereotype Can Drag Down Performance
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

How a Self-Fulfilling Stereotype Can Drag Down Performance

By Shankar Vedantam

Washington Post

http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/02/01/AR2009020102171_pf.html

or

<http://tinyurl.com/b9wuqo>

Monday, February 2, 2009; A05

Here's a trick question, so think carefully before you answer: If someone mentions the word "beast" to you, which word would you match it with?

1. Afraid. 2. Words. 3. Large. 4. Animal. 5. Separate.

A beast is an animal, of course, so what's the trick? It's that getting the right answer may depend on who asks you the question.

Vocabulary questions like this have been routinely posed to thousands of Americans as part of the General Social Survey, a national survey that tracks societal trends. And for years, blacks have scored lower on the vocabulary test than whites.

Sociologist Min-Hsuing Huang recently decided to ask whether the race of the person administering the survey mattered: He found that when black people and white people answered 10 vocabulary questions posed by a white interviewer, blacks on average answered 5.49 questions correctly and whites answered 6.33 correctly -- a gap typical of the ones found on many standardized tests.

Huang then examined the performance of African Americans who interacted with black interviewers: He found that black respondents then answered 6.33 questions correctly -- the same as white ones. The reason African Americans scored more poorly on tests administered by white interviewers, Huang theorized, is that these situations can make the issue of race salient and subtly remind the test-takers of the societal stereotype that blacks are intellectually inferior to whites.

SNIP

=20

=20

--=20

Leo G. Simonetta

Director of Research

Art & Science Group

6115 Falls Road, Suite 101=20

Baltimore, MD 21209=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: Tue, 3 Feb 2009 13:36:26 -0500
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Poll vs Poll in the Atlantic
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Poll v. Poll: How Each Side Describes "Card Check"

<http://tinyurl.com/dho7p2>

=20

I've obtained some internal polling from proponents of the Employee Free Choice Act that shows us precisely how interest groups shape public opinion as they gague it.=20

=20

Let's take the main provision of EFCA -- "card check," which the AFL-CIO now calls "majority sign up."

=20

The AFL-CIO's polling firm, Hart Research Associates, asks respondents whether they'd support legislation that "[a]llows employees to have a union once a majority of employees in a workplace sign authorization cards indicating they want to form a union."=20

=20

75% say yes.

=20

Pollster John McLaughlin, working for the Coalition for a Democratic Workplace,the question this way: "There is a bill in Congress called the Employee Free Choice Act which would effectively replace a federally supervised secret ballot election with a process that requires a majority of workers to simply sign a card to authorize organizing a union and the workers' signatures would be made public to their employer, the union organizers and their co-workers. Do you support or oppose Congress passing this legislation?"

=20

74% say no.

=20

SNIP

=20

=20

Which was followed by

=20

Poll v. Poll: A Response

=20

<http://tinyurl.com/dklzb5>

=20

And=20

=20

Poll v. Poll: AFL-CIO's Pollster Responds To Mike Murphy

=20

<http://tinyurl.com/cdxldt>

=20

=20

--=20

Leo G. Simonetta

Director of Research

Art & Science Group

6115 Falls Road, Suite 101=20

Baltimore, MD 21209=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: Tue, 3 Feb 2009 14:20:48 -0800
Reply-To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@GMAIL.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@GMAIL.COM>
Subject: Re: Poll vs Poll in the Atlantic
Comments: To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To:
<3248A9B21DD5574785FE5E2C8E521684CBC0A1@exchange.local.artsience.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Great Leo,

Thanks. The trick, obviously, is that the anti-Free Choice Act question suggests (dishonestly) but without actually lying, that the employer would get the names even if the Union organizers did not get the 50% plus one, thereby exposing those workers who signed up to retaliation (firing). Which is to say the question appears to be concerned about the protection of the workers rights when it was written to get respondents to move away from any inclination to support workers' right to a quick unionization process without being subjected to intimidation. In the midst of being polled people are highly unlikely to think long enough about this slight of hand (or word) to realize that the names would only be public if the Union had enough names to submit them and declare a victory. Then when they submitted the names to NLRB the employer would have access, but also would already be obligated to negotiate a contract. Those negotiations and that contract (as well as the NLRA) would always protect the rights of organizers and those who signed cards. The question for the Public Opinion research community, however, is: how to police self-serving political polling so that each specific intentional distortion of meaning is either publicly castigated in the Media by experts or there are some professionally based penalties for that kind of activity. With the moral scruples of our culture sinking lower each day, and the grab for money increasing as the economy falters, I think these are more than trivial questions. And I appreciate your bringing such gross examples to light.

Marc

Marc Sapir MD, MPH
510-848-3826
marcsapir@gmail.com

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta
Sent: Tuesday, February 03, 2009 10:36 AM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Poll vs Poll in the Atlantic

Poll v. Poll: How Each Side Describes "Card Check"

<http://tinyurl.com/dho7p2>

I've obtained some internal polling from proponents of the Employee Free Choice Act that shows us precisely how interest groups shape public opinion as they gague it.

Let's take the main provision of EFCA -- "card check," which the AFL-CIO now calls "majority sign up."

The AFL-CIO's polling firm, Hart Research Associates, asks respondents whether they'd support legislation that "[a]llows employees to have a union once a majority of employees in a workplace sign authorization cards indicating they want to form a union."

75% say yes.

Pollster John McLaughlin, working for the Coalition for a Democratic Workplace, the question this way: "There is a bill in Congress called the Employee Free Choice Act which would effectively replace a federally supervised secret ballot election with a process that requires a majority of workers to simply sign a card to authorize organizing a union and the workers' signatures would be made public to their employer, the union organizers and their co-workers. Do you support or oppose Congress passing this legislation?"

74% say no.

SNIP

Which was followed by

Poll v. Poll: A Response

<http://tinyurl.com/dklzb5>

And

Poll v. Poll: AFL-CIO's Pollster Responds To Mike Murphy

<http://tinyurl.com/cdxldt>

--

Leo G. Simonetta

Director of Research

Art & Science Group

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: Tue, 3 Feb 2009 17:54:58 -0500
Reply-To: philip_meyer@unc.edu
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>
Organization: University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Subject: Re: Poll vs Poll in the Atlantic
Comments: To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@GMAIL.COM>
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <004001c9864d\$ac488f50\$4001a8c0@RetroPoll>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Our Standards Committee used to have a procedure for inquiring into these matters and shedding light on them in a very public way. Whatever happened to that? If you know, and don't want to bother the list with it, please fill me in privately.

Thanks,
Phil Meyer

Marc Sapir wrote:

> Great Leo,
>
> Thanks. The trick, obviously, is that the anti-Free Choice Act question
> suggests (dishonestly) but without actually lying, that the employer
> would get the names even if the Union organizers did not get the 50%
> plus one, thereby exposing those workers who signed up to retaliation
> (firing). Which is to say the question appears to be concerned about
> the protection of the workers rights when it was written to get
> respondents to move away from any inclination to support workers' right
> to a quick unionization process without being subjected to intimidation.
> In the midst of being polled people are highly unlikely to think long
> enough about this slight of hand (or word) to realize that the names
> would only be public if the Union had enough names to submit them and
> declare a victory. Then when they submitted the names to NLRB the
> employer would have access, but also would already be obligated to
> negotiate a contract. Those negotiations and that contract (as well as
> the NLRA) would always protect the rights of organizers and those who
> signed cards. The question for the Public Opinion research community,
> however, is: how to police self-serving political polling so that each
> specific intentional distortion of meaning is either publicly castigated
> in the Media by experts or there are some professionally based penalties
> for that kind of activity. With the moral scruples of our culture
> sinking lower each day, and the grab for money increasing as the economy
> falters, I think these are more than trivial questions. And I appreciate
> your bringing such gross examples to light.
>
> Marc
>

> Marc Sapir MD, MPH
> 510-848-3826
> marcsapir@gmail.com

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta
> Sent: Tuesday, February 03, 2009 10:36 AM
> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
> Subject: Poll vs Poll in the Atlantic

> Poll v. Poll: How Each Side Describes "Card Check"

> <http://tinyurl.com/dho7p2>

> I've obtained some internal polling from proponents of the Employee Free
> Choice Act that shows us precisely how interest groups shape public
> opinion as they gague it.

> Let's take the main provision of EFCA -- "card check," which the AFL-CIO
> now calls "majority sign up."

> The AFL-CIO's polling firm, Hart Research Associates, asks respondents
> whether they'd support legislation that "[a]llows employees to have a
> union once a majority of employees in a workplace sign authorization
> cards indicating they want to form a union."

> 75% say yes.

> Pollster John McLaughlin, working for the Coalition for a Democratic
> Workplace, the question this way: "There is a bill in Congress called the
> Employee Free Choice Act which would effectively replace a federally
> supervised secret ballot election with a process that requires a
> majority of workers to simply sign a card to authorize organizing a
> union and the workers' signatures would be made public to their
> employer, the union organizers and their co-workers. Do you support or
> oppose Congress passing this legislation?"

> 74% say no.

>
> SNIP
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> Which was followed by
>
>
>
>
> Poll v. Poll: A Response
>
>
>
> <http://tinyurl.com/dklzb5>
>
>
>
>
> And
>
>
>
>
> Poll v. Poll: AFL-CIO's Pollster Responds To Mike Murphy
>
>
>
>
> <http://tinyurl.com/cdxldt>
>
>
>
>
>
> --
>
> Leo G. Simonetta
>
> Director of Research
>
> Art & Science Group
>
> 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: Wed, 4 Feb 2009 09:02:14 -0500
Reply-To: Richard Kulka <Richard_Kulka@ABTASSOC.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Richard Kulka <Richard_Kulka@ABTASSOC.COM>
Subject: AAPOR Finds Gilbert Burnham in Violation of Ethics Code
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=UTF-8
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

This has gone out over the wire this morning, but I wanted all of our members on AAPORnet to be aware of this action taken by the Executive Council.

EMBARGOED until 5 a.m. EDT Wednesday, February 4, 2009 -- Option 1

Press Release â€œ February 4, 2009

AAPOR Finds Gilbert Burnham in Violation of Ethics Code

Wednesday, February 3, 2009 -- The Executive Council of the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) announced Tuesday that an 8-month investigation found that Dr. Gilbert Burnham violated the Association's Code of Professional Ethics & Practices.

AAPOR found that Burnham, a faculty member at the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, repeatedly refused to make public essential facts about his research on civilian deaths in Iraq. In particular, the AAPOR inquiry focused on Burnham's publication of results from a survey reported in the October 2006 issue of the journal Lancet. When asked to provide several basic facts about this research, Burnham refused.

AAPOR holds that researchers must disclose, or make available for public disclosure, the wording of questions and other basic methodological details when survey findings are made public. This disclosure is important so that claims made on the basis of survey research findings can be independently evaluated. Section III of the AAPOR Code states: "Good professional practice imposes the obligation upon all public opinion researchers to include, in any report of research results, or to make available when that report is released, certain essential information about how the research was conducted."

Mary E. Losch, chair of AAPOR's Standards Committee, noted that AAPOR's investigation of Burnham began in March 2008, after receiving a complaint from a member. According to Losch, "AAPOR formally requested on more than one occasion from Dr. Burnham some basic information about his survey including, for example, the wording of the questions he used, instructions and explanations that were provided to respondents, and a summary of the outcomes for all households selected as potential participants in the survey. Dr. Burnham provided only partial information and explicitly refused to provide complete information about the basic elements of his research."

AAPOR's President, Richard A. Kulka, added "When researchers draw important conclusions and make public statements and arguments based on survey research data, then subsequently refuse to answer even basic questions about how their research was conducted, this violates the fundamental standards of science, seriously undermines open public debate on critical issues, and undermines the credibility of all survey and public opinion research. These concerns have been at the foundation of AAPOR's standards and professional code throughout our history, and when these principles have clearly been violated, making the public aware of these violations is in integral part of our mission and values as a professional organization."

AAPOR is the leading professional organization of public opinion and survey research professionals in the U.S., with nearly 2,200 members from government agencies, colleges and universities, nonprofit organizations, media corporations, and commercial polling firms. It is committed to the principle that public opinion research is essential to a healthy democracy, providing information crucial to informed policymaking and giving voice to the nation's beliefs, attitudes, desires, and shared experiences. To ensure that public opinion research can continue to play this critical role, AAPOR has a strong interest in protecting and strengthening the credibility of survey research. AAPOR promotes the sound and ethical conduct and use of public opinion research, along with greater public awareness of these standards.

Burnham is not a member of the organization

MEDIA CONTACTS:

President

Richard A. Kulka
Abt Associates Inc.
4620 Creekstone St., Suite 190
Durham, NC 27703
Phone: (919) 294-7710
E-Mail: Richard_Kulka@abtassoc.com

Standards Chair

Mary Losch
University of Northern Iowa
Center for Social & Behavioral Resources
221 Sabin Hall
Cedar Falls, IA 50614
Phone: (319) 273-2105
E-Mail: mary.losch@uni.edu

Associate Standards Chair

Stephen Blumberg
National Ctr. for Health Statistics, CDC
3311 Toledo Rd., Rm. 2112
Hyattsville, MD 20782
Phone: (301) 458-4107
E-Mail: sblumberg@cdc.gov

Kristin Povilonis

Executive Coordinator
Phone: (913) 895-4794
E-Mail: kpovilonis@goamp.com

Richard A. Kulka, Ph.D. | Group Vice President | Survey Research
Abt Associates Inc. 4620 Creekstone Drive, Suite 190 Durham, NC 27703
(919) 294-7710 (telephone) (617) 386-8555 (fax) (919) 219-8741 (cell)

Richard A. Kulka, Ph.D. | Group Vice President | Survey Research
Abt Associates Inc. 4620 Creekstone Drive, Suite 190 Durham, NC 27703
(919) 294-7710 (telephone) (617) 386-8555 (fax) (919) 219-8741 (cell)

President, American Association for Public Opinion Research

www.aapor.org

This message may contain privileged and confidential information intended solely for the addressee. Please do not read, disseminate or copy it unless you are the intended recipient. If this message has been received in error, we kindly ask that you notify the sender immediately by return email and delete all copies of the message from your system. Thank you.

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, 4 Feb 2009 09:16:49 -0700
Reply-To: "Matthew A. Vile" <matthew.vile@GOODWILL.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Matthew A. Vile" <matthew.vile@GOODWILL.ORG>
Subject: Re: Poll vs Poll in the Atlantic
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

To start, I'd think we would prefer to not impugn McLaughlin's motives for the question wording and stick to an evidence-based appraisal of the question. Frankly, I think the question fails on so many levels before you ever get ethical questions of survey intent. I'm not surprised McLaughlin gets a 75% "no" response - I doubt more than 30% of his respondents even actually understood the question.

That being said, I think we have to admit that the AFL-CIO's question and McLaughlin's question are focused on different topics and that neither really speaks to the other in comparable terms.

The AFL-CIO's question is clearly focused on measuring the respondents' opinions regarding ease of organizing. Presuming the AFL-CIO were surveying the general public, I'm willing to bet they could have simply asked, "Do you think it should be easy for workers to organize a union?" and they would have produced very simple results.

McLaughlin's question, though bad, is clearly focused on the secret ballot component of the issue. The most important normative question regarding

McLaughlin's question is whether anyone actually believes that the general public cares about the question of whether the ballot is "secret" in the traditional sense of the word in the U.S. or merely that the results be "protected," (meaning the voters are safe from retribution.)

Matthew A. Vile, Ph.D
Manager of Surveys and Data Analysis
(an undisclosed non-governmental organization)

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, 4 Feb 2009 12:38:08 -0500

Reply-To: Marc Zwelling <marc@VECTORRESEARCH.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Marc Zwelling <marc@VECTORRESEARCH.COM>

Subject: Re: Poll vs Poll in the Atlantic

Comments: To: "Matthew A. Vile" <matthew.vile@GOODWILL.ORG>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

In-Reply-To: <LISTSERV%200902040916492268.9A73@LISTS.ASU.EDU>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Interesting that both questions accept the frame that belonging to a union - unlike other legal organizations such as the NRA or the Republican Party - could subject someone to reprisals and intimidation.

Marc Zwelling, CMRP

Vector Research + Development Inc. / 416.733.2320

<http://www.vectorresearch.com>

... Turning questions into strategy

This message has been scanned by Norton Antivirus 2008 Professional

<http://securityresponse.symantec.com/>

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

From: Matthew A. Vile [<mailto:matthew.vile@GOODWILL.ORG>]

Sent: Wednesday, February 04, 2009 11:17 AM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: Re: Poll vs Poll in the Atlantic

To start, I'd think we would prefer to not impugn McLaughlin's motives for

the question wording and stick to an evidence-based appraisal of the question. Frankly, I think the question fails on so many levels before you ever get ethical questions of survey intent. I'm not surprised McLaughlin get's a 75% "no" response - I doubt more than 30% of his respondents even actually understood the question.

That being said, I think we have to admit that the AFL-CIO's question and McLaughlin's question are focused on different topics and that neither really speaks to the other in comparable terms.

The AFL-CIO's question is clearly focused on measuring the respondents' opinions regarding ease of organizing. Presuming the AFL-CIO were surveying the general public, I'm willing to bet they could have simply asked, "Do you think it should be easy for workers to organize a union?" and they would have produced very simple results.

McLaughlin's question, though bad, is clearly focused on the secret ballot component of the issue. The most important normative question regarding McLaughlin's question is whether anyone actually believes that the general public cares about the question of whether the ballot is "secret" in the traditional sense of the word in the U.S. or merely that the results be "protected," (meaning the voters are safe from retribution.)

Matthew A. Vile, Ph.D

Manager of Surveys and Data Analysis

(an undisclosed non-governmental organization)

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, 4 Feb 2009 09:53:13 -0800
Reply-To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@GMAIL.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@GMAIL.COM>
Subject: Re: Poll vs Poll in the Atlantic
Comments: To: Marc Zwelling <marc@VECTORRESEARCH.COM>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <BBF2A523C5484DCBA06F18DCF64E4E2A@WKS1>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Marc,

You have yourself reframed. It isn't "belonging to a union" that subjects people to retaliation but being involved in a union organizing drive. It's hardly "interesting" that that is the frame here. It's simply a matter of fact in history and in the present day. And since the Bill is directed at neutralizing that factor the framing would inevitably (pro or con) revolve around that issue. If you're not aware that people systematically get fired for trying to organize unions at their workplace, and that employers with enough money hire consulting firms to disrupt their efforts, you surely ought to be. One doesn't have to be pro-union to know such things.

marc

Marc Sapir MD, MPH
510-848-3826
marcsapir@gmail.com

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Marc Zwelling
Sent: Wednesday, February 04, 2009 9:38 AM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: Poll vs Poll in the Atlantic

Interesting that both questions accept the frame that belonging to a union - unlike other legal organizations such as the NRA or the Republican Party - could subject someone to reprisals and intimidation.

Marc Zwelling, CMRP

Vector Research + Development Inc. / 416.733.2320

<http://www.vectorresearch.com>

... Turning questions into strategy

This message has been scanned by Norton Antivirus 2008 Professional

<http://securityresponse.symantec.com/>

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

From: Matthew A. Vile [mailto:matthew.vile@GOODWILL.ORG]

Sent: Wednesday, February 04, 2009 11:17 AM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: Re: Poll vs Poll in the Atlantic

To start, I'd think we would prefer to not impugn McLaughlin's motives for

the question wording and stick to an evidence-based appraisal of the

question. Frankly, I think the question fails on so many levels before you

ever get ethical questions of survey intent. I'm not surprised McLaughlin

get's a 75% "no" response - I doubt more than 30% of his respondents even

actually understood the question.

That being said, I think we have to admit that the AFL-CIO's question and

McLaughlin's question are focused on different topics and that neither really speaks to the other in comparable terms.

The AFL-CIO's question is clearly focused on measuring the respondents' opinions regarding ease of organizing. Presuming the AFL-CIO were surveying the general public, I'm willing to bet they could have simply asked, "Do you think it should be easy for workers to organize a union?" and they would have produced very simple results.

McLaughlin's question, though bad, is clearly focused on the secret ballot

component of the issue. The most important normative question regarding

McLaughlin's question is whether anyone actually believes that the general

public cares about the question of whether the ballot is "secret" in the

traditional sense of the word in the U.S. or merely that the results

be "protected," (meaning the voters are safe from retribution.)

Matthew A. Vile, Ph.D

Manager of Surveys and Data Analysis

(an undisclosed non-governmental organization)

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, 4 Feb 2009 10:25:49 -0800
Reply-To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@GMAIL.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@GMAIL.COM>
Subject: Re: Poll vs Poll in the Atlantic
Comments: To: "Matthew A. Vile" <matthew.vile@GOODWILL.ORG>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <LISTSERV%200902040916492268.9A73@LISTS.ASU.EDU>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Matthew,

"Evidence based appraisal?" I dissected the meaning, as I understand it, of the way the wording was constructed. We do that all the time in constructing questions for surveys. It's the only way to get to a question we understand to be both fair and legitimately evaluative in the public arena. There is no "evidence" other than the wording of the question, which rather obviously distorts the issue of the Bill. What I think you mean by "evidence based appraisal" is 'don't draw a conclusion about motive/intent' without evidence. However, the distortion seems so obvious to me that I don't think it out of bounds to posit a hostile conclusion without inhabiting the heads of the people who wrote the question. If they want to challenge my interpretation, they should post their own explanation of why they made it look like people would be exposed to retaliation for signing a union card. I would truly like to hear them explain their actions.

Marc

Marc Sapir MD, MPH
510-848-3826
marcsapir@gmail.com

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Matthew A. Vile
Sent: Wednesday, February 04, 2009 8:17 AM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: Poll vs Poll in the Atlantic

To start, I'd think we would prefer to not impugn McLaughlin's motives for the question wording and stick to an evidence-based appraisal of the question. Frankly, I think the question fails on so many levels before you ever get ethical questions of survey intent. I'm not surprised McLaughlin get's a 75% "no" response - I doubt more than 30% of his respondents even actually understood the question.

That being said, I think we have to admit that the AFL-CIO's question and McLaughlin's question are focused on different topics and that neither really speaks to the other in comparable terms.

The AFL-CIO's question is clearly focused on measuring the respondents' opinions regarding ease of organizing. Presuming the AFL-CIO were surveying the general public, I'm willing to bet they could have simply asked, "Do you think it should be easy for workers to organize a union?"

and they would have produced very simple results.

McLaughlin's question, though bad, is clearly focused on the secret ballot component of the issue. The most important normative question regarding

McLaughlin's question is whether anyone actually believes that the general public cares about the question of whether the ballot is "secret" in the

traditional sense of the word in the U.S. or merely that the results be "protected," (meaning the voters are safe from retribution.)

Matthew A. Vile, Ph.D
Manager of Surveys and Data Analysis
(an undisclosed non-governmental organization)

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, 4 Feb 2009 20:06:40 +0000
Reply-To: "Langer, Gary" <Gary.Langer@ABC.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Langer, Gary" <Gary.Langer@ABC.COM>
Subject: FW: AAPOR Finds Gilbert Burnham in Violation of Ethics Code
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Update FYI: ABC News has learned that the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health is conducting its own investigation of the Burnham report "to determine if any violation of the school's rules or guidelines for the conduct of research occurred."

=20
Details at <http://abcnews.go.com/PollingUnit/story?id=3D6799754&page=3D1>
=20
=20

From: AAPOR_Executive_Office [mailto:AAPOR_Executive_Office@goamp.com]=20
Sent: Wednesday, February 04, 2009 9:15 AM
Subject: AAPOR Finds Gilbert Burnham in Violation of Ethics Code

This press release went out over the wire early this morning, but I wanted all of our members to be aware of this action taken by the Executive Council.

=20

Press Release - February 4, 2009

AAPOR Finds Gilbert Burnham in Violation of Ethics Code

Wednesday, February 3, 2009 -- The Executive Council of the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) announced Tuesday that an 8-month investigation found that Dr. Gilbert Burnham violated the Association's Code of Professional Ethics & Practices <http://www.aapor.org/aaporcodeofethics_> .

AAPOR found that Burnham, a faculty member at the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, repeatedly refused to make public essential facts about his research on civilian deaths in Iraq. In particular, the AAPOR inquiry focused on Burnham's publication of results from a survey reported in the October 2006 issue of the journal Lancet. When asked to provide several basic facts about this research, Burnham refused.

AAPOR holds that researchers must disclose, or make available for public disclosure, the wording of questions and other basic methodological details when survey findings are made public. This disclosure is important so that claims made on the basis of survey research findings can be independently evaluated. Section III of the AAPOR Code states: "Good professional practice imposes the obligation upon all public opinion researchers to include, in any report of research results, or to

make available when that report is released, certain essential information about how the research was conducted."

Mary E. Losch, chair of AAPOR's Standards Committee, noted that AAPOR's investigation of Burnham began in March 2008, after receiving a complaint from a member. According to Losch, "AAPOR formally requested on more than one occasion from Dr. Burnham some basic information about his survey including, for example, the wording of the questions he used, instructions and explanations that were provided to respondents, and a summary of the outcomes for all households selected as potential participants in the survey. Dr. Burnham provided only partial information and explicitly refused to provide complete information about the basic elements of his research."

AAPOR's President, Richard A. Kulka, added "When researchers draw important conclusions and make public statements and arguments based on survey research data, then subsequently refuse to answer even basic questions about how their research was conducted, this violates the fundamental standards of science, seriously undermines open public debate on critical issues, and undermines the credibility of all survey and public opinion research. These concerns have been at the foundation of AAPOR's standards and professional code throughout our history, and when these principles have clearly been violated, making the public aware of these violations is in integral part of our mission and values as a professional organization."

AAPOR is the leading professional organization of public opinion and survey research professionals in the U.S., with nearly 2,200 members from government agencies, colleges and universities, nonprofit organizations, media corporations, and commercial polling firms. It is committed to the principle that public opinion research is essential to a healthy democracy, providing information crucial to informed policymaking and giving voice to the nation's beliefs, attitudes, desires, and shared experiences. To ensure that public opinion research can continue to play this critical role, AAPOR has a strong interest in protecting and strengthening the credibility of survey research. AAPOR promotes the sound and ethical conduct and use of public opinion research, along with greater public awareness of these standards.

Burnham is not a member of the organization

=20

MEDIA CONTACTS:

President =20

Richard A. Kulka

Abt Associates Inc.

4620 Creekstone St., Suite 190

Durham, NC 27703

Phone: (919) 294-7710

E-Mail: Richard_Kulka@abtassoc.com <mailto:Richard_kulka@abtassoc.com_>

=20

Standards Chair =20

Mary Losch

University of Northern Iowa

Center for Social & Behavioral Resources

221 Sabin Hall

Cedar Falls, IA 50614

Phone: (319) 273-2105

E-Mail: mary.losch@uni.edu <mailto:mary.losch@uni.edu_>=20

=20

Associate Standards Chair =20

Stephen Blumberg

National Ctr. for Health Statistics, CDC

3311 Toledo Rd., Rm. 2112

Hyattsville, MD 20782

Phone: (301) 458-4107

E-Mail: sblumberg@cdc.gov <mailto:sblumberg@cdc.gov_>=20

=20

Kristin Povilonis

Executive Coordinator =20

Phone: (913) 895-4794=20

E-Mail: kpovilonis@goamp.com <mailto:kpovilonis@goamp.com_> =20

=20

=20

=20

=20

=20

=20

Please contact the Executive Office if you have any questions or comments or if you would like to be removed from this list.=20

=20

American Association for Public Opinion Research

P. O. Box 14263=20

Lenexa, KS 66285-4263

Phone: (913) 895-4601

Fax: (913) 895-4652

AAPOR-info@goAMP.com

www.AAPOR.org

=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: Wed, 4 Feb 2009 16:51:28 -0800
Reply-To: Dean Bonner <bonner@PPIC.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Dean Bonner <bonner@PPIC.ORG>
Subject: PPIC Internship Opportunity
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Dear Colleagues,

=20

I'd like to bring to your attention the Richard J. Riordan Summer Intern Program at PPIC. The Public Policy Institute of California is an

independent, nonpartisan, non-profit research institution, based in San Francisco. The institute informs policymaking by producing and disseminating high-quality, objective research on a range of public policy issues.=20

The Richard J. Riordan Summer Intern Program provides an opportunity for undergraduate and graduate students interested in a public policy career to work in a policy research environment. Intern projects are proposed by PPIC researchers and designed around a specific set of tasks and deliverables that can be accomplished within the term of the internship.

We have five summer internship opportunities available, as detailed in the descriptions on our website at

<http://www.ppic.org/main/position.asp?i=3D1201>

<<http://www.ppic.org/main/position.asp?i=3D1201>> . One of these is focused on PPIC's Statewide Survey work. =20

=20

The application deadline for these internships is March 13, 2009. We would appreciate your assistance in spreading the word about these internships to qualified candidates. =20

=20

PPIC values the wide variety of backgrounds and experiences of our staff. Key elements in the consideration of qualified candidates include excellence; diversity of talents, backgrounds, and viewpoints; and a strong fit with our mission and goals. PPIC is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action employer.

=20

Dean Bonner

Survey Project Manager

=20

PUBLIC POLICY

INSTITUTE OF CALIFORNIA
500 Washington Street, Suite 600

San Francisco, CA 94111
tel 415 291 4497

fax 415 291 4401=20

web www.ppic.org=20

=20

Any opinions expressed in this message are those of the author alone and do not necessarily reflect any position of the Public Policy Institute of California.

=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: Wed, 4 Feb 2009 22:38:52 -0500
Reply-To: Colleen Porter <colleen_porter@COX.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Colleen Porter <colleen_porter@COX.NET>
Subject: Re: AAPOR Finds Gilbert Burnham in Violation of Ethics Code
Comments: To: AAPORNET list <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
In-Reply-To: <200902041402.n147R4wx003357@lists.asu.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII; format=flowed; delsp=yes
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Mime-Version: 1.0 (Apple Message framework v930.3)

Pollster.com has a roundup of later developments for those interested in more details without wading through the zillions of blog entries that a google search brings up today, with many commentators using this to support their pre-existing viewpoint--across a wide spectrum.

My least-favorite observation was a comment at

<http://scienceblogs.com/deltoid/>

which asked, "What does an mortality survey have to do with opinion polls anyway?"

As a health care researcher who finds much fellowship at AAPOR, the connection seems obvious, but perhaps the depth and breadth of AAPOR membership is not widely understood.

On Feb 4, 2009, at 9:02 AM, Richard Kulka wrote:

>
> Mary E. Losch, chair of AAPOR's Standards Committee, noted that
> AAPOR's
> investigation of Burnham began in March 2008, after receiving a
> complaint
> from a member.

I have mixed feelings about all this.

Part of me wonders, what is the statute of limitations on disclosure?
Because here we are, 2 years and 5 months after the study's

publication, and AAPOR is just getting around to making a statement about it. The delay makes us seem like a stodgy ivory-tower organization that forms committees and ponders stuff and doesn't really *do* anything in a timely manner.

I kinda understand the timing of the complaint, because it was early January 2008 that the New England Journal of Medicine published "Violence-Related Mortality in Iraq from 2002 to 2006" by the Iraq Family Health Survey Study Group, a collaboration between the WHO and Iraqi health ministries. That group's estimates were much lower, raising questions anew about the methodology in the Lancet study. But still, it has been a full year since that impetus (because the NEJM article was available on web prior to the Jan. 31 print date).

The reference to "a complaint from a member" also sends chills down my spine. I have a good friend, a solid scientist, whose grant proposals were rejected for a few years running. He finally had to ask that a certain individual be recused from reviewing his applications and, zingo, he was funded thereafter. It turned out that a few years earlier he had given a keynote address on the development of a subspecialty of research, and had failed to mention that reviewer by name. That individual felt slighted and used every opportunity to slam my friend's manuscripts and proposals. Knowing our council, I am sure there was more than merely a single complaint by one individual that caused them to feel an investigation was warranted, and they would never allow themselves to be used by a vindictive individual...but it is not so clear from what was released.

- > AAPOR's President, Richard A. Kulka, added "When researchers draw
- > important
- > conclusions and make public statements and arguments based on survey
- > research data, then subsequently refuse to answer even basic questions
- > about how their research was conducted, this violates the fundamental
- > standards of science, seriously undermines open public debate on
- > critical
- > issues, and undermines the credibility of all survey and public
- > opinion
- > research.

Of course that's true. I agree wholeheartedly. But it applies to so many other studies out there as well. Many such cases have been discussed at AAPOR meetings and on AAPORnet, and yet those researchers weren't censured. Censure is pretty rare, isn't it? Why Burnham? Why now?

Is this a new trend? Are members being encouraged to make more use of the formal complaint process? Is AAPOR taking on the role of policeman to the world's surveys?

How do we act in a manner that is timely, but not rash? How to speak out in favor of full disclosure without sounding like a neighborhood association sending a letter that someone needs to mow their lawn more often or more carefully?

While he isn't an AAPOR member, Burnham reviewed articles for POQ and spoke at a DC AAPOR gathering shortly after the Lancet publication, and some AAPOR members reviewed his study and/or supported it in media reports at the time of publication. Does the organization need distance from him, because of those linkages?

I don't want to sound unsupportive of council or disloyal toward AAPOR, but those are the questions being asked by the journalist side of my brain today.

Colleen Porter
Gainesville, FL (where it is plummeting to 19 degrees tonight, killing this year's blueberry crop)

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, 4 Feb 2009 20:29:57 -0800

Reply-To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@GMAIL.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@GMAIL.COM>

Subject: Re: AAPOR Finds Gilbert Burnham in Violation of Ethics Code

Comments: To: Colleen Porter <colleen_porter@COX.NET>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

In-Reply-To: <76B7D1B0-2D31-48C3-B2B9-95B3CFFDC617@cox.net>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I have the same kinds of questions that Colleen raises. Certainly Burnham has a responsibility to fully disclose methodology to any colleagues and the public. Did he fail to do that with Lancet? If so the press release is justified. But how did AAPOR approach him? Was it as an organization (as a non member he would have no obligation to respond to an organization, given that the organization admittedly was "investigating" him at the request of a member) or was he approached as a colleague by an AAPOR leader or member interested in the subject matter and methods used? AAPOR can not expect or require that researchers in general have to respond to investigations by AAPOR. It would be plausible, given the political environment in the US over the past several years and particularly the polarization over the Iraq occupation, that someone in his position might feel the hot breadth of a witchhunt on his neck if this was presented as an investigation (by a group that has no legal standing to investigate him). And was it the press release that had the effect of triggering an investigation by Johns Hopkins or something else? Is Burnham's failure to divulge methods (to AAPOR) a smoking gun of any kind of impropriety? Colleen assumes that the request to AAPOR for the ethics investigation was not just by one person whose motivations may or may not be clear. I hope she's right and that the request resulted from an evaluation of the work that caused specific methodologic concern about the work's veracity? Yet if that were the case, the beef would have to go equally to the

Lancet, a prestigious peer reviewed journal whose reviewers (rather than AAPOR) had the obligation to assure that the methods were presented fully. Is Lancet also guilty of violating AAPOR's ethical code by not requiring full disclosure? If he disclosed all methods to Lancet and its reviewers then AAPOR has made an error in judgement. If not, then both the researcher and the Lancet need to be called to task simultaneously, until the study methods can be fully evaluated.

I think the press release suggests that AAPOR (as a representative of 2,200 people in the field of survey research and with an ethical standard) claims some actual legal right to police non-members. In an earlier post about the Labor legislation I urged that AAPOR should exercise its ethical standards in the real world and expose the misuse of survey methods. So in this case I am not arguing that AAPOR has no role. But I was taken aback at the strength of the intervention when --at least on the face of the press release itself--there is no real allegation of impropriety in the conduct of the research. It should be easy enough to find out whether he followed full disclosure to the Lancet or not, and so I have to assume that an 8 month investigation did that. But in that case, why is Lancet not also on the hot seat if they did not fully review the methods? More facts are needed by the AAPOR membership and so I think that AAPOR should divulge some of these details to the list in order to assuage concerns..

Marc

Marc Sapir MD, MPH
510-848-3826
marcsapir@gmail.com

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Colleen Porter
Sent: Wednesday, February 04, 2009 7:39 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: AAPOR Finds Gilbert Burnham in Violation of Ethics Code

Pollster.com has a roundup of later developments for those interested in more details without wading through the zillions of blog entries that a google search brings up today, with many commentators using this to support their pre-existing viewpoint--across a wide spectrum.

My least-favorite observation was a comment at

<http://scienceblogs.com/deltoid/>

which asked, "What does an mortality survey have to do with opinion polls anyway?"

As a health care researcher who finds much fellowship at AAPOR, the connection seems obvious, but perhaps the depth and breadth of AAPOR membership is not widely understood.

On Feb 4, 2009, at 9:02 AM, Richard Kulka wrote:

- >
- > Mary E. Losch, chair of AAPOR's Standards Committee, noted that
- > AAPOR's investigation of Burnham began in March 2008, after receiving
- > a complaint
- > from a member.

I have mixed feelings about all this.

Part of me wonders, what is the statute of limitations on disclosure? Because here we are, 2 years and 5 months after the study's publication, and AAPOR is just getting around to making a statement about it. The delay makes us seem like a stodgy ivory-tower organization that forms committees and ponders stuff and doesn't really *do* anything in a timely manner.

I kinda understand the timing of the complaint, because it was early January 2008 that the New England Journal of Medicine published "Violence-Related Mortality in Iraq from 2002 to 2006" by the Iraq Family Health Survey Study Group, a collaboration between the WHO and Iraqi health ministries. That group's estimates were much lower, raising questions anew about the methodology in the Lancet study. But still, it has been a full year since that impetus (because the NEJM article was available on web prior to the Jan. 31 print date).

The reference to "a complaint from a member" also sends chills down my spine. I have a good friend, a solid scientist, whose grant proposals were rejected for a few years running. He finally had to ask that a certain individual be recused from reviewing his applications and, zingo, he was funded thereafter. It turned out that a few years earlier he had given a keynote address on the development of a subspecialty of research, and had failed to mention that reviewer by name. That individual felt slighted and used every opportunity to slam my friend's manuscripts and proposals. Knowing our council, I am sure there was more than merely a single complaint by one individual that caused them to feel an investigation was warranted, and they would never allow themselves to be used by a vindictive individual...but it is not so clear from what was released.

- > AAPOR's President, Richard A. Kulka, added "When researchers draw
- > important conclusions and make public statements and arguments based
- > on survey research data, then subsequently refuse to answer even basic

- > questions about how their research was conducted, this violates the
- > fundamental standards of science, seriously undermines open public
- > debate on critical
- > issues, and undermines the credibility of all survey and public
- > opinion
- > research.

Of course that's true. I agree wholeheartedly. But it applies to so many other studies out there as well. Many such cases have been discussed at AAPOR meetings and on AAPORnet, and yet those researchers weren't censured. Censure is pretty rare, isn't it? Why Burnham? Why

now?

Is this a new trend? Are members being encouraged to make more use of the formal complaint process? Is AAPOR taking on the role of policeman to the world's surveys?

How do we act in a manner that is timely, but not rash? How to speak out in favor of full disclosure without sounding like a neighborhood association sending a letter that someone needs to mow their lawn more often or more carefully?

While he isn't an AAPOR member, Burnham reviewed articles for POQ and spoke at a DC AAPOR gathering shortly after the Lancet publication, and some AAPOR members reviewed his study and/or supported it in media reports at the time of publication. Does the organization need distance from him, because of those linkages?

I don't want to sound unsupportive of council or disloyal toward AAPOR, but those are the questions being asked by the journalist side of my brain today.

Colleen Porter
Gainesville, FL (where it is plummeting to 19 degrees tonight, killing this year's blueberry crop)

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, 4 Feb 2009 23:34:06 -0800
Reply-To: mark@MARKDAVIDRICHARDS.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark David Richards <mark@MARKDAVIDRICHARDS.COM>
Subject: Re: AAPOR Finds Gilbert Burnham in Violation of Ethics Code
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <[00ad01c9874a\\$677ec260\\$4001a8c0@RetroPoll](mailto:00ad01c9874a$677ec260$4001a8c0@RetroPoll)>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

=A0
I generally=A0trust AAPOR to make a good decision about an ethics violation=
.=A0 The=A0questions about AAPOR's timing and protocol for launching and is=
suing a notice of violation could be useful if it drives AAPOR toward a mor=
e uniform and systematic=A0policy for responding to violations.=A0 The orga=
nization obviously needs to avoid=A0the appearance of being=A0politically m=
otivated or biased in its case selection.

=A0

It does seem rare when AAPOR takes a formal position=A0- and it seems that = it takes a position when the stakes associated with unsubstantiated research= h=A0claims are=A0extremely high=A0(from a political or public policy influe= nce point-of-view).=A0 Perhaps it takes so long because AAPOR is so cautiou= s.=A0 I'm sure most people have experienced violations of the code where AA= POR has not taken action.=A0 (I've asked for basic information and exact qu= estions=A0for publicly reported studies and have been ignored or refused, b= ut I didn't do anything for lack of time and energy.)

=A0

On the other hand, why a serious researcher=A0cannot respond to an inquiry = from ANYONE about their research methodology and provide the questions they= asked to arrive at their claims=A0is beyond me.=A0 No one is so important = they should ignore a basic request for their method and questions, whether = it comes from a high school student, CASRO, or AAPOR.=A0 Most serious=A0res= earchers expect=A0to be asked=A0for this basic information and include it w= hen they release their findings.=A0 It's not=A0very=A0complicated, is it.

=A0

Researchers and critics=A0should be able to=A0argue over approaches and que= stions and talk about order bias and=A0whether we are "creating" opinions= =A0or measuring them,=A0or if our sizing estimates are even close to reliab= le...=A0but from a scientific point-of-view=A0it is unacceptable to make cl= aims based on a methodology that one is unwilling to reveal.=A0=A0How can o= ne replicate and=A0put the claim to the test if it's secret?=A0 (It may mak= e sense to hide a method for economic reasons--but=A0that still leaves the= =A0method in question.)

=A0

Of course part=A0of the problem is that some reporters and communications s= ources=A0will broadcast information=A0without checking the basis of the res= earch.=A0 Sometimes it's because they're ignorant, sometimes because they'r= e lazy, and sometimes because the findings support their point-of-view and = they don't care about the method.=A0 If a researcher won't reveal their met= hod, their research shouldn't even make it to press.=A0 But that's another = topic.

=A0

--- On Wed, 2/4/09, Marc Sapir <marcsapir@GMAIL.COM> wrote:

From: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@GMAIL.COM>
Subject: Re: AAPOR Finds Gilbert Burnham in Violation of Ethics Code
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Date: Wednesday, February 4, 2009, 11:29 PM

I have the same kinds of questions that Colleen raises. Certainly Burnham has a responsibility to fully disclose methodology to any colleagues and the public. Did he fail to do that with Lancet? If so the press release is justified. But how did AAPOR approach him? Was it as an organization (as a non member he would have no obligation to respond to an organization, given that the organization admittedly was "investigating" him at the request of a member) or was he approached as a colleague by an AAPOR leader or member interested in the subject matter and methods used? AAPOR can not expect or require that researchers in general have to respond to investigations by AAPOR. It

would be plausible, given the political environment in the US over the past several years and particularly the polarization over the Iraq occupation, that someone in his position might feel the hot breath of a witchhunt on his neck if this was presented as an investigation (by a group that has no legal standing to investigate him). And was it the press release that had the effect of triggering an investigation by Johns Hopkins or something else? Is Burnham's failure to divulge methods (to AAPOR) a smoking gun of any kind of impropriety? Colleen assumes that the request to AAPOR for the ethics investigation was not just by one person whose motivations may or may not be clear. I hope she's right and that the request resulted from an evaluation of the work that caused specific methodologic concern about the work's veracity? Yet if that were the case, the beef would have to go equally to the Lancet, a prestigious peer reviewed journal whose reviewers (rather than AAPOR) had the obligation to assure that the methods were presented fully. Is Lancet also guilty of violating AAPOR's ethical code by not requiring full disclosure? If he disclosed all methods to Lancet and its reviewers then AAPOR has made an error in judgement. If not, then both the researcher and the Lancet need to be called to task simultaneously, until the study methods can be fully evaluated.

I think the press release suggests that AAPOR (as a representative of 2,200 people in the field of survey research and with an ethical standard) claims some actual legal right to police non-members. In an earlier post about the Labor legislation I urged that AAPOR should exercise its ethical standards in the real world and expose the misuse of survey methods. So in this case I am not arguing that AAPOR has no role. But I was taken aback at the strength of the intervention when --at least on the face of the press release itself--there is no real allegation of impropriety in the conduct of the research. It should be easy enough to find out whether he followed full disclosure to the Lancet or not, and so I have to assume that an 8 month investigation did that. But in that case, why is Lancet not also on the hot seat if they did not fully review the methods? More facts are needed by the AAPOR membership and so I think that AAPOR should divulge some of these details to the list in order to assuage concerns..

Marc

Marc Sapir MD, MPH
510-848-3826
marcsapir@gmail.com

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Colleen Porter
Sent: Wednesday, February 04, 2009 7:39 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: AAPOR Finds Gilbert Burnham in Violation of Ethics Code

Pollster.com has a roundup of later developments for those interested in more details without wading through the zillions of blog entries that a google search brings up today, with many commentators using this to

support their pre-existing viewpoint--across a wide spectrum.

My least-favorite observation was a comment at

<http://scienceblogs.com/deltoid/>

which asked, "What does an mortality survey have to do with opinion polls anyway?"

As a health care researcher who finds much fellowship at AAPOR, the connection seems obvious, but perhaps the depth and breadth of AAPOR membership is not widely understood.

On Feb 4, 2009, at 9:02 AM, Richard Kulka wrote:

>
> Mary E. Losch, chair of AAPOR's Standards Committee, noted that
> AAPOR's investigation of Burnham began in March 2008, after receiving
> a complaint
> from a member.

I have mixed feelings about all this.

Part of me wonders, what is the statute of limitations on disclosure? Because here we are, 2 years and 5 months after the study's publication, and AAPOR is just getting around to making a statement about it. The delay makes us seem like a stodgy ivory-tower organization that forms committees and ponders stuff and doesn't really *do* anything in a timely manner.

I kinda understand the timing of the complaint, because it was early January 2008 that the New England Journal of Medicine published "Violence-Related Mortality in Iraq from 2002 to 2006" by the Iraq Family Health Survey Study Group, a collaboration between the WHO and Iraqi health ministries. That group's estimates were much lower, raising questions anew about the methodology in the Lancet study. But still, it has been a full year since that impetus (because the NEJM article was available on web prior to the Jan. 31 print date).

The reference to "a complaint from a member" also sends chills down my spine. I have a good friend, a solid scientist, whose grant proposals were rejected for a few years running. He finally had to ask that a certain individual be recused from reviewing his applications and, zingo, he was funded thereafter. It turned out that a few years earlier he had given a keynote address on the development of a subspecialty of research, and had failed to mention that reviewer by name. That individual felt slighted and used every opportunity to slam my friend's manuscripts and proposals. Knowing our council, I am sure there was more than merely a single complaint by one individual that caused them to feel an investigation was warranted, and they would never allow themselves to be used by a vindictive individual...but it is not so clear from what was released.

> AAPOR's President, Richard A. Kulka, added "When researchers draw

- > important conclusions and make public statements and arguments based
- > on survey research data, then subsequently refuse to answer even basic

- > questions about how their research was conducted, this violates the
- > fundamental standards of science, seriously undermines open public
- > debate on critical
- > issues, and undermines the credibility of all survey and public
- > opinion
- > research.

Of course that's true. I agree wholeheartedly. But it applies to so many other studies out there as well. Many such cases have been discussed at AAPOR meetings and on AAPORnet, and yet those researchers weren't censured. Censure is pretty rare, isn't it? Why Burnham? Why now?

Is this a new trend? Are members being encouraged to make more use of the formal complaint process? Is AAPOR taking on the role of policeman to the world's surveys?

How do we act in a manner that is timely, but not rash? How to speak out in favor of full disclosure without sounding like a neighborhood association sending a letter that someone needs to mow their lawn more often or more carefully?

While he isn't an AAPOR member, Burnham reviewed articles for POQ and spoke at a DC AAPOR gathering shortly after the Lancet publication, and some AAPOR members reviewed his study and/or supported it in media reports at the time of publication. Does the organization need distance from him, because of those linkages?

I don't want to sound unsupportive of council or disloyal toward AAPOR, but those are the questions being asked by the journalist side of my brain today.

Colleen Porter
Gainesville, FL (where it is plummeting to 19 degrees tonight, killing this year's blueberry crop)

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> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Thu, 5 Feb 2009 07:42:41 -0500
Reply-To: Richard Kulka <Richard_Kulka@ABTASSOC.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Richard Kulka <Richard_Kulka@ABTASSOC.COM>
Subject: Re: AAPOR Finds Gilbert Burnham in Violation of Ethics Code
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <303022.52023.qm@web1116.biz.mail.sk1.yahoo.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

This action by AAPOR has clearly lit a major spark on AAPORNET, and that is as it should be. Rather than weigh in on each individual message or opinion expressed, although both Mary and I have responded to many such queries, I believe that we will all benefit from what I believe will be a continued healthy exchange, and I and Council through various mechanisms will respond to our membership in various way, including here, in a newsletter, and quite possibly at our conference. A key issue raised, however, is whether our standards and procedures--all very specific and posted on our website--are fully understood by our members. The issue on nonmembers is one such issue, and what and how we investigate is another. We all sign up for these when we join AAPOR, but it is worth considering these carefully for two reasons. First, they provide an important background for the discussion. And, second, we as members can always revisit them if we deem appropriate. I am confident that our procedures were carefully and completely followed in this case, and several members have commented favorably on the action taken. But the essence of AAPOR is vigorous discussion and debate, and I think that we are all committed to that principle, both in general, and especially as it pertains to standards.

Richard A. Kulka, Ph.D. | Group Vice President | Survey Research
Abt Associates Inc. " 4620 Creekstone Drive, Suite 190 " Durham, NC 27703
(919) 294-7710 (telephone) · (617) 386-8555 (fax) · (919) 219-8741 (cell)

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

Mark David
Richards
<mark@MARKDAVIDRI
CHARDS.COM> To
AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Sent by: AAPORNET cc
<AAPORNET@asu.edu
>
Subject
Re: AAPOR Finds Gilbert Burnham in
Violation of Ethics Code
02/05/2009 02:34
AM

Please respond to
mark@MARKDAVIDRIC
HARDS.COM

I generally trust AAPOR to make a good decision about an ethics violation. The questions about AAPOR's timing and protocol for launching and issuing a notice of violation could be useful if it drives AAPOR toward a more uniform and systematic policy for responding to violations. The organization obviously needs to avoid the appearance of being politically motivated or biased in its case selection

It does seem rare when AAPOR takes a formal position - and it seems that it takes a position when the stakes associated with unsubstantiated research claims are extremely high (from a political or public policy influence point-of-view). Perhaps it takes so long because AAPOR is so cautious. I'm sure most people have experienced violations of the code where AAPOR has not taken action. (I've asked for basic information and exact questions for publicly reported studies and have been ignored or refused, but I didn't do anything for lack of time and energy.

On the other hand, why a serious researcher cannot respond to an inquiry from ANYONE about their research methodology and provide the questions they asked to arrive at their claims is beyond me. No one is so important they should ignore a basic request for their method and questions, whether it comes from a high school student, CASRO, or AAPOR. Most serious researchers expect to be asked for this basic information and include it when they release their findings. It's not very complicated, is it

Researchers and critics should be able to argue over approaches and questions and talk about order bias and whether we are "creating" opinions or measuring them, or if our sizing estimates are even close to reliable... but from a scientific point-of-view it is unacceptable to make claims based on a methodology that one is unwilling to reveal. How can one replicate and put the claim to the test if it's secret? (It may make sense to hide a method for economic reasons--but that still leaves the method in question.

Of course part of the problem is that some reporters and communications sources will broadcast information without checking the basis of the research. Sometimes it's because they're ignorant, sometimes because they're lazy, and sometimes because the findings support their point-of-view and they don't care about the method. If a researcher won't reveal their method, their research shouldn't even make it to press. But that's another topic

--- On Wed, 2/4/09, Marc Sapir <marcsapir@GMAIL.COM> wrote:

From: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@GMAIL.COM>
Subject: Re: AAPOR Finds Gilbert Burnham in Violation of Ethics Code
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Date: Wednesday, February 4, 2009, 11:29 PM

I have the same kinds of questions that Colleen raises. Certainly Burnham has a responsibility to fully disclose methodology to any colleagues and the public. Did he fail to do that with Lancet? If so the press release is justified. But how did AAPOR approach him? Was it as an organization (as a non member he would have no obligation to respond to an organization, given that the organization admittedly was "investigating" him at the request of a member) or was he approached as a colleague by an AAPOR leader or member interested in the subject matter and methods used? AAPOR can not expect or require that researchers in general have to respond to investigations by AAPOR. It would be plausible, given the political environment in the US over the past several years and particularly the polarization over the Iraq occupation, that someone in his position might feel the hot breath of a witchhunt on his neck if this was presented as an investigation (by a group that has no legal standing to investigate him). And was it the press release that had the effect of triggering an investigation by Johns Hopkins or something else? Is Burnham's failure to divulge methods (to AAPOR) a smoking gun of any kind of impropriety? Colleen assumes that the request to AAPOR for the ethics investigation was not just by one person whose motivations may or may not be clear. I hope she's right and that the request resulted from an evaluation of the work that caused specific methodologic concern about the work's veracity? Yet if that were the case, the beef would have to go equally to the Lancet, a prestigious peer reviewed journal whose reviewers (rather than AAPOR) had the obligation to assure that the methods were presented fully. Is Lancet also guilty of violating AAPOR's ethical code by not requiring full disclosure? If he disclosed all methods to Lancet and its reviewers then AAPOR has made an error in judgement. If not, then both the researcher and the Lancet need to be called to task simultaneously, until the study methods can be fully evaluated.

I think the press release suggests that AAPOR (as a representative of 2,200 people in the field of survey research and with an ethical standard) claims some actual legal right to police non-members. In an earlier post about the Labor legislation I urged that AAPOR should exercise it's ethical standards in the real world and expose the misuse of survey methods. So in this case I am not arguing that AAPOR has no role. But I was taken aback at the strength of the intervention when --at least on the face of the press release itself--there is no real allegation of impropriety in the conduct of the research. It should be easy enough to find out whether he followed full disclosure to the Lancet or not, and so I have to assume that an 8 month investigation did that. But in that case, why is Lancet not also on the hot seat if they did not fully review the methods? More facts are needed by the AAPOR membership and so I think that AAPOR should divulge some of these details to the list in order to assuage concerns..

Marc

Marc Sapir MD, MPH
510-848-3826

marcsapir@gmail.com

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Colleen Porter

Sent: Wednesday, February 04, 2009 7:39 PM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: Re: AAPOR Finds Gilbert Burnham in Violation of Ethics Code

Pollster.com has a roundup of later developments for those interested in more details without wading through the zillions of blog entries that a google search brings up today, with many commentators using this to support their pre-existing viewpoint--across a wide spectrum.

My least-favorite observation was a comment at

<http://scienceblogs.com/deltoid/>

which asked, "What does an mortality survey have to do with opinion polls anyway?"

As a health care researcher who finds much fellowship at AAPOR, the connection seems obvious, but perhaps the depth and breadth of AAPOR membership is not widely understood.

On Feb 4, 2009, at 9:02 AM, Richard Kulka wrote:

>
> Mary E. Losch, chair of AAPOR's Standards Committee, noted that
> AAPOR's investigation of Burnham began in March 2008, after receiving
> a complaint
> from a member.

I have mixed feelings about all this.

Part of me wonders, what is the statute of limitations on disclosure? Because here we are, 2 years and 5 months after the study's publication, and AAPOR is just getting around to making a statement about it. The delay makes us seem like a stodgy ivory-tower organization that forms committees and ponders stuff and doesn't really *do* anything in a timely manner.

I kinda understand the timing of the complaint, because it was early January 2008 that the New England Journal of Medicine published "Violence-Related Mortality in Iraq from 2002 to 2006" by the Iraq Family Health Survey Study Group, a collaboration between the WHO and Iraqi health ministries. That group's estimates were much lower, raising questions anew about the methodology in the Lancet study. But still, it has been a full year since that impetus (because the NEJM article was available on web prior to the Jan. 31 print date).

The reference to "a complaint from a member" also sends chills down my spine. I have a good friend, a solid scientist, whose grant proposals

were rejected for a few years running. He finally had to ask that a certain individual be recused from reviewing his applications and, zingo, he was funded thereafter. It turned out that a few years earlier he had given a keynote address on the development of a subspecialty of research, and had failed to mention that reviewer by name. That individual felt slighted and used every opportunity to slam my friend's manuscripts and proposals. Knowing our council, I am sure there was more than merely a single complaint by one individual that caused them to feel an investigation was warranted, and they would never allow themselves to be used by a vindictive individual...but it is not so clear from what was released.

- > AAPOR's President, Richard A. Kulka, added "When researchers draw
- > important conclusions and make public statements and arguments based
- > on survey research data, then subsequently refuse to answer even basic

- > questions about how their research was conducted, this violates the
- > fundamental standards of science, seriously undermines open public
- > debate on critical
- > issues, and undermines the credibility of all survey and public
- > opinion
- > research.

Of course that's true. I agree wholeheartedly. But it applies to so many other studies out there as well. Many such cases have been discussed at AAPOR meetings and on AAPORnet, and yet those researchers weren't censured. Censure is pretty rare, isn't it? Why Burnham? Why now?

Is this a new trend? Are members being encouraged to make more use of the formal complaint process? Is AAPOR taking on the role of policeman to the world's surveys?

How do we act in a manner that is timely, but not rash? How to speak out in favor of full disclosure without sounding like a neighborhood association sending a letter that someone needs to mow their lawn more often or more carefully?

While he isn't an AAPOR member, Burnham reviewed articles for POQ and spoke at a DC AAPOR gathering shortly after the Lancet publication, and some AAPOR members reviewed his study and/or supported it in media reports at the time of publication. Does the organization need distance from him, because of those linkages?

I don't want to sound unsupportive of council or disloyal toward AAPOR, but those are the questions being asked by the journalist side of my brain today.

Colleen Porter
Gainesville, FL (where it is plummeting to 19 degrees tonight, killing this year's blueberry crop)

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> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

This message may contain privileged and confidential information intended solely for the addressee. Please do not read, disseminate or copy it unless you are the intended recipient. If this message has been received in error, we kindly ask that you notify the sender immediately by return email and delete all copies of the message from your system. Thank you.

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, 5 Feb 2009 07:47:37 -0500
Reply-To: Colleen Porter <colleen_porter@COX.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Colleen Porter <colleen_porter@COX.NET>
Subject: Re: AAPOR Finds Gilbert Burnham in Violation of Ethics Code
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <200902050734.n157JstK023099@lists.asu.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII; format=flowed; delsp=yes
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Mime-Version: 1.0 (Apple Message framework v930.3)

Following up on my own comment, but...

My thoughts last night were precipitated by reading through a lot of the blogosphere reaction yesterday, much more than I usually would have, because a family member had surgery and I was killing time with the iPhone.

Part of my reaction was to the title and first paragraph of the release, particularly the use of the word "violated." Much of the controversy surrounds whether an organization has any right to censure someone outside the organization.

It seems this could have been avoided by taking a different approach in our presentation, along the lines of "AAPOR finds that Gilbert Burnham failed to disclose critical information about the survey,

items that responsible researchers make available at time of publication so that findings can be independently evaluated." And then explain our views without bringing up "violation" of something to which he did not agree in the first place.

Then also, the notion of a member initiating a complaint could have been avoided by simply leaving that phrase out, because if an investigation was warranted, it doesn't really matter how it started and thus we avoid any hint of interpersonal problems.

But also, I wonder if it would have been appropriate if the 2,200 members had known this investigation was in progress.

It may be there were others among us who asked Burnham as well as the complainant mentioned in the press release, but felt like Mark David Richards describes:

> (I've asked for basic information and exact questions for publicly
> reported studies and have been ignored or refused, but I didn't do
> anything for lack of time and energy.)

However, if those folks had known this was under discussion by AAPOR, they could add a data point to inform council's considerations.

At last year's general business meeting, a former council member observed that she hoped council would use AAPORnet to let membership know what kinds of things were being discussed. Is this one of those times when it might have been a good thing?

And yes, I do appreciate that it is much easier to ask questions than come up with the hard answers, and I appreciate all that council does in that regard.

Colleen Porter
Gainesville, FL

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, 5 Feb 2009 09:51:07 -0500
Reply-To: Christopher Weiss <cw2036@COLUMBIA.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Christopher Weiss <cw2036@COLUMBIA.EDU>
Subject: NYAAPOR Event - Bloomberg & Term Limits - Weds, Feb 11
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=windows-1252; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

*"Limits to Term Limits?"

*"Mike Bloomberg and the 2009 Mayoral Election"***

Wednesday, February 11, 2009 6:30 – 8:30 PM

at

Baruch College

Newman Vertical Campus

Room 14-220

55 Lexington Avenue (enter at E. 24th St. corner)

Doors open at 6pm for socializing and networking. Panel begins at 6:30pm.

/NYAAPOR and Baruch College Survey Research host an evening session to discuss opinions and predictions for Mayor Bloomberg's efforts for a third term as mayor./

/With/

Micheline Blum, Director of Baruch College Survey Research at Baruch's School of Public Affairs

Maurice Carroll, Director of the Quinnipiac University Polling Institute

*David Chen, *City Hall Bureau Chief for /The/ /New York Times/

Ester Fuchs, Professor of Public Affairs and Political Science at Columbia University and former Special Advisor to the Mayor

This event is free to NYAAPOR members, student members (and students with valid student ID) and CUNY affiliates;

\$20 for non-members.

Please register for the event at: (212) 684-0542, info@nyaapor.org
<<mailto:info@nyaapor.org>> or <http://www.nyaapor.org>
<<http://www.nyaapor.org/>>.

* *

--

Christopher Weiss, NYAAPOR Program Chair
Quantitative Methods in the Social Sciences Program (QMSS)
Institute for Social and Economic Research and Policy (ISERP)
Columbia University
420 W. 118th St., Room 807A
Mail Code 3355
New York, NY 10027
Phone: (212) 854-7559
FAX: (212) 854-8925
www.qmss.columbia.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, 5 Feb 2009 13:28:54 -0600
Reply-To: Jeannetta Smiley <jsmiley@GOAMP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jeannetta Smiley <jsmiley@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: Job Posting
Comments: To: "aapornet@asu.edu" <aapornet@asu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Research Analyst

Overview:

The American Institutes for Research (AIR) is a well-established not-for-profit social science research and development organization. AIR's Federal Statistics Program works with the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), which is the federal government's primary source for collecting and analyzing statistical data about public education in the United States and around the world. We are currently seeking a Research Analyst for our Statistical Standards task, to provide methodological and statistical support to NCES.

Responsibilities:

The candidate will provide methodological and statistical support for technical review activities, including leading reviews and providing substantive and technical comments on draft NCES products (reports, data files, file documentation, and web sites). The candidate will also take leading roles in projects that monitor the data quality at NCES and the use of NCES data by practitioners, researchers, and policy makers; and be responsible for developing and maintaining electronic databases, as well as reporting and production of key deliverables of the findings. Responsibilities may also include conducting data analysis, and writing research and technical reports.

Qualifications:

Required qualifications:

- * Ph.D. or equivalent in a related area such as Education, Educational Psychology, Statistics, Survey/Research Methods, Sociology, or other related fields;
- * Experience in education and social science research;
- * Proficiency in data analysis and strong quantitative research skills;
- * Proficiency in statistical package such as SAS, Stata, or SPSS;
- * Excellent verbal and written communication skills;
- * Demonstrated ability to work independently with little direction and the ability to coordinate many different tasks;
- * Strong interpersonal skills and ability to effectively collaborate with co-workers and clients;

Preferred qualifications:

- * Knowledge and Experience with large scale surveys and complex sample design;

- * Proficiency using SAS for statistical analyses and data management of large data sets;
- * Proficiency in Microsoft Access.

To apply:

AIR offers an excellent compensation and benefits package, including a fully funded retirement plan, generous paid time off, subsidized garage parking, tuition assistance, and more. For more information, please visit our website at www.air.org. To apply, please go to <http://jobs-airdc.icims.com?&sn=3DAAPOR> and conduct a job title search. EOE.

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, 5 Feb 2009 15:30:56 -0500
Reply-To: Howard Fienberg <howard.fienberg@MRA-NET.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Howard Fienberg <howard.fienberg@MRA-NET.ORG>
Subject: Call to Action: Support the Decennial Census
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

The economic stimulus legislation being debated right now in the U.S. Senate includes \$1 billion for Census 2010 preparations. U.S. Senator Tom Coburn (R-OK) will shortly be offering an amendment to strike that funding, which he has referred to as "wasteful".

=20
The Marketing Research Association (MRA) respectfully asks that you support funding for the decennial Census RIGHT NOW by contacting your U.S. Senators and asking them to oppose Senator Coburn's amendment. His amendment could be brought up for consideration on the Senate floor at any moment.

=20
This site will connect you to your state's Senators:
http://www.senate.gov/general/contact_information/senators_cfm.cfm
<http://www.senate.gov/general/contact_information/senators_cfm.cfm>=20
=20

Sincerely,
Howard Fienberg
Director of Government Affairs
Marketing Research Association (MRA)
howard.fienberg@mra-net.org
1111 16th St. NW, Suite 120
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 775-5170
Fax: (202) 775-5172
<http://www.mra-net.org> <<http://www.mra-net.org>>=20
<http://www.cmor.org> <<http://www.cmor.org>>=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, 6 Feb 2009 08:20:35 -0600
Reply-To: Smith-Tom <smitht@NORC.UCHICAGO.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Smith-Tom <smitht@NORC.UCHICAGO.EDU>
Subject: Mitofsky award
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Call for Nominations

=20

=20

The Warren J. Mitofsky Award for
Excellence in Public Opinion Research

An annual award of The Roper Center

=20

The Mitofsky award carries a cash prize and recognizes outstanding research or reporting that uses The Roper Center's public opinion data archive. The 2009 award prize is \$1,000. The award acknowledges important work on public opinion or survey methodology that has been published in a book, journal, magazine, or newspaper, or presented at a professional conference. Special consideration will be given to work that is based on data obtained by the researcher or author directly from the Roper archive, as well as to work that utilizes multiple data sources or compares survey results over time. =20

=20

The award recognizes both work published recently and work from the past that continues to have a significant impact on our understanding of society. Anyone can make a nomination by submitting a statement that includes the full citation of the work and a brief description of the work's outstanding accomplishment and its use of the Roper Center's public opinion data archives. =20

=20

For full consideration nominations must be received by May 15, 2009.
Please send nominations to: =20

=20

Tom W. Smith

=20

NORC

1155 East 60th St.

Chicago, IL 60637

=20

773-256-6288

=20

smitht@norc.uchicago.edu

=20

=20

=20

=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: Sat, 7 Feb 2009 17:54:35 -0500

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

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

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

Subject: FW: Deaths in Iraq

Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

fyi

From: Survey Research Methods Section of the ASA
[mailto:SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU] On Behalf Of Tom Jabine
Sent: Saturday, February 07, 2009 9:56 AM
To: SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU
Subject: Deaths in Iraq

My post yesterday re the design of the survey to estimate civilian deaths in Iraq led to a detailed and useful response by Prof. Michael Spagat which I am posting with his permission.

Tom Jabine

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

Subject:

Your listserve message

Date:

Fri, 6 Feb 2009 16:32:59 -0000

From:

Spagat M <mailto:M.Spagat@rhul.ac.uk> <M.Spagat@rhul.ac.uk>

To:

<mailto:tjabine@starpower.net> <tjabine@starpower.net>

CC:

<mailto:scheuren@aol.com> <scheuren@aol.com>

Dear Mr. Jabine,

I am not on the SRMSNET listserve but Fritz Scheuren forwarded your posting to me. Your posting is very strong, especially considering that, apparently, you did it cold based just on reading the Lancet paper. There has been a lot of discussion related to some of the issues you raise that you are probably not aware of. So I thought that I would bring you up to date. I will focus on sampling but I have much more on my home page:

<<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Research.htm>>

<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Research.htm>

Feel free to post this onto the listserve if you wish.

Here is paper I participated in on possible sampling bias related to the "main-street" aspect of the sampling plan that you refer to below:

<http://www.hicn.org/research_design/rdn2.pdf>

http://www.hicn.org/research_design/rdn2.pdf

This paper was recently published in the Journal of Peace Research and even won article of the year:

<<http://www.prio.no/Research-and-Publications/Journal-of-Peace-Research/Article-of-the-year/>>

<http://www.prio.no/Research-and-Publications/Journal-of-Peace-Research/Article-of-the-year/>

Here we extend the analysis in a paper recently published in European Physics Letters:

<<http://arxiv.org/abs/0807.4420>> <http://arxiv.org/abs/0807.4420>

We also set up a web sight on this "main-street bias" issue:

<<http://www.rhul.ac.uk/Economics/Research/conflict-analysis/iraq-mortality/>>

<http://www.rhul.ac.uk/Economics/Research/conflict-analysis/iraq-mortality/>

Nevertheless, it is hard to get a handle on the types of issues that you and we have raised because there have been a series of changing and contradictory stories on how the sampling was done in the Burnham et al. paper. I discuss these ambiguities here:

<<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Households%20in%20Conflict%202007.pdf>>

<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Households%20in%20Conflict%202007.pdf>

and here in pages 11-14. (This paper is forthcoming in the journal Defense and Peace Economics)

<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Ethics%20and%20Data%20Integrity_8_09_08.pdf>

http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Ethics%20and%20Data%20Integrity_8_09_08.pdf

pdf

I have some more specific comments below.

I have just recently obtained and read the Lancet article reporting on this study. Following are some comments and questions that I would raise about the sample selection and estimation procedures. I look forward to seeing the evaluation of the survey methodology by Peter Lynn.

Comments on October 2006 Lancet article on deaths in Iraq

SAMPLE SELECTION

Stage 1

Systematic PPS to determine no. of clusters to be selected from each of 17 governates, with a total of 50 to be selected. Measure of size was

midyear 2004 pop estimates. The Baghdad Governate had 12 "hits", and several others had more than one. Two governates had no hits.

Stage 2

Administrative units within each selected governate were selected "randomly proportionate to population size".

Questions:

1. Was the selection systematic for those governates from which more than one cluster was to be selected?
2. Were there any administrative units that had more than one hit?

[MS] Good questions. I'm not aware of anyone ever having asked these. I wonder if AAPOR asked questions like these? It really would be nice if they would specify precisely what they asked for and did not get.

Stage 3

"The third stage consisted of random selection of a main street within the administrative unit from a list of all main streets. A residential street was then randomly selected from a list of residential streets crossing the main street. On the residential street, houses were numbered and a start household was randomly selected. From this start household, the team proceeded to the adjacent residence until 40=20 households were surveyed. For this study, a household was defined as a unit that ate together, and had a separate entrance from the street or a separate apartment entrance."

Questions:

1. Are there any households in Iraq that are not on residential streets and therefore had no chance of selection? Are any households located on main streets?
2. Are there any residential streets that do not cross a main street and therefore had no chance of selection?
3. Are there any residential streets that cross more than one main street and therefore had multiple chances of selection?
4. For the selected residential streets, were all households numbered?
5. Were there any residential streets with fewer than 40 households?
6. What rules were used for proceeding from the selected starting household on a residential street to the "adjacent" households?

[MS] Again, really good questions. To repeat, the paper states "The third stage consisted of random selection of a main street within the administrative unit from a list of all main streets." Unfortunately, Burnham et al. have been asked to provide their lists of "administrative units" and also of main streets within these administrative units and have refused. In fact, Seppo Laaksonen, professor of survey methodology in Helsinki

<<http://wiki.helsinki.fi/display/mathstatHenkilokunta/Laaksonen,+Seppo>>
<http://wiki.helsinki.fi/display/mathstatHenkilokunta/Laaksonen,+Seppo>
asked just for the average number of main streets per administrative unit and was refused. So its hard to even gauge how major these main-street arteries are. Thus, there is no way to really know exactly what a main street is in which case your questions become difficult to answer. Still, in some of the papers I link to above we try get at some issues like the ones you are raising.

Your point number 6 about how one proceeds from household to household by "adjacency" is a crucial and underappreciated one in conflict surveys, and probably beyond. Many papers in this literature contain a statement like "after selecting the first household we proceed by proximity" without pinning down what this "proximity" means. In a situation where there may be, say, a bombed out house nearby giving discretion to field teams to define proximity invites bias. I get into this a bit in this presentation:

<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Brussels_2007_bias.pdf>
http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Brussels_2007_bias.pdf

ESTIMATION PROCEDURE

The article does not provide any details. It would appear that all sample households were given the same weight. If this is the case, the estimates do not reflect the varying selection probabilities resulting from the sampling procedures used in stage 3.

[MS] You are right. Although the paper does not make this clear subsequent discussion has clarified that each household was given equal weight. The bias resulting from this was a point was first made by Seppo Laaksonen here:

<<http://www.warc.com/LandingPages/Generic/Results.asp?Ref=819>>
<http://www.warc.com/LandingPages/Generic/Results.asp?Ref=819> (password protected unfortunately but I would think that he'd email it to you.)

Thank you very much for your efforts Mr. Jabine. I would be honored to correspond with you further.

With the Greatest Respect,
Mike Spagat

Tom Jabine

Professor Michael Spagat
Department of Economics
Royal Holloway College
University of London
Egham
Surrey
TW20 0EX
United Kingdom
+44 1784 414001 (W)
+44 1784 439534 (F)
M.Spagat@rhul.ac.uk
<<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014>> <http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014>

~~~~~ To subscribe/unsubscribe SRMSNet:  
<http://listserv.umd.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A0=srmsnet&D=0&F=&H=0&O=T&S=&T=1>

~~~~~ SRMS website: <http://www.amstat.org/sections/srms/>  
~~~~~

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

=====

Date: Sat, 7 Feb 2009 16:49:29 -0800  
Reply-To: Marc Sapir <[marcsapir@GMAIL.COM](mailto:marcsapir@GMAIL.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Marc Sapir <[marcsapir@GMAIL.COM](mailto:marcsapir@GMAIL.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Deaths in Iraq  
Comments: To: Paul J Lavrakas PhD <[pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET](mailto:pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <001f01c98977\$0d784870\$2868d950\$@net>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Paul,

Do you have a link for the original Burnham Lancet article? In looking at Michael Spagat's last article I have a few questions that someone may be able to help me out with. It appears to me that the Spagat analysis is made considering only deaths related to the improvised explosive devices and suicide bombings (and other attacks by either the Iraqi resistance, Iraqi factions or Al Qaeda in Iraq). The assumption that most deaths occur near interesections (i.e. presumably intersections with main streets) was predicated upon that and the text says as much. I had thought that these various papers on civilian deaths in Iraq were aimed at looking at all deaths (including caused by US actions). Bombings from planes or helicopter fire, ground fire and other US military attacks are probably not more likely to occur at intersections. Does the Lancet paper not pertain to all Iraqi deaths? Wouldn't that

change Spagat's analysis some? Then there is the problem of diffusion. Once one assumes a low level of population mobility under the conditions of war in Iraq the error calculation proceeds from that. But is there evidence on population diffusion, one way or another? In countries under occupation population mobility varies from day to day and month to month depending upon conditions and threat levels and rules of the occupying forces. When things calm down people come out on the streets and try to restore their normal lives. Moreover, there have been reports of as many as 4 million displaced people wandering around Iraq and 2 million emigrees. How can one estimate a diffusion level under such varying circumstances? Doesn't this problem defeat the exercise?

Spagat et al point out that the Burnham results are 3-4 times greater than 2 other studies and 12 times greater than the Iraq Body Count based upon newspaper reports. Am I right that the 3-4 times estimate seems to conform best to Spagat's statistical adjustment maneuver? That total would still be in the hundreds of thousands and far greater than the figures the US government was releasing. Also, if the Burnham study was estimating all deaths due directly to all warfare, was there no one looking at fractional deaths caused directly by US military activity? In past wars, such as Vietnam, the US would release figures of non-US as well as US military deaths. But with Iraq it seems the Pentagon decided it was not in the "national interest" to compile and release such numbers.

Finally, this thread began with AAPOR's press release citing Burnham. I may have missed some intervening e-mails, but I don't yet understand how he concealed the methodology, leading ultimately to the press release. After the 2004 election debacle (in Ohio and with the exit polls in most battle ground states overestimating Kerry) a number of people were trying to get Edison-Mitovsky to fully release their methods and data. After quite a delay the data got posted but without identifying markers for the particular precincts sampled. That made it pretty much impossible to try and check the sampling against the reported data of the actual vote precinct by precinct. (The argument made then against release was that there was potential loss of confidentiality, that individual voters might be identified, though that could have been overcome). Although I obviously don't know what Burnham withheld nor why, I'd appreciate understanding how the 2004 Presidential situation was different from this one?

Marc

Marc Sapir MD, MPH  
510-848-3826  
marcsapir@gmail.com

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Paul J Lavrakas  
PhD

Sent: Saturday, February 07, 2009 2:55 PM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: FW: Deaths in Iraq

fyi

From: Survey Research Methods Section of the ASA  
[mailto:SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU] On Behalf Of Tom Jabine  
Sent: Saturday, February 07, 2009 9:56 AM  
To: SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU  
Subject: Deaths in Iraq

My post yesterday re the design of the survey to estimate civilian deaths in Iraq led to a detailed and useful response by Prof. Michael Spagat which I am posting with his permission.

Tom Jabine

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

Subject:

Your listserve message

Date:

Fri, 6 Feb 2009 16:32:59 -0000

From:

Spagat M <mailto:M.Spagat@rhul.ac.uk> <M.Spagat@rhul.ac.uk>

To:

<mailto:tjabine@starpower.net> <tjabine@starpower.net>

CC:

<mailto:scheuren@aol.com> <scheuren@aol.com>

Dear Mr. Jabine,  
I am not on the SRMSNET listserve but Fritz Scheuren forwarded your posting to me. Your posting is very strong, especially considering

that, apparently, you did it cold based just on reading the Lancet paper. There has been a lot of discussion related to some of the issues you raise that you are probably not aware of. So I thought that I would bring you up to date. I will focus on sampling but I have much more on my home page:

<<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Research.htm>>

<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Research.htm>

Feel free to post this onto the listserv if you wish.

Here is paper I participated in on possible sampling bias related to the "main-street" aspect of the sampling plan that you refer to below:

<[http://www.hicn.org/research\\_design/rdn2.pdf](http://www.hicn.org/research_design/rdn2.pdf)>

[http://www.hicn.org/research\\_design/rdn2.pdf](http://www.hicn.org/research_design/rdn2.pdf)

This paper was recently published in the Journal of Peace Research and even won article of the year:

<<http://www.prio.no/Research-and-Publications/Journal-of-Peace-Research/Article-of-the-year/>>

<http://www.prio.no/Research-and-Publications/Journal-of-Peace-Research/Article-of-the-year/>

Here we extend the analysis in a paper recently published in European Physics Letters: <<http://arxiv.org/abs/0807.4420>>

<http://arxiv.org/abs/0807.4420> We also set up a web sight on this "main-street bias" issue:

<<http://www.rhul.ac.uk/Economics/Research/conflict-analysis/iraq-mortality/>>

<http://www.rhul.ac.uk/Economics/Research/conflict-analysis/iraq-mortality/>

Nevertheless, it is hard to get a handle on the types of issues that you and we have raised because there have been a series of changing and contradictory stories on how the sampling was done in the Burnham et al. paper. I discuss these ambiguities here:

<<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Households%20in%20Conflict%202007.pdf>>

<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Households%20in%20Conflict%202007.pdf>

and here in pages 11-14. (This paper is forthcoming in the journal Defense and Peace Economics)

<[http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Ethics%20and%20Data%20Integrity\\_8\\_09\\_08.pdf](http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Ethics%20and%20Data%20Integrity_8_09_08.pdf)>

[http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Ethics%20and%20Data%20Integrity\\_8\\_09\\_08.pdf](http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Ethics%20and%20Data%20Integrity_8_09_08.pdf)

pdf

I have some more specific comments below.

I have just recently obtained and read the Lancet article reporting on this study. Following are some comments and questions that I would raise about the sample selection and estimation procedures. I look forward to seeing the evaluation of the survey methodology by Peter Lynn.

Comments on October 2006 Lancet article on deaths in Iraq

## SAMPLE SELECTION

### Stage 1

Systematic PPS to determine no. of clusters to be selected from each of 17 governates, with a total of 50 to be selected. Measure of size was midyear 2004 pop estimates. The Baghdad Governate had 12 "hits", and several others had more than one. Two governates had no hits.

### Stage 2

Administrative units within each selected governate were selected "randomly proportionate to population size".

### Questions:

1. Was the selection systematic for those governates from which more than one cluster was to be selected?
2. Were there any administrative units that had more than one hit?

[MS] Good questions. I'm not aware of anyone ever having asked these. I wonder if AAPOR asked questions like these? It really would be nice if they would specify precisely what they asked for and did not get.

### Stage 3

"The third stage consisted of random selection of a main street within the administrative unit from a list of all main streets. A residential street was then randomly selected from a list of residential streets crossing the main street. On the residential street, houses were numbered and a start household was randomly selected. From this start household, the team proceeded to the adjacent residence until 40=2 0households were surveyed. For this study, a household was defined as a unit that ate together, and had a separate entrance from the street or a separate apartment entrance."

### Questions:

1. Are there any households in Iraq that are not on residential streets and therefore had no chance of selection? Are any households located on main streets?

2. Are there any residential streets that do not cross a main street and therefore had no chance of selection?
3. Are there any residential streets that cross more than one main street and therefore had multiple chances of selection?
4. For the selected residential streets, were all households numbered?
5. Were there any residential streets with fewer than 40 households?
6. What rules were used for proceeding from the selected starting household on a residential street to the "adjacent" households?

[MS] Again, really good questions. To repeat, the paper states "The third stage consisted of random selection of a main street within the administrative unit from a list of all main streets." Unfortunately, Burnham et al. have been asked to provide their lists of "administrative units" and also of main streets within these administrative units and have refused. In fact, Seppo Laaksonen, professor of survey methodology in Helsinki

<<http://wiki.helsinki.fi/display/mathstatHenkilokunta/Laaksonen,+Seppo>>  
<http://wiki.helsinki.fi/display/mathstatHenkilokunta/Laaksonen,+Seppo>  
asked just for the average number of main streets per administrative unit and was refused. So its hard to even gauge how major these main-street arteries are. Thus, there is no way to really know exactly what a main street is in which case your questions become difficult to answer. Still, in some of the papers I link to above we try get at some issues like the ones you are raising.

Your point number 6 about how one proceeds from household to household by "adjacency" is a crucial and underappreciated one in conflict surveys, and probably beyond. Many papers in this literature contain a statement like "after selecting the first household we proceed by proximity" without pinning down what this "proximity" means. In a situation where there may be, say, a bombed out house nearby giving discretion to field teams to define proximity invites bias. I get into this a bit in this presentation:

<[http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Brussels\\_2007\\_bias.pdf](http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Brussels_2007_bias.pdf)>  
[http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Brussels\\_2007\\_bias.pdf](http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Brussels_2007_bias.pdf)

## ESTIMATION PROCEDURE

The article does not provide any details. It would appear that all sample households were given the same weight. If this is the case, the estimates do not reflect the varying selection probabilities resulting from the sampling procedures used in stage 3.

[MS] You are right. Although the paper does not make this clear subsequent discussion has clarified that each household was given equal weight. The bias resulting from this was a point was first made by Seppo Laaksonen here:

<<http://www.warc.com/LandingPages/Generic/Results.asp?Ref=819>>  
<http://www.warc.com/LandingPages/Generic/Results.asp?Ref=819> (password  
protected unfortunately but I would think that he'd email it to you.)

Thank you very much for your efforts Mr. Jabine. I would be honored to  
correspond with you further. With the Greatest Respect, Mike Spगत

Tom Jabine

Professor Michael Spगत  
Department of Economics  
Royal Holloway College  
University of London  
Egham  
Surrey  
TW20 0EX  
United Kingdom  
+44 1784 414001 (W)  
+44 1784 439534 (F)  
M.Spagat@rhul.ac.uk  
<<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014>>  
<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014>

~~~~~ To subscribe/unsubscribe  
SRMSNet:
<http://listserv.umd.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A0=srmsnet&D=0&F=&H=0&O=T&S=&T=1>

SRMS website: <http://www.amstat.org/sections/srms/>
~~~~~

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

-----  
Date: Sun, 8 Feb 2009 05:27:51 -0500  
Reply-To: [scheuren@AOL.COM](mailto:scheuren@AOL.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Fritz Scheuren <[scheuren@AOL.COM](mailto:scheuren@AOL.COM)>  
Subject: More on AAPOR Decision re Iraq Lancet Surveys  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)



In-Reply-To: <498DA115.2050806@starpower.net>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="utf-8"

Dear Colleagues:

Here is a post from SRMSNET that may be of interest on the recent AAPOR decision re Iraq Lancet Surveys.

Bless all, Fritz

=20

=20

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

From: Tom Jabine <tjabine@STARPOWER.NET>  
To: SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU  
Sent: Sat, 7 Feb 2009 9:56 am  
Subject: Deaths in Iraq

=20

=20

My post yesterday re the design of the survey to estimate civilian deaths in Iraq led to a detailed and useful response by Prof. Michael Spagat which I am posting with his permission.

Tom Jabine

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

=20

=20

=20  
Subject:=20

=20  
Your listserve message

=20

=20

=20  
Date:=20

=20  
Fri, 6 Feb 2009 16:32:59 -0000

=20

=20

=20  
From:=20

=20  
Spagat M <M.Spagat@rhul.ac.uk>

=20

=20

=20  
To:=20

=20  
<tjabin@starpower.net>

=20

=20

=20  
CC:=20

=20  
<scheuren@aol.com>

=20

=20

Dear Mr. Jabine,

I am not on the SRMSNET  
listserve but Fritz Scheuren forwarded your posting to me. Your  
posting is very strong, especially considering that, apparently, you  
did it cold based just on reading the Lancet paper. There has been a  
lot of discussion related to some of the issues you raise that you are  
probably not aware of. So I thought that I would bring you up to  
date. I will focus on sampling but I have much more on my home page:

<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Research.htm>

Feel free to post this  
onto the listserve if you wish.

Here is paper I  
participated in on possible sampling bias related to the "main-street"  
aspect of the sampling plan that you refer to below:

[http://www.hicn.org/research\\_design/rdn2.pdf](http://www.hicn.org/research_design/rdn2.pdf)

This paper was recently  
published in the Journal of Peace Research and even won article  
of the year:

<http://www.prio.no/Research-and-Publications/Journal-of-Peace-Research/Article-of-the-year/>

Here we extend the  
analysis in a paper recently published in European Physics Letters:

<http://arxiv.org/abs/0807.4420>

We also set up a web  
sight on this "main-street bias" issue:

<http://www.rhul.ac.uk/Economics/Research/conflict-analysis/iraq-mortality/>

Nevertheless, it is hard to get a handle on the types of issues that you and we have raised because there have been a series of changing and contradictory stories on how the sampling was done in the Burnham et al. paper. I discuss these ambiguities here:

<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Households%20in%20Conflict%202007.pdf>

and here in pages 11-14. (This paper is forthcoming in the journal Defense and Peace Economics)

[http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Ethics%20and%20Data%20Integrity\\_8\\_09\\_08.pdf](http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Ethics%20and%20Data%20Integrity_8_09_08.pdf)

I have some more specific comments below.

I have just recently obtained and read the Lancet article reporting on

this study. Following are some comments and questions that I would raise

about the sample selection and estimation procedures. I look forward to

seeing the evaluation of the survey methodology by Peter Lynn.

Comments on October 2006 Lancet article on deaths in Iraq

## SAMPLE SELECTION

Stage 1

Systematic PPS to determine no. of clusters to be selected from each of

17 governates, with a total of 50 to be selected. Measure of size was

midyear 2004 pop estimates. The Baghdad Governate had 12 =E2=80=9Chits=E2=  
=80=9D, and

several others had more than one. Two governates had no hits.

## Stage 2

Administrative units within each selected governate were selected

=E2=80=9Crandomly proportionate to population size=E2=80=9D.

## Questions:

1. Was the selection systematic for those governates from which more than one cluster was to be selected?
2. Were there any administrative units that had more than one hit?

[MS]=C2=A0 Good

questions.=C2=A0 I'm not aware of anyone ever having asked these.=C2=A0 I wo=  
nder

if AAPOR asked questions like these?=C2=A0 It really would be nice if they  
would specify precisely what they asked for and did not get.

## Stage 3

=E2=80=9CThe third stage consisted of random

selection of a main street within the administrative unit

from a list of all main streets. A residential street was then randomly selected from a list of residential streets crossing the main street. On the residential street, houses were numbered and a start household was randomly selected. From this start household, the team proceeded to the adjacent 3D2 0residence until 40=3D2 0households were surveyed. For this study, a household was defined as a unit that ate together, and had a separate entrance from the street or a separate apartment entrance.=E2=80=9D

Questions:

1. Are there any households in Iraq that are not on residential streets and therefore had no chance of selection? Are any households located on main streets?
2. Are there any residential streets that do not cross a main street and therefore had no chance of selection?
3. Are there any residential streets that cross more than one main street and therefore had multiple chances of selection?
4. For the selected residential streets, were all households numbered?
5. Were there any residential streets with fewer than 40 households?
6. What rules were used for proceeding from the selected starting

household on a residential street to the adjacent household?

[MS] Again, really good questions. To repeat, the paper states "The third stage consisted of random selection of a main street within the administrative unit from a list of all main streets." Unfortunately, Burnham et al. have been asked to provide their lists of "administrative units" and also of main streets within these administrative units and have refused. In fact, Seppo Laaksonen, professor of survey methodology in Helsinki

<http://wiki.helsinki.fi/display/mathstatHenkilokunta/Laaksonen,+Seppo>

asked just for the average number of main streets per administrative unit and was refused. So its hard to even gauge how major these main-street arteries are. Thus, there is no way to really know exactly what a main street is in which case your questions become difficult to answer. Still, in some of the papers I link to above we try get at some issues like the ones you are raising.

Your point number 6 about how one proceeds from household to household by "adjacency" is a crucial and underappreciated one in conflict surveys, and probably beyond. Many papers in this literature contain a statement like "after selecting the first household we proceed by proximity" without pinning down what this "proximity" means. In a situation where there may be, say, a bombed out house nearby giving discretion to field teams to define proximity invites bias. I get into this a bit in this presentation:

[http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Brussels\\_2007\\_bias.pdf](http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Brussels_2007_bias.pdf)

## ESTIMATION PROCEDURE

The article does not provide any details. It would appear that all sample households were given the same weight. If this is the case, the

estimates do not reflect the varying selection probabilities resulting  
from the sampling procedures used in stage 3.

[MS]=C2=A0 You are  
right.=C2=A0 Although the paper does not make this clear subsequent  
discussion has clarified that each household was given equal weight.=C2=A0  
The bias resulting from this was a point was first made by Seppo  
Laaksonen here:

<http://www.warc.com/LandingPages/Generic/Results.asp?Ref=3D819=C2=A0> (pa  
ssword protected  
unfortunately but I would think that he'd email it to you.)

Thank you very much  
for your efforts Mr. Jabine.=C2=A0 I would be honored to correspond with you  
further.

With the Greatest  
Respect,

Mike Spगत

Tom Jabine

Professor Michael  
Spगत

Department of Economics

Royal Holloway College

University of London



Egham

Surrey

TW20 0EX

United Kingdom

+44 1784 414001 (W)

+44 1784 439534 (F)

M.Spogat@rhul.ac.uk

<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014>

~~~~~  
To subscribe/unsubscribe SRMSNet:

<http://listserv.umd.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A0=3Dsirmsnet&D=3D0&F=3D&H=3D0&O=3DT&S=3D&T=3D1>

SRMS website: <http://www.amstat.org/sections/srms/>
~~~~~

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

=====

Date: Mon, 9 Feb 2009 11:36:25 -0000

Reply-To: Spogat M <[M.Spogat@RHUL.AC.UK](mailto:M.Spogat@RHUL.AC.UK)>

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

From: Spogat M <[M.Spogat@RHUL.AC.UK](mailto:M.Spogat@RHUL.AC.UK)>

Subject: Re: Deaths in Iraq

Comments: To: Marc Sapir <[marcsapir@GMAIL.COM](mailto:marcsapir@GMAIL.COM)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

In-Reply-To: A<[004501c98987\\$1a6fe1e0\\$4001a8c0@RetroPoll](mailto:004501c98987$1a6fe1e0$4001a8c0@RetroPoll)>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Hello everyone. =20

Marc. Thank you so much for your very thoughtful comments! =20

Below I try to answer all the questions as well as I can.

Mike Spगत

Professor Michael Spगत  
Department of Economics  
Royal Holloway College  
University of London  
Egham  
Surrey  
TW20 0EX  
United Kingdom  
+44 1784 414001 (W)  
+44 1784 439534 (F)  
M.Spगत@rhul.ac.uk  
<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014>

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Marc Sapir  
Sent: 08 February 2009 00:49  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Deaths in Iraq

Paul,

Do you have a link for the original Burnham Lancet article?

[MS] Here is a link that doesn't require a password or registrations:  
<http://brusselstribunal.org/pdf/lancet111006.pdf>

In looking at Michael Spगत's last article I have a few questions that someone may be able to help me out with. It appears to me that the Spगत analysis is made considering only deaths related to the improvised explosive devices and suicide bombings (and other attacks by either the Iraqi resistance, Iraqi factions or Al Qaeda in Iraq). The assumption that most deaths occur near interesections (i.e. presumably intersections with main streets) was predicated upon that and the text says as much.

[MS] We try to give some sense in our paper of the ways in which this bias would assert itself. For example,=20

"For conflicts like the one in Iraq, violent events tend to be focused

around cross-streets since they are a natural habitat for patrols, convoys, police stations, parked cars, road-blocks, cafes and street-markets. Major highways would not offer such a wide range of potential targets -- nor would secluded neighbourhoods."

and

"It is likely that the streets that define the samplable region are sufficiently broad and well-paved for military convoys and patrols to pass, are highly suitable for street-markets and concentrations of people and are, therefore, prime targets for improvised explosive devices, car bombs, sniper attacks, abductions and drive-by shootings."

We definitely think that the bias does apply to more than improvised explosive devices and suicide bombings. Military/police patrols do not normally penetrate into, say, back alleys. Military vehicles are even restricted in the kinds of places they can go to and generally have to stick fairly close to main arteries.

I had thought that these various papers on civilian deaths in Iraq were aimed at looking at all deaths (including caused by US actions.

[MS] Perhaps this is a small point in this context but none of the four surveys of conflict mortality (and other things for two of them) actually distinguish between civilians and combatants. Usually conflict surveys do not ask household members to disclose whether dead household members were combatants or not because it is believed that doing so might intimidate some respondents and would also invite some false reporting. So the four surveys measure mortality of civilians plus combatants. It is hard not to be confused on this point because the media, the authors of the surveys that were published in the Lancet and even official statements of the Bloomberg School of Public Health often describe these estimates as estimates of civilian deaths. =20

The Iraq Body Count (IBC) project records only civilian deaths. (IBC's range in part reflects uncertainty over whether some deaths were of civilians or of combatants.)

Bombings from planes or helicopter fire, ground fire and other US military attacks are probably not more likely to occur at intersections. Does the Lancet paper not pertain to all Iraqi deaths? Wouldn't that change Spagat's analysis some?=20

[MS] Certainly the Lancet paper pertains to all deaths. Also, you are certainly right that we'd expect that the locations of events, and locations of households where victims of events live, would depend on the type of event. =20

At the moment I don't know of any real data for Iraq that is available and would help us to really analyze such relationships. Based on my general impressions you might have a point. For example, planes may sometimes hit targets that contain households but are still away from bustling areas. Still, often aerial bombs will be linked with ground

attacks that often will be based around main arteries. Similarly, I suspect that helicopters and ground fire by the US military would tend to have such bias because of the types of places where military patrols would go. =20

Maybe this is a good place to say that our group doesn't hang our hats on any particular value of bias. The degree of bias, if any, depends on the parameters of the model. We did try to think through a plausible set of values for the parameters. These values generate a bias factor of 3. The paper contains a sensitivity analysis showing how the amount of bias depends on the parameter values. We also give the conditions that would have to hold for there to be no bias. We could make better estimates of the bias if Burnham et al. would release some basic data that they must have, for example, the lists of main streets from which they made their random choices. Unfortunately, this information is still unavailable.

Then there is the problem of diffusion. Once one assumes a low level of population mobility under the conditions of war in Iraq the error calculation proceeds from that. But is there evidence on population diffusion, one way or another? In countries under occupation population mobility varies from day to day and month to month depending upon conditions and threat levels and rules of the occupying forces. When things calm down people come out on the streets and try to restore their normal lives.

[MS] Yes, certainly diffusion is crucial. We show in our paper, intuitively enough, that if diffusion is perfect then there is no bias. I don't know of any data that can really help to pin this down for Iraq. However, we were able to find some remarkable data on the conflict in Thailand that records both the districts where people were killed and injured and the districts where they lived/live. See figure three of this paper which was just published in European Physics Letters:

[http://arxiv.org/PS\\_cache/arxiv/pdf/0807/0807.4420v3.pdf](http://arxiv.org/PS_cache/arxiv/pdf/0807/0807.4420v3.pdf)

It shows that the overwhelming majority of casualties (i.e., killings plus injuries) occur in the district where people live, i.e., close to home. Upon reflection, I think this is what most people would expect but it is very nice that there is some data to back up this feeling. =20

Marc's analysis on how diffusion might vary depending on conditions makes perfect sense to me. =20

"When things calm down people come out on the streets and try to restore their normal lives."

I note that an implication of this would be that the greater the violence the less the diffusion and, hence, the greater the bias.

Moreover, there have been reports of as many as 4 million displaced

people wandering around Iraq and 2 million emigrees. How can one estimate a diffusion level under such varying circumstances? Doesn't this problem defeat the exercise?

[MS] Such high levels of displacement will muck up all sorts of analyses, certainly including surveys, and our analysis would hardly be immune. Note, however, that the Burnham et. al. Lancet study says nothing about displacement. In fact, the word "displacement" does not appear and "refugee" only appears in the name of the center that Gilbert Burnham heads. Some people in the sample may well have been displaced and moved in with relatives but, apparently, no one was in anything like a camp for the displaced. =20

Spagat et al point out that the Burnham results are 3-4 times greater than 2 other studies and 12 times greater than the Iraq Body Count based upon newspaper reports. Am I right that the 3-4 times estimate seems to conform best to Spagat's statistical adjustment maneuver?

[MS] I think I touched on this already but I want to make everything as clear as possible. Yes, I guess you could say that the factor of 3 was our best statistical adjustment maneuver based on the inadequate information that is available. It is in no way a rigid claim. Our sensitivity analysis suggests all sorts of other possibilities. Really the tables we give aren't even all that necessary. The formula is simple. Anyone can punch parameter values he/she thinks make sense into a calculator and see what comes out. =20

I'm sure that views on our team differ but I personally do not think that this bias alone can account for the yawning gap between the Burnham et al. estimate all the credible evidence. I do think that it is one factor that might explain a big chunk of the gap. =20

That total would still be in the hundreds of thousands and far greater than the figures the US government was releasing. =20

[MS] There is no doubt that there has been massive carnage in Iraq. =20

As of today Iraq Body Count gives a range of 90,590 to 98,892 violent deaths of civilians since the beginning of the war. There are just documented deaths, excluding combatants, so a full count, including combatants and undocumented deaths, must be well above 100,000. =20

The Iraq Family Health Survey, which was published just over a year ago in the New England Journal of Medicine, estimated 151,000 violent deaths of civilians plus combatants as of the middle of 2006 (before violence peaked, actually). I think that there were some sources of overestimation in this survey (which I would be happy to elaborate on if people are interested) but this was definitely large, serious, careful, well-supervised survey. =20

As for the US government, I am not aware of anything like an official figure that has been released that begins to approach the actual scale of the violence. I believe that the first hint of US data on civilian

casualties in Iraq was in the famous April, 2008 testimony of General Petraeus before Congress:

[http://www.mnf-iraq.com/images/stories/Press\\_briefings/2008/april/080408\\_petraeus\\_handout.pdf](http://www.mnf-iraq.com/images/stories/Press_briefings/2008/april/080408_petraeus_handout.pdf)

One of the slides accompanying the testimony is a time series of civilian deaths but it only starts in January 2006. The US Congress mandated regular reports from the Pentagon on progress in Iraq and these are posted here:

[http://www.defenselink.mil/home/features/Iraq\\_Reports/index.html](http://www.defenselink.mil/home/features/Iraq_Reports/index.html)

These contain a fair amount of data, including on civilian deaths, but not a lot of documentation. The civilian time series always start in 2006. I just looked at the civilian time series from the latest report:

[http://www.defenselink.mil/pubs/pdfs/9010\\_Report\\_to\\_Congress\\_Dec\\_08.pdf](http://www.defenselink.mil/pubs/pdfs/9010_Report_to_Congress_Dec_08.pdf)

I guesstimated numbers off the graph and added them up. It comes to about 55,000 civilians killed between January of 2006 and November of 2008. (The IBC range for the same period is 56,398-60,562.) I've never heard a US spokesperson come out with an aggregate number like this but I guess you could say that, implicitly, the US accepts that there have been tens of thousand of civilian deaths in Iraq. =20

By the way, I've been expecting the Pentagon database, called "SIGACTS", to be released at the week-district, unfortunately not incident, level for a while not but this hasn't happened yet. =20

Also, if the Burnham study was estimating all deaths due directly to all warfare, was there no one looking at fractional deaths caused directly by US military activity? In past wars, such as Vietnam, the US would release figures of non-US as well as US military deaths. But with Iraq it seems the Pentagon decided it was not in the "national interest" to compile and release such numbers.

[MS] I take it that you're interested in what percentage of the deaths are directly caused by US forces. This is another kind of question that is often not asked in surveys, again because it might intimidate people and also because it might encourage false responses. Think about it. If you give people a chance to report not just that there has been a death in the household but that the death was caused by a group they hate the temptation to make up a death, or simply make up a perpetrator can become pretty strong.

Nevertheless, the Burnham et al. Lancet survey reports that 31% of its violent deaths were directly attributed to the coalition (slightly broader than US). This would translate into an estimate of about 186,000 violent deaths of civilians plus combatants directly caused by coalition forces.

IBC records over the whole war a range of 10678-13267 violent deaths of

civilians directly attributable to coalition forces. However, it is crucial to realize that IBC is not able to pin down perpetrators for many deaths. For example, some deaths enter the database through monthly figures released by the Baghdad morgue and are not traceable to particular incidents. Maybe 10% of these victims were killed by Coalition forces. So the true number would be higher than the above range. Information on combatants killed by coalition forces is fragmentary and not hugely reliable but it is almost surely larger than 10,000. =20

Of course, here we are talking about direct US responsibility. Since the US initiated the war its full responsibility runs deeper than this.

I think that Marc is absolutely right that "the Pentagon decided it was not in the "national interest" to compile and release such numbers." I think they were definitely wrong about this. Among the consequences are some of the consequent gap has been plugged by bad statistics. =20

Finally, this thread began with AAPOR's press release citing Burnham. I may have missed some intervening e-mails, but I don't yet understand how he concealed the methodology, leading ultimately to the press release.

[MS] I think it would be good if the AAPOR Standards Committee would give an inventory of the things that they asked for and did not obtain. I am sure that a lot of people, including me, are wondering about this. However, I discuss the non-disclosure issue in pages 7-18 of this paper:

[http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Ethics%20and%20Data%20Integrity\\_8\\_09\\_08.pdf](http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Ethics%20and%20Data%20Integrity_8_09_08.pdf)

This paper is now forthcoming in Defense and Peace Economics and, in an earlier form, is what I submitted to the AAPOR standards committee when I requested that they investigate the Burnham et al. paper in the first place. =20

For me, the most important things that have not been disclosed are:

1. The questionnaire. =20
2. Data matching anonymized interviewer IDs with households.
3. Basic information on the sample design.

But there are certainly other things that have not been disclosed, such as an informed consent script.

After the 2004 election debacle (in Ohio and with the exit polls in most battle ground states overestimating Kerry) a number of people were trying to get Edison-Mitovsky to fully release their methods and data. After quite a delay the data got posted but without identifying markers for the particular precincts sampled. That made it pretty much

impossible to try and check the sampling against the reported data of the actual vote precinct by precinct. (The argument made then against release was that there was potential loss of confidentiality, that individual voters might be identified, though that could have been overcome). Although I obviously don't know what Burnham withheld nor why, I'd appreciate understanding how the 2004 Presidential situation was different from this one?

[MS] I'm afraid I can't answer that one.

I hope that people have found this message to be useful. I will be happy to respond to further questions.

Mike Spagat

Marc

Marc Sapir MD, MPH  
510-848-3826  
marcsapir@gmail.com

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Paul J Lavrakas PhD

Sent: Saturday, February 07, 2009 2:55 PM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: FW: Deaths in Iraq

fyi

From: Survey Research Methods Section of the ASA [mailto:SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU] On Behalf Of Tom Jabine

Sent: Saturday, February 07, 2009 9:56 AM

To: SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU

Subject: Deaths in Iraq

My post yesterday re the design of the survey to estimate civilian deaths in Iraq led to a detailed and useful response by Prof. Michael Spagat which I am posting with his permission.

Tom Jabine

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

Subject:

Your listserve message



Date:

Fri, 6 Feb 2009 16:32:59 -0000

From:

Spagat M <mailto:M.Spagat@rhul.ac.uk> <M.Spagat@rhul.ac.uk>

To:

<mailto:tjabine@starpower.net> <tjabine@starpower.net>

CC:

<mailto:scheuren@aol.com> <scheuren@aol.com>

Dear Mr. Jabine,

I am not on the SRMSNET listserv but Fritz Scheuren forwarded your posting to me. Your posting is very strong, especially considering that, apparently, you did it cold based just on reading the Lancet paper. There has been a lot of discussion related to some of the issues you raise that you are probably not aware of. So I thought that I would bring you up to date. I will focus on sampling but I have much more on my home page:

<<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Research.htm>>

<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Research.htm>

Feel free to post this onto the listserv if you wish.

Here is paper I participated in on possible sampling bias related to the "main-street" aspect of the sampling plan that you refer to below:

<[http://www.hicn.org/research\\_design/rdn2.pdf](http://www.hicn.org/research_design/rdn2.pdf)>

[http://www.hicn.org/research\\_design/rdn2.pdf](http://www.hicn.org/research_design/rdn2.pdf)

This paper was recently published in the Journal of Peace Research and even won article of the year:

<<http://www.prio.no/Research-and-Publications/Journal-of-Peace-Research/>

Arti

cle-of-the-year/>

<http://www.prio.no/Research-and-Publications/Journal-of-Peace-Research/A>

rtic

le-of-the-year/

Here we extend the analysis in a paper recently published in European

Physics Letters: <<http://arxiv.org/abs/0807.4420>>

<http://arxiv.org/abs/0807.4420> We also set up a web sight on this

"main-street bias" issue:

<<http://www.rhul.ac.uk/Economics/Research/conflict-analysis/iraq-mortality/>>  
<http://www.rhul.ac.uk/Economics/Research/conflict-analysis/iraq-mortality/>

Nevertheless, it is hard to get a handle on the types of issues that you and we have raised because there have been a series of changing and contradictory stories on how the sampling was done in the Burnham et al. paper. I discuss these ambiguities here:

<<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Households%20in%20Conflict%202007.pdf>>  
<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Households%20in%20Conflict%202007.pdf>

and here in pages 11-14. (This paper is forthcoming in the journal Defense and Peace Economics)

<[http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Ethics%20and%20Data%20Integrity\\_8\\_09\\_08.pdf](http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Ethics%20and%20Data%20Integrity_8_09_08.pdf)>  
[http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Ethics%20and%20Data%20Integrity\\_8\\_09\\_08.pdf](http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Ethics%20and%20Data%20Integrity_8_09_08.pdf)

I have some more specific comments below.

I have just recently obtained and read the Lancet article reporting on this study. Following are some comments and questions that I would raise about the sample selection and estimation procedures. I look forward to seeing the evaluation of the survey methodology by Peter Lynn.

Comments on October 2006 Lancet article on deaths in Iraq

## SAMPLE SELECTION

### Stage 1

Systematic PPS to determine no. of clusters to be selected from each of 17 governates, with a total of 50 to be selected. Measure of size was midyear 2004 pop estimates. The Baghdad Governate had 12 "hits", and several others had more than one. Two governates had no hits.

### Stage 2

Administrative units within each selected governate were selected "randomly proportionate to population size".

### Questions:

1. Was the selection systematic for those governates from which more than one cluster was to be selected?

2. Were there any administrative units that had more than one hit?

[MS] Good questions. I'm not aware of anyone ever having asked these. I wonder if AAPOR asked questions like these? It really would be nice if they would specify precisely what they asked for and did not get.

### Stage 3

"The third stage consisted of random selection of a main street within the administrative unit from a list of all main streets. A residential street was then randomly selected from a list of residential streets crossing the main street. On the residential street, houses were numbered and a start household was randomly selected. From this start household, the team proceeded to the adjacent residence until 40 households were surveyed. For this study, a household was defined as a unit that ate together, and had a separate entrance from the street or a separate apartment entrance."

#### Questions:

1. Are there any households in Iraq that are not on residential streets and therefore had no chance of selection? Are any households located on main streets?
2. Are there any residential streets that do not cross a main street and therefore had no chance of selection?
3. Are there any residential streets that cross more than one main street and therefore had multiple chances of selection?
4. For the selected residential streets, were all households numbered?
5. Were there any residential streets with fewer than 40 households?
6. What rules were used for proceeding from the selected starting household on a residential street to the "adjacent" households?

[MS] Again, really good questions. To repeat, the paper states "The third stage consisted of random selection of a main street within the administrative unit from a list of all main streets." Unfortunately, Burnham et al. have been asked to provide their lists of "administrative units" and also of main streets within these administrative units and have refused. In fact, Seppo Laaksonen, professor of survey methodology in Helsinki

<<http://wiki.helsinki.fi/display/mathstatHenkilokunta/Laaksonen,+Seppo>>  
<http://wiki.helsinki.fi/display/mathstatHenkilokunta/Laaksonen,+Seppo>  
asked just for the average number of main streets per administrative unit and was refused. So its hard to even gauge how major these main-street arteries are. Thus, there is no way to really know exactly

what a main street is in which case your questions become difficult to answer. Still, in some of the papers I link to above we try get at some issues like the ones you are raising.

Your point number 6 about how one proceeds from household to household by "adjacency" is a crucial and underappreciated one in conflict surveys, and probably beyond. Many papers in this literature contain a statement like "after selecting the first household we proceed by proximity" without pinning down what this "proximity" means. In a situation where there may be, say, a bombed out house nearby giving discretion to field teams to define proximity invites bias. I get into this a bit in this presentation:

<[http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Brussels\\_2007\\_bias.pdf](http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Brussels_2007_bias.pdf)>  
[http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Brussels\\_2007\\_bias.pdf](http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Brussels_2007_bias.pdf)

## ESTIMATION PROCEDURE

The article does not provide any details. It would appear that all sample households were given the same weight. If this is the case, the estimates do not reflect the varying selection probabilities resulting from the sampling procedures used in stage 3.

[MS] You are right. Although the paper does not make this clear subsequent discussion has clarified that each household was given equal weight. The bias resulting from this was a point was first made by Seppo Laaksonen here:

<<http://www.warc.com/LandingPages/Generic/Results.asp?Ref=3D819>>  
<http://www.warc.com/LandingPages/Generic/Results.asp?Ref=3D819> =  
(password  
protected unfortunately but I would think that he'd email it to you.)

Thank you very much for your efforts Mr. Jabine. I would be honored to correspond with you further. With the Greatest Respect, Mike Spagat

Tom Jabine

Professor Michael Spagat  
Department of Economics  
Royal Holloway College  
University of London  
Egham  
Surrey  
TW20 0EX  
United Kingdom  
+44 1784 414001 (W)  
+44 1784 439534 (F)  
M.Spagat@rhul.ac.uk  
<<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014>>

http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014

~~~~~ To subscribe/unsubscribe

SRMSNet:

http://listserv.umd.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A0=3Dsrmsnet&D=3D0&F=3D&H=3D0&O=3DT&S=3D=&T=3D1

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

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>
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, 9 Feb 2009 10:47:10 -0500
Reply-To: Greg Smith <gsmith@PEWFORUM.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Greg Smith <gsmith@PEWFORUM.ORG>
Subject: Job Opening, Pew Research Center's Forum on Religion & Public
Life
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

The Pew Research Center's Forum on Religion & Public Life has an opening =
for an Analyst to support research in the area of religion and social =
welfare. Details below.

=20

-Greg Smith

=20

=20

=20

Research Analyst, Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life

=20

Organization Overview

The Pew Research Center is a nonpartisan "fact tank" that provides information on the issues, attitudes and trends shaping America and the world. It does so by conducting public opinion polling and social science research; analyzing news coverage; and holding forums and briefings. It does not take positions on policy issues. Its work is carried out by a "Core" administrative and publishing unit and these seven projects:

=20

* The Pew Research Center for the People and the Press ([people-press.org](http://www.people-press.org)) led by Andrew Kohut

* Pew Project for Excellence in Journalism (journalism.org) led by Tom Rosenstiel

* Pew Internet & American Life Project (pewinternet.org) led by Lee Rainie

* Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life (pewforum.org) led by Luis Lugo

* Pew Hispanic Center (pewhispanic.org) led by Paul Taylor

* Pew Global Attitudes Project (pewglobal.org) led by Andrew Kohut

* Pew Social & Demographic Trends (pewsocialtrends.org) led by Paul Taylor

=20

Forum on Religion and Public Life Overview

The Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life (Forum), launched in 2001, seeks to promote a deeper understanding of issues at the intersection of religion and public affairs. The Forum pursues its mission by delivering timely, impartial information to national opinion leaders, including government officials and journalists. The Forum functions as both an information clearinghouse and a town hall. As a clearinghouse it tracks and aggregates news and conducts independent research, including surveys, legal backgrounders, reports, books and Q&A interviews. As a town hall, it provides a neutral venue for discussion. In these roles, the Forum serves as an important information resource for political leaders, journalists, scholars and public interest groups.

=20

Position Summary=20

The Research Analyst supports all aspects of the Forum's quantitative = and qualitative research agenda in the area of religion and social = welfare. This includes helping to prepare and review analysis reports, = performing statistical analysis of data, and creating topline and = tables for survey reports. The Research Analyst will track and analyze = faith-based social programs and related social welfare policy issues.

=20

Responsibilities=20

- * Statistical analysis (30%)
- * Report writing and number checking (30%)
- * Survey development and analysis (20%)
- * Tracking and analyzing policies (20%)

=20

Education/Experience

- * Bachelor's degree required. =20
- * 1-3 years experience in public policy research required.
- * Master's degree in the social sciences preferred.
- * Proven ability to undertake research involving data analysis required, = including using SPSS, Excel and other software, and using Lexis-Nexis to = track policies. =20
- * Primary interest area in religion and social welfare policy preferred.

=20

Knowledge/Skills

- * Quantitative skills, including an ability to use SPSS and other = statistical programs to organize and analyze large amounts of data.
- * Policy analysis skills, including use of Lexis-Nexis.
- * Attention to detail, including exacting standards to maintain accuracy = and impartiality in all work products
- * Strong verbal and written communications skills
- * Ability to work collaboratively and collegially with senior staff and = other researchers, as well as with staff from other PRC projects and = outside organizations.=20
- * Ability to balance multiple projects and meet tight deadlines while = ensuring accuracy in data management, fact checking and research.

=20

Application Procedure

Applicant should send a r=E9sum=E9, cover letter (indicating where you =

learned of the opening) and salary expectations to:

=20

Ms. April McWilliams

Human Resources Director

Pew Research Center

1615 L Street, NW Suite 700

Washington, DC 20036

=20

Responses can also be faxed to 202-419-4339 or e-mailed to =
careers@pewresearch.org

=20

We are an equal opportunity employer.

=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: Mon, 9 Feb 2009 10:48:21 -0800

Reply-To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@GMAIL.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@GMAIL.COM>

Subject: Re: Deaths in Iraq

Comments: To: Spagat M <M.Spagat@rhul.ac.uk>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

In-Reply-To: <E5F8E4518B68AA439EE1BDFCF08ABE71011B3A2A@EXCH-DB-02.cc.rhul.local>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Professor Spagat,

Thank you kindly for taking the time to answer my questions in such great detail. You've clarified most of my concerns. The one

outstanding concern I have pertains again to the issue of the intersections. Since we do not know what proportion of deaths in Iraq are the result of the US use of aircraft or the abduction murders by sectarian groups (some of which unfortunately were funded by the US as well) I still believe that these factors could introduce a significant (uncalculable) level of uncertainty into any modelling. Although the recent Israeli attack on Gaza is not directly analogous to the protracted killing in Iraq, the Gaza situation has shown that Israel's bombardments involved careful calculated targetting in urban locations that would likely be unrelated to street traffic density considerations. The US has provided Israel with weapons that have amazing accuracy in targetting (and Israel also has very sophisticated technology capacity of its own). Thus a lot of the warfare there was not "responsive" or "reactive" but strategic and planned based upon various political considerations (eg. the bombing of the UN compound, of the American School, the Muslim college, of all the public/government buildings and of apartment houses Israeli forces had told people to flee to). The US now produces a small bomb (the DIME bomb) one of whose versions is capable of tracking a mobile target for a period of time before attacking it. Targets are then chosen by their "political value" and can be hunted. The US may (or may not) have used similar military strategy planning in Baghdad, in Falujah or in other intense combat exercises in Iraq. These newer innovations of urban irregular warfare are the cause of a high proportion of deaths and casualties in Gaza that had little to do with intersections. I do agree that a cluster sampling method that concentrated more on main thoroughfares might overestimate the deaths but for another reason--by oversampling prominent building sites in such a setting. I hope that Burnham's group will choose to respond to the various concerns you and AAPOR have raised, as your concerns appear to be methodological and not to be politically motivated. Unfortunately, the AAPOR press release did not create the needed confidence in that respect. As an aside regarding the Thailand deaths, I'm not sure that the data you allude to supports your point on diffusion. As you may know studies show that most automobile accidents in the US occur within a few miles of the home. Aren't both of these instances examples of the physics principle that diffusion concentration is related to the square of the distance from the emanation point even with a diffusion coefficient of 1? Inevitably, more people are likely to die closer to home for most causes that don't require a uniquely specified environment (eg. a plane crash). Certainly, if one hopes to generalize to a national population estimate everyone should have a near equal probability of getting sampled and any potential for a systematic geographical bias should be examined. Thanks again.

marc sapir

Marc Sapir MD, MPH
510-848-3826

marcsapir@gmail.com

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

From: Spagat M [mailto:M.Spagat@rhul.ac.uk]

Sent: Monday, February 09, 2009 3:36 AM

To: Marc Sapir; AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: RE: Deaths in Iraq

Hello everyone.

Marc. Thank you so much for your very thoughtful comments!

Below I try to answer all the questions as well as I can.

Mike Spagat

Professor Michael Spagat
Department of Economics
Royal Holloway College
University of London
Egham
Surrey
TW20 0EX
United Kingdom
+44 1784 414001 (W)
+44 1784 439534 (F)
M.Spagat@rhul.ac.uk
<<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014>>
<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014>

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

From: AAPORNET [<<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>> <mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On
Behalf Of Marc Sapir
Sent: 08 February 2009 00:49
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: Deaths in Iraq

Paul,

Do you have a link for the original Burnham Lancet article?

[MS] Here is a link that doesn't require a password or registrations:
<<http://brusselstribunal.org/pdf/lancet111006.pdf>>
<http://brusselstribunal.org/pdf/lancet111006.pdf>

In looking at Michael Spagat's last article I have a few questions that someone may be able to help me out with. It appears to me that the Spagat analysis is made considering only deaths related to the improvised explosive devices and suicide bombings (and other attacks by either the Iraqi resistance, Iraqi factions or Al Qaeda in Iraq). The assumption that most deaths occur near interesections (i.e. presumably intersections with main streets) was predicated upon that and the text says as much.

[MS] We try to give some sense in our paper of the ways in which this bias would assert itself. For example,

"For conflicts like the one in Iraq, violent events tend to be focused around cross-streets since they are a natural habitat for patrols, convoys, police stations, parked cars, road-blocks, cafes and street-markets. Major highways would not offer such a wide range of potential targets -- nor would secluded neighbourhoods."

and

"It is likely that the streets that define the samplable region are sufficiently broad and well-paved for military convoys and patrols to pass, are highly suitable for street-markets and concentrations of people and are, therefore, prime targets for improvised explosive devices, car bombs, sniper attacks, abductions and drive-by shootings."

We definitely think that the bias does apply to more than improvised explosive devices and suicide bombings. Military/police patrols do not normally penetrate into, say, back alleys. Military vehicles are even restricted in the kinds of places they can go to and generally have to stick fairly close to main arteries.

I had thought that these various papers on civilian deaths in Iraq were aimed at looking at all deaths (including caused by US actions.

[MS] Perhaps this is a small point in this context but none of the four surveys of conflict mortality (and other things for two of them) actually distinguish between civilians and combatants. Usually conflict surveys do not ask household members to disclose whether dead household members were combatants or not because it is believed that doing so might intimidate some respondents and would also invite some false reporting. So the four surveys measure mortality of civilians plus combatants. It is hard not to be confused on this point because the media, the authors of the surveys that were published in the Lancet and even official statements of the Bloomberg School of Public Health often describe these estimates as estimates of civilian deaths.

The Iraq Body Count (IBC) project records only civilian deaths. (IBC's range in part reflects uncertainty over whether some deaths were of civilians or of combatants.)

Bombings from planes or helicopter fire, ground fire and other US military attacks are probably not more likely to occur at intersections. Does the Lancet paper not pertain to all Iraqi deaths? Wouldn't that change Spagat's analysis some?

[MS] Certainly the Lancet paper pertains to all deaths. Also, you are certainly right that we'd expect that the locations of events, and locations of households where victims of events live, would depend on the type of event.

At the moment I don't know of any real data for Iraq that is available

and would help us to really analyze such relationships. Based on my general impressions you might have a point. For example, planes may sometimes hit targets that contain households but are still away from bustling areas. Still, often aerial bombs will be linked with ground attacks that often will be based around main arteries. Similarly, I suspect that helicopters and ground fire by the US military would tend to have such bias because of the types of places where military patrols would go.

Maybe this is a good place to say that our group doesn't hang our hats on any particular value of bias. The degree of bias, if any, depends on the parameters of the model. We did try to think through a plausible set of values for the parameters. These values generate a bias factor of 3. The paper contains a sensitivity analysis showing how the amount of bias depends on the parameter values. We also give the conditions that would have to hold for there to be no bias. We could make better estimates of the bias if Burnham et al. would release some basic data that they must have, for example, the lists of main streets from which they made their random choices. Unfortunately, this information is still unavailable.

Then there is the problem of diffusion. Once one assumes a low level of population mobility under the conditions of war in Iraq the error calculation proceeds from that. But is there evidence on population diffusion, one way or another? In countries under occupation population mobility varies from day to day and month to month depending upon conditions and threat levels and rules of the occupying forces. When things calm down people come out on the streets and try to restore their normal lives.

[MS] Yes, certainly diffusion is crucial. We show in our paper, intuitively enough, that if diffusion is perfect then there is no bias. I don't know of any data that can really help to pin this down for Iraq. However, we were able to find some remarkable data on the conflict in Thailand that records both the districts where people were killed and injured and the districts where they lived/live. See figure three of this paper which was just published in European Physics Letters:

<http://arxiv.org/PS_cache/arxiv/pdf/0807/0807.4420v3.pdf>
http://arxiv.org/PS_cache/arxiv/pdf/0807/0807.4420v3.pdf

It shows that the overwhelming majority of casualties (i.e., killings plus injuries) occur in the district where people live, i.e., close to home. Upon reflection, I think this is what most people would expect but it is very nice that there is some data to back up this feeling.

Marc's analysis on how diffusion might vary depending on conditions makes perfect sense to me.

"When things calm down people come out on the streets and try to restore their normal lives."

I note that an implication of this would be that the greater the violence the less the diffusion and, hence, the greater the bias.

Moreover, there have been reports of as many as 4 million displaced people wandering around Iraq and 2 million emigres. How can one estimate a diffusion level under such varying circumstances? Doesn't this problem defeat the exercise?

[MS] Such high levels of displacement will muck up all sorts of analyses, certainly including surveys, and our analysis would hardly be immune. Note, however, that the Burnham et. al. Lancet study says nothing about displacement. In fact, the word "displacement" does not appear and "refugee" only appears in the name of the center that Gilbert Burnham heads. Some people in the sample may well have been displaced and moved in with relatives but, apparently, no one was in anything like a camp for the displaced.

Spagat et al point out that the Burnham results are 3-4 times greater than 2 other studies and 12 times greater than the Iraq Body Count based upon newspaper reports. Am I right that the 3-4 times estimate seems to conform best to Spagat's statistical adjustment maneuver?

[MS] I think I touched on this already but I want to make everything as clear as possible. Yes, I guess you could say that the factor of 3 was our best statistical adjustment maneuver based on the inadequate information that is available. It is in no way a rigid claim. Our sensitivity analysis suggests all sorts of other possibilities. Really the tables we give aren't even all that necessary. The formula is simple. Anyone can punch parameter values he/she thinks make sense into a calculator and see what comes out.

I'm sure that views on our team differ but I personally do not think that this bias alone can account for the yawning gap between the Burnham et al. estimate all the credible evidence. I do think that it is one factor that might explain a big chunk of the gap.

That total would still be in the hundreds of thousands and far greater than the figures the US government was releasing.

[MS] There is no doubt that there has been massive carnage in Iraq.

As of today Iraq Body Count gives a range of 90,590 to 98,892 violent deaths of civilians since the beginning of the war. There are just documented deaths, excluding combatants, so a full count, including combatants and undocumented deaths, must be well above 100,000.

The Iraq Family Health Survey, which was published just over a year ago in the New England Journal of Medicine, estimated 151,000 violent deaths of civilians plus combatants as of the middle of 2006 (before violence peaked, actually). I think that there were some sources of overestimation in this survey (which I would be happy to elaborate on if people are interested) but this was definitely large, serious, careful,

well-supervised survey.

As for the US government, I am not aware of anything like an official figure that has been released that begins to approach the actual scale of the violence. I believe that the first hint of US data on civilian casualties in Iraq was in the famous April, 2008 testimony of General Petraeus before Congress:

<http://www.mnf-iraq.com/images/stories/Press_briefings/2008/april/080408_petraeus_handout.pdf>
http://www.mnf-iraq.com/images/stories/Press_briefings/2008/april/080408_petraeus_handout.pdf

One of the slides accompanying the testimony is a time series of civilian deaths but it only starts in January 2006. The US Congress mandated regular reports from the Pentagon on progress in Iraq and these are posted here:

<http://www.defenselink.mil/home/features/Iraq_Reports/index.html>
http://www.defenselink.mil/home/features/Iraq_Reports/index.html

These contain a fair amount of data, including on civilian deaths, but not a lot of documentation. The civilian time series always start in 2006. I just looked at the civilian time series from the latest report:

<http://www.defenselink.mil/pubs/pdfs/9010_Report_to_Congress_Dec_08.pdf>
>
http://www.defenselink.mil/pubs/pdfs/9010_Report_to_Congress_Dec_08.pdf

I guesstimated numbers off the graph and added them up. It comes to about 55,000 civilians killed between January of 2006 and November of 2008. (The IBC range for the same period is 56,398-60,562.) I've never heard a US spokesperson come out with an aggregate number like this but I guess you could say that, implicitly, the US accepts that there have been tens of thousand of civilian deaths in Iraq.

By the way, I've been expecting the Pentagon database, called "SIGACTS", to be released at the week-district, unfortunately not incident, level for a while not but this hasn't happened yet.

Also, if the Burnham study was estimating all deaths due directly to all warfare, was there no one looking at fractional deaths caused directly by US military activity? In past wars, such as Vietnam, the US would release figures of non-US as well as US military deaths. But with Iraq it seems the Pentagon decided it was not in the "national interest" to compile and release such numbers.

[MS] I take it that you're interested in what percentage of the deaths are directly caused by US forces. This is another kind of question that is often not asked in surveys, again because it might intimidate people and also because it might encourage false responses. Think about it.

If you give people a chance to report not just that there has been a death in the household but that the death was caused by a group they hate the temptation to make up a death, or simply make up a perpetrator can become pretty strong.

Nevertheless, the Burnham et al. Lancet survey reports that 31% of its violent deaths were directly attributed to the coalition (slightly broader than US). This would translate into an estimate of about 186,000 violent deaths of civilians plus combatants directly caused by coalition forces.

IBC records over the whole war a range of 10678-13267 violent deaths of civilians directly attributable to coalition forces. However, it is crucial to realize that IBC is not able to pin down perpetrators for many deaths. For example, some deaths enter the database through monthly figures released by the Baghdad morgue and are not traceable to particular incidents. Maybe 10% of these victims were killed by Coalition forces. So the true number would be higher than the above range. Information on combatants killed by coalition forces is fragmentary and not hugely reliable but it is almost surely larger than 10,000.

Of course, here we are talking about direct US responsibility. Since the US initiated the war its full responsibility runs deeper than this.

I think that Marc is absolutely right that "the Pentagon decided it was not in the "national interest" to compile and release such numbers." I think they were definitely wrong about this. Among the consequences are some of the consequent gap has been plugged by bad statistics.

Finally, this thread began with AAPOR's press release citing Burnham. I may have missed some intervening e-mails, but I don't yet understand how he concealed the methodology, leading ultimately to the press release.

[MS] I think it would be good if the AAPOR Standards Committee would give an inventory of the things that they asked for and did not obtain. I am sure that a lot of people, including me, are wondering about this. However, I discuss the non-disclosure issue in pages 7-18 of this paper:

<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Ethics%20and%20Data%20Integrity_8_09_08.pdf>
http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Ethics%20and%20Data%20Integrity_8_09_08.pdf

This paper is now forthcoming in Defense and Peace Economics and, in an earlier form, is what I submitted to the AAPOR standards committee when I requested that they investigate the Burnham et al. paper in the first place.

For me, the most important things that have not been disclosed are:

1. The questionnaire.
2. Data matching anonymized interviewer IDs with households.
3. Basic information on the sample design.

But there are certainly other things that have not been disclosed, such as an informed consent script.

After the 2004 election debacle (in Ohio and with the exit polls in most battle ground states overestimating Kerry) a number of people were trying to get Edison-Mitovsky to fully release their methods and data. After quite a delay the data got posted but without identifying markers for the particular precincts sampled. That made it pretty much impossible to try and check the sampling against the reported data of the actual vote precinct by precinct. (The argument made then against release was that there was potential loss of confidentiality, that individual voters might be identified, though that could have been overcome). Although I obviously don't know what Burnham withheld nor why, I'd appreciate understanding how the 2004 Presidential situation was different from this one?

[MS] I'm afraid I can't answer that one.

I hope that people have found this message to be useful. I will be happy to respond to further questions.

Mike Spagat

Marc

Marc Sapir MD, MPH
510-848-3826
marcsapir@gmail.com

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu> mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Paul J Lavrakas PhD
Sent: Saturday, February 07, 2009 2:55 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: FW: Deaths in Iraq

fyi

From: Survey Research Methods Section of the ASA [<mailto:SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU> mailto:SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU] On Behalf Of Tom Jabine
Sent: Saturday, February 07, 2009 9:56 AM
To: SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU
Subject: Deaths in Iraq

My post yesterday re the design of the survey to estimate civilian deaths in Iraq led to a detailed and useful response by Prof. Michael Spagat which I am posting with his permission.

Tom Jabine

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

Subject:

Your listserv message

Date:

Fri, 6 Feb 2009 16:32:59 -0000

From:

Spagat M <<mailto:M.Spagat@rhul.ac.uk> mailto:M.Spagat@rhul.ac.uk>
<M.Spagat@rhul.ac.uk>

To:

<<mailto:tjabine@starpower.net> mailto:tjabine@starpower.net>
<tjabine@starpower.net>

CC:

<<mailto:scheuren@aol.com> mailto:scheuren@aol.com> <scheuren@aol.com>

Dear Mr. Jabine,

I am not on the SRMSNET listserv but Fritz Scheuren forwarded your posting to me. Your posting is very strong, especially considering that, apparently, you did it cold based just on reading the Lancet paper. There has been a lot of discussion related to some of the issues you raise that you are probably not aware of. So I thought that I would bring you up to date. I will focus on sampling but I have much more on my home page:

<<<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Research.htm>>

<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Research.htm>
<<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Research.htm>>

<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Research.htm>

Feel free to post this onto the listserv if you wish.

Here is paper I participated in on possible sampling bias related to the "main-street" aspect of the sampling plan that you refer to below:

<<http://www.hicn.org/research_design/rdn2.pdf>

http://www.hicn.org/research_design/rdn2.pdf

<http://www.hicn.org/research_design/rdn2.pdf>

http://www.hicn.org/research_design/rdn2.pdf

This paper was recently published in the Journal of Peace Research and even won article of the year:

<

<<http://www.prio.no/Research-and-Publications/Journal-of-Peace-Research/>

>

<http://www.prio.no/Research-and-Publications/Journal-of-Peace-Research/>

Arti

cle-of-the-year/>

<<http://www.prio.no/Research-and-Publications/Journal-of-Peace-Research/>

A>

<http://www.prio.no/Research-and-Publications/Journal-of-Peace-Research/A>

rtic

le-of-the-year/

Here we extend the analysis in a paper recently published in European

Physics Letters: <<<http://arxiv.org/abs/0807.4420>>

<http://arxiv.org/abs/0807.4420>> <<http://arxiv.org/abs/0807.4420>>

<http://arxiv.org/abs/0807.4420> We also set up a web sight on this

"main-street bias" issue:

<

<<http://www.rhul.ac.uk/Economics/Research/conflict-analysis/iraq-mortality/>

>

<http://www.rhul.ac.uk/Economics/Research/conflict-analysis/iraq-mortality/>

ty/>

<<http://www.rhul.ac.uk/Economics/Research/conflict-analysis/iraq-mortality/>

t>

<http://www.rhul.ac.uk/Economics/Research/conflict-analysis/iraq-mortality/>

y/

Nevertheless, it is hard to get a handle on the types of issues that you

and we have raised because there have been a series of changing and

contradictory stories on how the sampling was done in the Burnham et al.

paper. I discuss these ambiguities here:

<

<[http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Households%20in%20Conflict%202007.p](http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Households%20in%20Conflict%202007.pdf)

>

[http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Households%20in%20Conflict%202007.p](http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Households%20in%20Conflict%202007.pdf)

df>

<<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Households%20in%20Conflict%202007.pdf>>

<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Households%20in%20Conflict%202007.pdf>

f
and here in pages 11-14. (This paper is forthcoming in the journal
Defense and Peace Economics)

<
<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Ethics%20and%20Data%20Integrity_8_09_08.pdf>

>
http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Ethics%20and%20Data%20Integrity_8_09_08.pdf>

<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Ethics%20and%20Data%20Integrity_8_09_08.pdf>

>
http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Ethics%20and%20Data%20Integrity_8_09_08.pdf

_08.

pdf

I have some more specific comments below.

I have just recently obtained and read the Lancet article reporting on this study. Following are some comments and questions that I would raise about the sample selection and estimation procedures. I look forward to seeing the evaluation of the survey methodology by Peter Lynn.

Comments on October 2006 Lancet article on deaths in Iraq

SAMPLE SELECTION

Stage 1

Systematic PPS to determine no. of clusters to be selected from each of 17 governates, with a total of 50 to be selected. Measure of size was midyear 2004 pop estimates. The Baghdad Governate had 12 "hits", and several others had more than one. Two governates had no hits.

Stage 2

Administrative units within each selected governate were selected "randomly proportionate to population size".

Questions:

1. Was the selection systematic for those governates from which more than one cluster was to be selected?

2. Were there any administrative units that had more than one hit?

[MS] Good questions. I'm not aware of anyone ever having asked these. I wonder if AAPOR asked questions like these? It really would be nice

if they would specify precisely what they asked for and did not get.

Stage 3

"The third stage consisted of random selection of a main street within the administrative unit from a list of all main streets. A residential street was then randomly selected from a list of residential streets crossing the main street. On the residential street, houses were numbered and a start household was randomly selected. From this start household, the team proceeded to the adjacent residence until 40=2 0households were surveyed. For this study, a household was defined as a unit that ate together, and had a separate entrance from the street or a separate apartment entrance."

Questions:

1. Are there any households in Iraq that are not on residential streets and therefore had no chance of selection? Are any households located on main streets?
2. Are there any residential streets that do not cross a main street and therefore had no chance of selection?
3. Are there any residential streets that cross more than one main street and therefore had multiple chances of selection?
4. For the selected residential streets, were all households numbered?
5. Were there any residential streets with fewer than 40 households?
6. What rules were used for proceeding from the selected starting household on a residential street to the "adjacent" households?

[MS] Again, really good questions. To repeat, the paper states "The third stage consisted of random selection of a main street within the administrative unit from a list of all main streets." Unfortunately, Burnham et al. have been asked to provide their lists of "administrative units" and also of main streets within these administrative units and have refused. In fact, Seppo Laaksonen, professor of survey methodology in Helsinki

<
<<http://wiki.helsinki.fi/display/mathstatHenkilokunta/Laaksonen,+Seppo>>
<http://wiki.helsinki.fi/display/mathstatHenkilokunta/Laaksonen,+Seppo>>
<<http://wiki.helsinki.fi/display/mathstatHenkilokunta/Laaksonen,+Seppo>>
<http://wiki.helsinki.fi/display/mathstatHenkilokunta/Laaksonen,+Seppo>
asked just for the average number of main streets per administrative unit and was refused. So its hard to even gauge how major these main-street arteries are. Thus, there is no way to really know exactly what a main street is in which case your questions become difficult to answer. Still, in some of the papers I link to above we try get at some

issues like the ones you are raising.

Your point number 6 about how one proceeds from household to household by "adjacency" is a crucial and underappreciated one in conflict surveys, and probably beyond. Many papers in this literature contain a statement like "after selecting the first household we proceed by proximity" without pinning down what this "proximity" means. In a situation where there may be, say, a bombed out house nearby giving discretion to field teams to define proximity invites bias. I get into this a bit in this presentation:

< <http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Brussels_2007_bias.pdf>
http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Brussels_2007_bias.pdf>
<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Brussels_2007_bias.pdf>
http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Brussels_2007_bias.pdf

ESTIMATION PROCEDURE

The article does not provide any details. It would appear that all sample households were given the same weight. If this is the case, the estimates do not reflect the varying selection probabilities resulting from the sampling procedures used in stage 3.

[MS] You are right. Although the paper does not make this clear subsequent discussion has clarified that each household was given equal weight. The bias resulting from this was a point was first made by Seppo Laaksonen here:

< <<http://www.warc.com/LandingPages/Generic/Results.asp?Ref=819>>
<http://www.warc.com/LandingPages/Generic/Results.asp?Ref=819>>
<<http://www.warc.com/LandingPages/Generic/Results.asp?Ref=819>>
<http://www.warc.com/LandingPages/Generic/Results.asp?Ref=819> (password protected unfortunately but I would think that he'd email it to you.)

Thank you very much for your efforts Mr. Jabine. I would be honored to correspond with you further. With the Greatest Respect, Mike Spagat

Tom Jabine

Professor Michael Spagat
Department of Economics
Royal Holloway College
University of London
Egham
Surrey
TW20 0EX
United Kingdom
+44 1784 414001 (W)
+44 1784 439534 (F)
M.Spagat@rhul.ac.uk

<<<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014>>
<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014>>
<<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014>>
<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014>

~~~~~ To subscribe/unsubscribe

SRMSNet:

<<http://listserv.umd.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A0=srmsnet&D=0&F=&H=0&O=T&S=&T=1>>  
<http://listserv.umd.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A0=srmsnet&D=0&F=&H=0&O=T&S=&T=1>

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

-----  
Archives: <<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>>  
<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>>  
<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>  
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, 9 Feb 2009 14:24:53 -0500  
Reply-To: Amy.Luo@EY.COM  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Amy Luo <Amy.Luo@EY.COM>  
Subject: Attorney-Client Privilege  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Comments: cc: Joe.Callender@ey.com  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

Hi All,

I am asking this for a colleague of mine. Please feel free to respond to  
me or Joe at Joe.callender@ey.com. Thank you for your help!

-----  
-----

-----  
We have clients interested in doing employee surveys where the results themselves are of a sensitive nature. There is significant literature on how to get response on sensitive questions. However, the concern here is that the survey results themselves may be damaging to the client, so they are hesitant to even conduct the survey. Knowing the results may help them address issues they may have, but the desire is to keep the results in house. If they are investigated by regulators or subject to some litigation, they are concerned that they may be forced to share the survey results in the trial's discovery phase. Does anyone have experience/literature on the use of attorney client privilege to protect the results of surveys from being shared with outside parties?

Joe

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

---

The information contained in this message may be privileged and confidential and protected from disclosure. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or an employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer.

Notice required by law: This e-mail may constitute an advertisement or solicitation under U.S. law, if its primary purpose is to advertise or promote a commercial product or service. You may choose not to receive advertising and promotional messages from Ernst & Young LLP (except for Ernst & Young Online and the ey.com website, which track e-mail preferences through a separate process) at this e-mail address by forwarding this message to no-more-mail@ey.com. If you do so, the sender of this message will be notified promptly. Our principal postal address is 5 Times Square, New York, NY 10036. Thank you. Ernst & Young LLP

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

Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Mon, 9 Feb 2009 18:22:28 -0600

Reply-To: "Steen, Bob" <[bob.steen@FLEISHMAN.COM](mailto:bob.steen@FLEISHMAN.COM)>

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

From: "Steen, Bob" <[bob.steen@FLEISHMAN.COM](mailto:bob.steen@FLEISHMAN.COM)>

Subject: Re: Attorney-Client Privilege

Comments: To: [Amy.Luo@EY.COM](mailto:Amy.Luo@EY.COM), [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

In-Reply-To: A<[OF558A0211.CA364C7C-ON85257558.006A3160-85257558.006AAC1B@EY.COM](mailto:OF558A0211.CA364C7C-ON85257558.006A3160-85257558.006AAC1B@EY.COM)>

MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="UTF-8"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

We have encountered this problem in the context of employee surveys and the possibility of sexual harassment claims being made on open-end questions from anonymous respondents. The law requires (as I understand it) that such claims be taken seriously and followed up. Difficult to do with anonymous respondents who may not provide location or department information. So it is not a choice of "keeping it internal." Certain types of behavior require a corporate response, even without a threat of investigation or litigation. It's the right thing to do.

We envisioned a research and consulting product at one time that would specifically ask about discrimination and harassment issues. In principle, companies that seek out such information and act upon it responsibly have less liability exposure if a case is ever litigated and a judgment handed down. We found it difficult to convince any corporate entity to increase their short-term exposure on purpose with the objective of reducing long-term liability.

Human subjects research protocols provide for procedures that protect certain types of research from subpoena, but that is not what you seem to be contemplating.

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

Delivering Results at the Point of Impact â,,

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Amy Luo  
Sent: Monday, February 09, 2009 1:25 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Attorney-Client Privilege

Hi All,

I am asking this for a colleague of mine. Please feel free to respond to me or Joe at Joe.callender@ey.com. Thank you for your help!

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

We have clients interested in doing employee surveys where the results themselves are of a sensitive nature. There is significant literature on how to get response on sensitive questions. However, the concern here is that the survey results themselves may be damaging to the client, so they



are hesitant to even conduct the survey. Knowing the results may help them address issues they may have, but the desire is to keep the results in house. If they are investigated by regulators or subject to some litigation, they are concerned that they may be forced to share the survey results in the trial's discovery phase. Does anyone have experience/literature on the use of attorney client privilege to protect the results of surveys from being shared with outside parties?

Joe

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

---

The information contained in this message may be privileged and confidential and protected from disclosure. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or an employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer.

Notice required by law: This e-mail may constitute an advertisement or solicitation under U.S. law, if its primary purpose is to advertise or promote a commercial product or service. You may choose not to receive advertising and promotional messages from Ernst & Young LLP (except for Ernst & Young Online and the ey.com website, which track e-mail preferences through a separate process) at this e-mail address by forwarding this message to no-more-mail@ey.com. If you do so, the sender of this message will be notified promptly. Our principal postal address is 5 Times Square, New York, NY 10036. Thank you. Ernst & Young LLP

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Tue, 10 Feb 2009 09:56:36 -0600  
Reply-To: Jeannetta Smiley <[jsmiley@GOAMP.COM](mailto:jsmiley@GOAMP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jeannetta Smiley <[jsmiley@GOAMP.COM](mailto:jsmiley@GOAMP.COM)>  
Subject: Job Listing  
Comments: To: "[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)" <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>

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

The Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology (FCSM) is planning a research conference to be held at the Washington Convention Center, Washington, DC, on November 2-4, 2009 (see Call for Papers at:

<http://www.fcsm.gov/events/>).

The conference will feature mostly contributed papers with formal discussion and software demonstrations on topics related to a variety of statistical research issues. Papers and demonstrations should address methodology, empirical studies, relevant issues, or needs for statistical research. Papers must be original and not previously published or disseminated.

Abstracts are due by April 10, 2009 and should be submitted as early as possible. Submit abstracts via the web at:

<http://www.fcsm.gov/cgi-bin/conference/submissions>

Dawn E. Haines

2009 FCSM Chair

U.S. Census Bureau

[dawn.e.haines@census.gov](mailto:dawn.e.haines@census.gov)<<mailto:dawn.e.haines@census.gov>>

301-763-4881

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Tue, 10 Feb 2009 12:06:13 -0700  
Reply-To: Peter Mohler <peter.mohler@UNI-MANNHEIM.DE>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Peter Mohler <peter.mohler@UNI-MANNHEIM.DE>  
Subject: public source of price per interview in the us  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Dear Colleagues,  
in writing a paper on survey research in different countries we could not=

find public (i.e. google etc.) information about American costs per  
interview for high quality CATI or Face to Face interviews.

Any hints would be appreciated

peter mohler

---

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Tue, 10 Feb 2009 15:35:42 -0500  
Reply-To: "Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D."  
<[jonathan.brill.wh82@wharton.upenn.edu](mailto:jonathan.brill.wh82@wharton.upenn.edu)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D."  
<[jonathan.brill.wh82@WHARTON.UPENN.EDU](mailto:jonathan.brill.wh82@WHARTON.UPENN.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: public source of price per interview in the us  
Comments: To: Peter Mohler <peter.mohler@UNI-MANNHEIM.DE>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; format=flowed; charset="iso-8859-1";  
reply-type=original  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

And you won't from any credible or reliable source. The reason is that  
interview costs depend on many variables - things like incidence, sampling  
method(s) used, subject matter of interview and necessary level of  
interviewer content expertise in the topic, etc. - so there can be no  
generalizeable cost.

Regards,

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.  
SBU Head, Marketing Research Consulting & Operations  
Satyam Computer Services Ltd.  
3 Oak Ridge Court  
Voorhees, NJ 08043  
Telephone: 856.772-9030  
Fax: 775.898-2651  
Business cell: 856.673-8092

Business e-mail: Jonathan\_Brill@satyam.com  
Alternate e-mail: jonathan.brill.wh82@wharton.upenn.edu

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

From: "Peter Mohler" <peter.mohler@UNI-MANNHEIM.DE>  
To: <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
Sent: Tuesday, February 10, 2009 2:06 PM  
Subject: public source of price per interview in the us

Dear Colleagues,  
in writing a paper on survey research in different countries we could not find public (i.e. google etc.) information about American costs per interview for high quality CATI or Face to Face interviews. Any hints would be appreciated  
peter mohler

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

=====  
Date: Tue, 10 Feb 2009 13:54:02 -0700  
Reply-To: Peter Mohler <peter.mohler@UNI-MANNHEIM.DE>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Peter Mohler <peter.mohler@UNI-MANNHEIM.DE>  
Subject: Re: public source of price per interview in the us  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

thanks for your comments. the only source I found has been from J.Krosnick in a press release:  
<http://news-service.stanford.edu/pr/2006/pr-krosnick-092706.html>

where he is cited: "It is still possible to conduct high-quality surveys=80=94face-to-face interviews yield 80 percent response rates=80=94but such methods cost \$1,000 per subject Krosnick said. Telephone interviews cost \$2.50 to \$6 a minute, he said, but respondents, even if they are available, usually won't talk on the phone for more than 20 minutes. And while research shows that people answer questions by computer more accurately than by

telephone, 90 percent of Internet surveys have self-selected respondents,=

Krosnick said=E2=80=94what is termed "haphazard sampling" of volunteers."=

I have heard such price ranges, which are for Europe well above funders' imagination - it would be nice to have more than Jon's statement. But I understand also why such information is a. study dependent and b. confide= ntial.

thanks again  
peter mohler

---

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Tue, 10 Feb 2009 16:19:45 -0500

Reply-To: Howard Fienberg <[howard.fienberg@MRA-NET.ORG](mailto:howard.fienberg@MRA-NET.ORG)>

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

From: Howard Fienberg <[howard.fienberg@MRA-NET.ORG](mailto:howard.fienberg@MRA-NET.ORG)>

Subject: Re: Call to Action: Support the Decennial Census

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

In-Reply-To: <[D751154249FA5F46AEA4158526596897CE6353@mraexch.mra-dom.mra-net.org](mailto:D751154249FA5F46AEA4158526596897CE6353@mraexch.mra-dom.mra-net.org)>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Thank you to all the AAPOR-ites who contacted their Senators last week to help secure the \$1 billion in funding for the decennial Census in the Senate stimulus bill. Senator Coburn did not get a vote on his amendment to strike the funding, and the bill, which passed this afternoon 61 - 37, retained that Census funding, despite pressures to cut it.

=20

Now, it is on to what I expect to be a speedy "conference" between House and Senate, and MRA will continue to advocate in the capitol to ensure that the Census funds make it through the process and are in the final version of the legislation.

=20

Sincerely,

Howard Fienberg

Director of Government Affairs

The Marketing Research Association (MRA)

=20

---

From: Howard Fienberg=20

Sent: Thursday, February 05, 2009 3:31 PM

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

Subject: Call to Action: Support the Decennial Census

The economic stimulus legislation being debated right now in the U.S. Senate includes \$1 billion for Census 2010 preparations. U.S. Senator Tom Coburn (R-OK) will shortly be offering an amendment to strike that funding, which he has referred to as "wasteful".

=20  
The Marketing Research Association (MRA) respectfully asks that you support funding for the decennial Census RIGHT NOW by contacting your U.S. Senators and asking them to oppose Senator Coburn's amendment. His amendment could be brought up for consideration on the Senate floor at any moment.

=20  
This site will connect you to your state's Senators:  
[http://www.senate.gov/general/contact\\_information/senators\\_cfm.cfm](http://www.senate.gov/general/contact_information/senators_cfm.cfm)  
<[http://www.senate.gov/general/contact\\_information/senators\\_cfm.cfm](http://www.senate.gov/general/contact_information/senators_cfm.cfm)>=20  
=20

Sincerely,  
Howard Fienberg  
Director of Government Affairs  
Marketing Research Association (MRA)  
[howard.fienberg@mra-net.org](mailto:howard.fienberg@mra-net.org)  
1111 16th St. NW, Suite 120  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 775-5170  
Fax: (202) 775-5172  
<http://www.mra-net.org> <<http://www.mra-net.org/>>=20  
<http://www.cmor.org> <<http://www.cmor.org/>>=20  
=20

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

=====  
Date: Tue, 10 Feb 2009 17:08:12 -0600  
Reply-To: Jeannetta Smiley <[jsmiley@GOAMP.COM](mailto:jsmiley@GOAMP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jeannetta Smiley <[jsmiley@GOAMP.COM](mailto:jsmiley@GOAMP.COM)>  
Subject: Job Listing  
Comments: To: "aapornet@asu.edu" <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

World Learning, a contractor of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) implementing the FORECAST project in Albania. Under FORECAST, World Learning/Albania arranges various programs including short-term technical assistance in support of Albanian organizations.

We are seeking several potential consultants to provide technical assistance to two local polling organizations, ideally from late February to July 2, 2009. If these dates are not completely possible for you, please let us know.

now which dates would be possible within that timeframe. The parliamentary = elections are set for June 28, 2009. The expert should have significant, re= cent expertise in design/implementation/analysis of findings/dissemination = of political polls in a politically polarized, developing country. He/she s= hould ideally be affiliated with or have worked for a well recognized polli= ng organization. Experience with issues faced by polling organizations in l= ess developed countries like Albania is important.

Sincerely,

(Ms.) Matty Thimm

USAID Contractor  
Project Director  
FORECAST/Albania  
+355-4 2240305  
069 2090 398

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

=====  
Date: Wed, 11 Feb 2009 10:00:35 -0500  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Is that what I've been steeping in?  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

More poll police may be needed=20

=20

<http://thehill.com/david-hill/more-poll-police-may--be-needed-2009-02-10.html>

or

<http://tinyurl.com/d9caua>

=20

By David Hill=20

Posted: 02/10/09 05:41 PM [ET]=20

Dick Wirthlin, the renowned Republican pollster, once grouched that the

polling industry was being ruined by "low barriers to entry." Wirthlin got his start, of course, in the days when privileged pollsters could access mainframe computers at universities. Then the personal computer hit the market, followed by the broad dissemination of SPSS and similar canned software packages to crunch poll data. "Field service" call centers sprang up, too, offering cheap WATS long distance. Suddenly, some guy operating a "polling firm" out of a van down by the river was ostensibly offering the same service as Dr. Dick Wirthlin.

It wasn't just the hardware and software that made Dick Wirthlin different, however. He had formal academic training, experience and judgment that the van guy didn't. One unique element of the training of most "academic" pollsters was and is an immersion in the history and ethics of polling. Properly trained opinion researchers are steeped in the tradition that we are acolytes of the public in the sacred practices of mass democracy. It is a sober responsibility. In graduate school, I was required to take a course in the philosophy of science, wherein we pondered our ethical responsibilities.

SNIP

It's good that AAPOR is there, because the threat of censure may encourage some good behavior.=20

But AAPOR's mandate is limited. Last year I asked AAPOR to censure a newspaper that blatantly misreported results of a poll that I conducted. AAPOR treated the matter seriously, but concluded that its organizational mandate was only to confront researchers, not reporters. That's a gap - censoring errant poll reporting - that someone like AAPOR needs to fill.

Most pollsters revel in our relatively unregulated enterprise. No training required. No certificate needed. No rules in place. The vacuum of that freedom, if abuses persist, will eventually be filled.=20

In a pro-regulatory Obama era, it may come sooner than we suspect.

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

=20

=20

=20

--=20

Leo G. Simonetta

Director of Research

Art & Science Group



6115 Falls Road, Suite 101=20

Baltimore, MD 21209=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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Wed, 11 Feb 2009 12:09:52 -0500  
Reply-To: [jannselzer@AOL.COM](mailto:jannselzer@AOL.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "J. Ann Selzer" <[jannselzer@AOL.COM](mailto:jannselzer@AOL.COM)>  
Subject: Lesson learned in web poll design  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[3248A9B21DD5574785FE5E2C8E521684CBC516@exchange.local.artscience.com](mailto:3248A9B21DD5574785FE5E2C8E521684CBC516@exchange.local.artscience.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

I welcome comments from experienced web poll designers on lessons you've learned. The dos and don'ts, if you will. I'm working with a captive audience and don't need help on the sampling end. Just wonder about some of the logistics:

1. Tagging respondents who have and have not responded for follow-up reminders.
2. Optimal length, or really, the point at which a poll is too long.
3. Anticipation of "do-not-contact me" responses.

Anything else you didn't anticipate, but learned along the way.

---

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

---

Date: Wed, 11 Feb 2009 12:11:50 -0500  
Reply-To: jannselzer@AOL.COM  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "J. Ann Selzer" <jannselzer@AOL.COM>  
Subject: Sorry about that  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

The previous e-mail sent before I was really ready (though I've learned that CTRL + Enter = Send).

My signature was not attached.

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.  
Selzer & Company  
1430 Locust St.  
Des Moines, IA? 50309  
515.271.5700

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

---

Date: Wed, 11 Feb 2009 19:04:23 -0500  
Reply-To: Douglas Cox <dcox@accurusresearch.com>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Douglas Cox <dcox@ACCURUSRESEARCH.COM>  
Subject: Verification Tool Embedded in Questionnaire  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; format=flowed; charset="iso-8859-1";  
reply-type=original  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I am working with a state government agency to develop a web-based questionnaire that will be distributed to agency partners, interest groups and some members of the public. The questionnaire is a reasonably short 17-question instrument that is designed on a single, scrollable page.

The questionnaire is being programmed by the agency's IT department and is to be placed on the agency's web site. The issue is the IT department's insistence, against my objections, to include a verification tool at the end of the questionnaire "for security purposes." The verification graphic is similar to those used by Ticketmaster when ordering concert tickets - slightly out of focus characters/words that the user must correctly re-type in order to proceed. In this case, respondents must correctly re-type the characters to submit the questionnaire.

I am interested in hearing the range of comments concerning the use of such verification techniques in a questionnaire.

Douglas Cox  
President  
Accurus Research Systems

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

---

---

Date: Wed, 11 Feb 2009 19:54:11 -0500  
Reply-To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jan Werner <[jwerner@JWDP.COM](mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM)>  
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing  
Subject: Re: Verification Tool Embedded in Questionnaire  
Comments: To: Douglas Cox <[dcox@accurusresearch.com](mailto:dcox@accurusresearch.com)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[386D1EB09C844BD7AD86DD88EA68A0C9@ACCURUS](mailto:386D1EB09C844BD7AD86DD88EA68A0C9@ACCURUS)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

This doesn't make a lot of sense to me.

The purpose of that kind of verification tool is to prevent web spiders (automated information gathering tools) from accessing a site or certain pages on a site to collect information there. In this case, the content of the questionnaire will be visible anyway.

What would make sense would be to have the entry to the questionnaire be a page that would contain such a verification tool to prevent automated tools from accessing the questionnaire itself.

Whether that is necessary or desirable is another question altogether.

Jan Werner

---

Douglas Cox wrote:

> I am working with a state government agency to develop a web-based  
> questionnaire that will be distributed to agency partners, interest groups  
> and some members of the public. The questionnaire is a reasonably short  
> 17-question instrument that is designed on a single, scrollable page.  
>  
> The questionnaire is being programmed by the agency's IT department and is  
> to be placed on the agency's web site. The issue is the IT department's  
> insistence, against my objections, to include a verification tool at the  
> end  
> of the questionnaire "for security purposes." The verification graphic is  
> similar to those used by Ticketmaster when ordering concert tickets -

> slightly out of focus characters/words that the user must correctly re-type  
> in order to proceed. In this case, respondents must correctly re-type the  
> characters to submit the questionnaire.  
>  
> I am interested in hearing the range of comments concerning the use of such  
> verification techniques in a questionnaire.

>  
>  
> Douglas Cox  
> President  
> Accurus Research Systems

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

=====  
Date: Thu, 12 Feb 2009 10:10:38 -0600  
Reply-To: Jeannetta Smiley <[jsmiley@GOAMP.COM](mailto:jsmiley@GOAMP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jeannetta Smiley <[jsmiley@GOAMP.COM](mailto:jsmiley@GOAMP.COM)>  
Subject: Job Posting  
Comments: To: "[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)" <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

On-line applications are now being accepted for IPDET 2009 (June 8 - July 3=  
) at [www.ipdet.org](http://www.ipdet.org)<<http://www.ipdet.org>>.

It is time to apply for one to four weeks at the International Program for =  
Development Evaluation Training (IPDET). Now entering its 9th year, the pro=  
gram will be held from June 8th through July 3rd at Carleton University in =  
Ottawa Canada. Weeks 1 and 2 are a graduate-level intensive applied core co=  
urse on development evaluation. Weeks 3 and 4 feature a choice of 30 worksh=  
ops which go in-depth on specific development evaluation topics. New this y=  
ear are workshops on evaluating governance and using the theory of change m=  
odel for evaluating environmental and social impacts. Visit the website for=  
more information about the new workshops and instructors, as well as retur=  
ning ones. Note that you must register on the IPDET website [www.ipdet.org](http://www.ipdet.org)<[h=  
ttp://www.ipdet.org](http://www.ipdet.org)> before you can log in and access the on-line applicati=  
on form. If you experience difficulties with the application process, conta=  
ct Mary Dixon, the IPDET Registrar, at [mary\\_dixon@carleton.ca](mailto:mary_dixon@carleton.ca)<[mailto:mary\\_d=  
ixon@carleton.ca](mailto:mary_dixon@carleton.ca)>. IPDET is a collaboration of the Independent Evaluation G=  
roup of the World Bank and Carleton University with the support of several =  
donor organizations.





\$40 million per year. =20

The center is the site of a large group of PhD level survey methodologists that includes Fred Conrad, Mick Couper, Michael Elliott, Robert Groves, Steve Heeringa, and James Lepkowski, Roderick Little, Trivellore Raghunathan, Norbert Schwarz, Roger Tourangeau, and Richard Valliant. Together they form the Survey Methodology Research Program, pursuing cutting-edge statistical and methodological research with investigator-initiated research grants.

The center also contains the Survey Research Operations unit, which has over 100 technical staff working on applied design and implementation of large complex sample surveys with advanced data collection technologies. These include large scale ongoing longitudinal surveys, one-time complex mixed mode designs (face-to-face, web, mail, telephone, bodily fluid samples, administrative records), and development of large scale survey software capabilities. =20

The Center invites applications from and nominations of outstanding candidates for the position of survey statistician in our non-tenured Research Scientist track or the tenured Research Professor track, depending on qualification and personal goals. Applicants and nominations will be considered at the ranks of Assistant, Associate and Full. The successful candidates will split their effort between our Survey Methodology Research Program and Survey Research Operations. In addition, suitable candidates will pursue their own research interests through external funding and collaborate with other scientists in ongoing research programs at the University of Michigan and beyond.=20

The successful candidate is expected to demonstrate knowledge and interest in statistical and sample design, missing data issues, variance estimation, statistical models of measurement error, adaptive/responsive survey designs, and analysis of data from complex designs. We are interested in researchers who would thrive in our entrepreneurial, interdisciplinary, collegial, yet highly independent culture. Depending on the rank of the successful candidate, mentoring of junior staff and graduate-level teaching opportunities may be included.  
=09

Applicants must have a doctoral degree in statistics, biostatistics, survey methodology with a concentration in statistics, or advanced quantitative methods in the social sciences. Applicants may initiate the process by submitting a letter describing their scholarly activities, funded research program and plans, and interest in SRC. Please include a CV, names (not letters) of references, and one or two recent publications. Start dates are flexible. Salary is highly competitive.=20  
=09

Please send applications, nominations and inquiries electronically to [srcsearch@isr.umich.edu](mailto:srcsearch@isr.umich.edu).

The University of Michigan is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer. Women and minority candidates are encouraged to apply.=20

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Thu, 12 Feb 2009 14:44:56 -0500  
Reply-To: [colleen\\_porter@COX.NET](mailto:colleen_porter@COX.NET)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Colleen Porter <[colleen\\_porter@COX.NET](mailto:colleen_porter@COX.NET)>  
Subject: visual response scale?  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=utf-8  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

For a survey of migrant farm workers, which will be administered in-person by an interviewer, it seems to me that a visual response scale flashcard might work well for some items, minimizing literacy issues.

I am thinking of one which is a bar with dark red at one end, white at the other and gradations in between, with something like 7-12 numbers along the scale.

Problem is, I lent out all my survey development books and can't seem to find that one. Does anyone recognize it, or have used it or something similar?

Many thanks,

Colleen Porter  
Gainesville, FL

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Thu, 12 Feb 2009 15:47:28 -0600  
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Subject: Commerce Secretary Nominee Judd Gregg,,  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=windows-1252; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

..over stimulus package and the 2010 Census.



## GREGG WITHDRAWS AS COMMERCE SECRETARY NOMINEE

By DAVID ESPO – 17 minutes ago

WASHINGTON (AP) — Republican Sen. Judd Gregg of New Hampshire abruptly withdrew his nomination as commerce secretary, citing "irresolvable conflicts" with President Barack Obama's handling of the economic stimulus and 2010 census.

"We are functioning from a different set of views on many critical items of policy," Gregg said in a statement released by his Senate office.

Gregg, 61, is a former New Hampshire governor who previously served in the House. He has been in the Senate since 1993 and currently serves as the top Republican on the Senate Budget Committee, where he is known as a crusader against big spending.

He was Obama's second choice to fill the Commerce portfolio.

New Mexico Gov. Bill Richardson withdrew several weeks ago in the wake of a grand jury investigation into alleged wrongdoing involving state contracts. He has not been implicated personally.

THIS IS A BREAKING NEWS UPDATE. Check back soon for further information. AP's earlier story is below.

(AP) — Republican Sen. Judd Gregg of New Hampshire has withdrawn his nomination to become President Barack Obama's commerce secretary.

In a statement released by his office, the New Hampshire senator cites "irresolvable conflicts" on issues including the economic stimulus package.

Gregg was named the Commerce nominee a week ago after the withdrawal of former New Mexico Gov. Bill Richardson.

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

Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Date: Thu, 12 Feb 2009 18:17:01 -0500

Reply-To: Paul J Lavrakas PhD <[pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET](mailto:pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET)>

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

From: Paul J Lavrakas PhD <[pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET](mailto:pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET)>

Subject: FW: Bryant Scholarship for a Graduate Student in Survey  
Statistics

Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

FYI -- neither the student nor the person(s) supporting the student needs to be an ASA member. To be eligible for consideration, the student needs to be a full-time graduate student studying survey statistics as of July 1, 2009.

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

From: Survey Research Methods Section of the ASA  
[mailto:SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU] On Behalf Of Elaine Zanutto  
Sent: Thursday, February 12, 2009 4:07 PM  
To: SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU  
Subject: Bryant Scholarship for a Graduate Student in Survey Statistics

Do you an excellent graduate student in survey statistics?

The ASA is currently accepting applications for the Edward C. Bryant Scholarship for an Outstanding Graduate Student in Survey Statistics. The award consists of a certificate and a \$2500 cash prize. The award committee will choose the recipient based on the student's potential to contribute to survey statistics, their applied experience in survey statistics, and their performance in graduate school.

Applications and three letters of reference must be received by April 1.

More details are available at the link below, or you can contact me with questions.

<http://www.amstat.org/education/ecbryantscholarship.cfm>

Elaine Zanutto,

Chair, Edward C. Bryant Scholarship Committee

Vice President of Methodology

-----  
National Analysts Worldwide  
1835 Market St. 25th Fl.  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
(215) 496-6878  
[ezanutto@nationalanalysts.com](mailto:ezanutto@nationalanalysts.com)

~~~~~  
SRMS website: <http://www.amstat.org/sections/srms/>
~~~~~

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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, 13 Feb 2009 10:39:19 -0000

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

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Iain Noble <Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK>

Subject: New directions in the use of incentive payments

Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

In-Reply-To:

A<3248A9B21DD5574785FE5E2C8E521684CBC516@exchange.local.artsience.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/feb/12/china-rigged-survey>

"It was an approval rate that any government would covet. The Qidong district in Jiangsu scored 94.8% in a telephone poll of residents by the province's bureau of statistics.

But the result reflected more than the rising standard of living. Local officials had "brazenly rigged" the survey by ordering citizens to give set answers and offering them money to comply, a state broadcaster has revealed.

Cadres issued a leaflet outlining replies to 10 questions, and handed out up to 1,000 yuan (£103) for answering "correctly" - and even gave pupils the day off school so they could memorise the answers and prompt their parents during the poll, according to China National Radio....."

Iain Noble

Department for Children, Schools and Families

Young People Analysis Division - Youth Research Team,

4th Floor, Sanctuary Buildings

Great Smith Street

London SW1P 3BT

0207 925 6226

Mobile: 0753 832 8523

The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intranet virus scanning service supplied by Cable&Wireless in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2007/11/0032.) 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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Fri, 13 Feb 2009 07:37:57 -0500  
Reply-To: Mike Donatello <[mike@DONATELLO.US](mailto:mike@DONATELLO.US)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mike Donatello <[mike@DONATELLO.US](mailto:mike@DONATELLO.US)>  
Subject: Re: New directions in the use of incentive payments  
Comments: To: "Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK" <[Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK](mailto:Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK)>, "AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
In-Reply-To: <[735BFE980C9E5A4590AA9DC39B50A36D1328F140@SBEXC01.AD.HQ.DEPT](mailto:735BFE980C9E5A4590AA9DC39B50A36D1328F140@SBEXC01.AD.HQ.DEPT)>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

This happened in China? I can't believe it! ;-)

--

Mike Donatello  
703.582.5680  
[mike@donatello.us](mailto:mike@donatello.us)

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Iain Noble  
Sent: Friday, February 13, 2009 5:39 AM  
To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Subject: [AAPORNET] New directions in the use of incentive payments

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/feb/12/china-rigged-survey>

"It was an approval rate that any government would covet. The Qidong district in Jiangsu scored 94.8% in a telephone poll of residents by the province's bureau of statistics.

But the result reflected more than the rising standard of living. Local officials had "brazenly rigged" the survey by ordering citizens to give set answers and offering them money to comply, a state broadcaster has revealed.

Cadres issued a leaflet outlining replies to 10 questions, and handed out up to 1,000 yuan (£103) for answering "correctly" - and even gave pupils the day off school so they could memorise the answers and prompt their parents during the poll, according to China National Radio....."

Iain Noble  
Department for Children, Schools and Families

Young People Analysis Division - Youth Research Team,

4th Floor, Sanctuary Buildings  
Great Smith Street  
London SW1P 3BT

0207 925 6226

Mobile: 0753 832 8523

The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intranet virus scanning service supplied by Cable&Wireless in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2007/11/0032.) 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](mailto: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 - [www.avg.com](http://www.avg.com)  
Version: 8.0.237 / Virus Database: 270.10.23/1950 - Release Date: 02/12/09 18:46:00

No virus found in this outgoing message.  
Checked by AVG - [www.avg.com](http://www.avg.com)  
Version: 8.0.237 / Virus Database: 270.10.23/1950 - Release Date: 02/12/09 18:46:00

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

=====  
Date: Fri, 13 Feb 2009 11:31:22 -0500  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: From the Johns Hopkins newsletter  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Professor under ethical investigation

By: Becca Fishbein

Posted: 2/12/09

<http://tinyurl.com/b2t8xq>

Gilbert Burnham, a professor at the Bloomberg School of Public Health who co-authored a study on the war in Iraq, has recently been found in violation of a research ethics code by a national watch-dog organization.=20

Burnham, a professor of international health and the co-director of the Center for Refugee and Disaster Response at Hopkins, published results of a survey taken on Iraqi casualties in the war in an October 2006 edition of British scientific medical journal The Lancet.=20

The survey's results were initially considered controversial in that they reported that approximately 655,000 Iraqis were casualties of the war, while the U.S. Department of Defense and the Iraq Body Count project stated that thousands fewer had been killed.=20

In March 2008, the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) began an investigation into Burnham's research methods after becoming suspicious of his lack of cooperation with the organization's ethics code.=20

"The code requires minimum disclosure of basic elements of methodology in terms of surveys when they are conducted," AAPOR Standards Committee Chairwoman Mary Losch said. "An evaluation committee found that that disclosure was not made."

SNIP

Parsons maintained that the school could not comment on whether or not the University would take disciplinary action against Burnham until the internal review's conclusion, which should surface in the near future.

"AAPOR chose to criticize Burnham for not fully cooperating with their own review," Parsons said. "We're not a member of the organization, so we don't know what procedures they followed and we're not sure why they concluded what they did."

AAPOR members maintain that their investigation into Burnham was a necessary procedure to allow other scientists to judge the dimensions of his research, not an attempt to disprove the study.

"We're not trying to undermine anyone's career. Almost everyone would agree that what [Burnham] tried to do was scientifically tough," Kulka said. "Hopkins is one of the top research facilities in the world. Our processes are not meant as an attack on anyone or any institution."=20

---

(c) Copyright 2009 News-Letter

=20

--=20

Leo G. Simonetta

Director of Research

Art & Science Group

6115 Falls Road, Suite 101=20

Baltimore, MD 21209=20

=20

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Fri, 13 Feb 2009 10:03:34 -0700

Reply-To: Paul DiPerna <[pd\\_wpa21@YAHOO.COM](mailto:pd_wpa21@YAHOO.COM)>

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

From: Paul DiPerna <[pd\\_wpa21@YAHOO.COM](mailto:pd_wpa21@YAHOO.COM)>

Subject: Calculating response rates for online surveys

Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Hi, I'm new to the list (and AAPOR) so I apologize ahead of time if this =

has

been addressed in a previous thread.

Does anyone have recommended references/articles on online survey methodology, and particularly on response rates?=20=20

I also have a specific question based on a survey I'm currently running f=

or

an association. Using their own software (I think ConstantContact), the association sent an email invitation to approximately 2,400 members. The=

ir

software dashboard indicates that only about 500 members actually opened =

the

email invites. We've obtained 124 responses so far on SurveyMonkey.

Do I calculate the response rate based on the 2,400 total sent, or the 50=

0  
opened? A couple folks who I'm working with argue for the latter. But my understanding has been to use the 2,400 number and then consider bounces and opt-outs/refusals..

I can see a rationale to use the 500 number. The 1,900 people who screened by subject line (presumably), or missed the email invite altogether, could be a parallel to phone surveys and Caller ID effects on responses?

Any references, thoughts, are all welcome on/off list.

Thanks,

Paul=20

---

Paul DiPerna  
cell/text: 202-641-1858  
email: pd\_wpa21@yahoo.com  
online ID: <http://claimid.com/pdiperna>

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

---

Date: Fri, 13 Feb 2009 16:10:32 -0500  
Reply-To: [slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu](mailto:slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Susan Losh <[slosh@FSU.EDU](mailto:slosh@FSU.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: New directions in the use of incentive payments  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
In-Reply-To:  
<[0B2665D8C6A26B4987A29750DC9733A10DED2E82@winxbeus12.exchange.xchg](mailto:0B2665D8C6A26B4987A29750DC9733A10DED2E82@winxbeus12.exchange.xchg)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-Disposition: inline  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

It beats execution as an incentive.

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

From: Mike Donatello <[mike@DONATELLO.US](mailto:mike@DONATELLO.US)>  
Date: Friday, February 13, 2009 7:39 am  
Subject: Re: New directions in the use of incentive payments  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU



> This happened in China? I can't believe it! ;-)

>

> --

> Mike Donatello

> 703.582.5680

> mike@donatello.us

>

>

>

>

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Iain Noble

> Sent: Friday, February 13, 2009 5:39 AM

> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

> Subject: [AAPORNET] New directions in the use of incentive payments

>

> <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/feb/12/china-rigged-survey>

>

>

> "It was an approval rate that any government would covet. The

> Qidong district in Jiangsu scored 94.8% in a telephone poll of

> residents by the province's bureau of statistics.

>

> But the result reflected more than the rising standard of living.

> Local officials had "brazenly rigged" the survey by ordering

> citizens to give set answers and offering them money to comply, a

> state broadcaster has revealed.

>

> Cadres issued a leaflet outlining replies to 10 questions, and

> handed out up to 1,000 yuan (£103) for answering "correctly" - and

> even gave pupils the day off school so they could memorise the

> answers and prompt their parents during the poll, according to

> China National Radio....."

>

>

> Iain Noble

> Department for Children, Schools and Families

> Young People Analysis Division - Youth Research Team,

>

>

> 4th Floor, Sanctuary Buildings

> Great Smith Street

> London SW1P 3BT

>

> 0207 925 6226

>

> Mobile: 0753 832 8523

>

>

>

>

> The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the

> Government Secure Intranet virus scanning service supplied by

> Cable&Wireless in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate

> Number 2007/11/0032.) 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](mailto: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 - [www.avg.com](http://www.avg.com)  
> Version: 8.0.237 / Virus Database: 270.10.23/1950 - Release Date:  
> 02/12/09 18:46:00

>  
> No virus found in this outgoing message.  
> Checked by AVG - [www.avg.com](http://www.avg.com)  
> Version: 8.0.237 / Virus Database: 270.10.23/1950 - Release Date:  
> 02/12/09 18:46:00

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

>  
I try to take one day at a time but sometimes several days attack me all at once. Anonymous.

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

VOICE (850) 644-8778  
FAX (850) 644-8776

American Statistical Association/NSF Research Fellow  
<http://mailer.fsu.edu/~slosh/index.html>

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

=====  
Date: Fri, 13 Feb 2009 17:25:01 -0600  
Reply-To: Jeannetta Smiley <[jsmiley@GOAMP.COM](mailto:jsmiley@GOAMP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>

From: Jeannetta Smiley <jsmiley@GOAMP.COM>  
Subject: Job Listing  
Comments: To: "aapornet@asu.edu" <aapornet@asu.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

## About The Dulchey Group, LLC

The Dulchey Group, LLC, a D&B Company, is the global leader of consumer spa research. The Dulchey firm exclusively caters to the advertising, marketing, research, and public-relation needs of spas worldwide. Dulchey designs, develops, administers, and analyzes consumer-opinion surveys in order to provide spas with essential intelligence that allows them to make better, more thoroughly informed decisions. For more information, visit [www.dulchey.com](http://www.dulchey.com)<<http://www.dulchey.com/>>. "Experience the Sophistication of Dulchey."

Company: The Dulchey Group, LLC ("DULCHEY")  
Job Description: Focus Group / Market Research Moderator

The Dulchey Group, LLC ("DULCHEY") headquartered in Atlanta, Georgia is looking to hire a Focus Group / Market Research Moderator. We are seeking a freelancer on project-by-project bases, with moderating experience (preferably with a minimum of 25 group sessions moderated) and at least three years of full-time experience in marketing and/or consumer research. In addition, we are looking for proven experience and/or interest related to the spa industry. This position may require some domestic and/or international travel. Candidates must be professional, punctual, dependable, neatly groomed (business attire required), well spoken, strong writing skills, analytical skills, excellent listening skills, and the ability to interact with clients, staff, and focus group volunteers with professionalism. The Focus Group Moderator will work closely with the Research Analyst. For immediate consideration, please contact LaWanda Scott at (404) 736-3570 and send your resume and cover letter via (Microsoft Word format) to [careers@dulchey.com](mailto:careers@dulchey.com)<<mailto:careers@dulchey.com>> .

## Requirements

### Experience:

3+ years of experience is required in  
Marketing and/or Market Research

### Other Desired skills:

Focus Groups, Moderator  
Public Speaking, Training

Education: Bachelors Degree (preferred)

Job Type: Freelancer

# of Focus Groups: 4 to 8 monthly

Length of Focus Groups: 1 hour each session

Salary: Varies on experience

Term: Project-by-Project Bases

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

---

Date: Sat, 14 Feb 2009 13:40:21 +0100  
Reply-To: Edith de Leeuw <[edithl@XS4ALL.NL](mailto:edithl@XS4ALL.NL)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Edith de Leeuw <[edithl@XS4ALL.NL](mailto:edithl@XS4ALL.NL)>  
Subject: Re: Calculating response rates for online surveys  
Comments: To: Paul DiPerna <[pd\\_wpa21@YAHOO.COM](mailto:pd_wpa21@YAHOO.COM)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[LISTSERV%200902131003347587.27D1@LISTS.ASU.EDU](mailto:LISTSERV%200902131003347587.27D1@LISTS.ASU.EDU)>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

The best general source on methodological issues and websurveys is  
[www.websm.org](http://www.websm.org)

Katja Lozar Manfreda and others did an excellent meta-analytic review on  
response rates.

The Esomar guidelines on internet surveys give some directions for  
response/nonresponse codes

[http://www.esomar.org/uploads/pdf/ESOMAR\\_Codes&Guideline-Conducting\\_research\\_using\\_Internet.pdf](http://www.esomar.org/uploads/pdf/ESOMAR_Codes&Guideline-Conducting_research_using_Internet.pdf)

The AAPOR standard definitions gives good rules for response rate  
calculation for Internet surveys of specifically named persons.  
Goto [aaapor.org](http://aaapor.org) than to resources for researchers and then to standard  
definitions.

Good luck

Edith

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

e-mail [edithl@xs4all.nl](mailto:edithl@xs4all.nl)

jAt 10:03 AM 2/13/2009 -0700, Paul DiPerna wrote:

>Hi, I'm new to the list (and AAPOR) so I apologize ahead of time if this has  
>been addressed in a previous thread.

>

>Does anyone have recommended references/articles on online survey  
>methodology, and particularly on response rates?

>

>I also have a specific question based on a survey I'm currently running for  
>an association. Using their own software (I think ConstantContact), the  
>association sent an email invitation to approximately 2,400 members. Their  
>software dashboard indicates that only about 500 members actually opened the  
>email invites. We've obtained 124 responses so far on SurveyMonkey.

>

>Do I calculate the response rate based on the 2,400 total sent, or the 500  
>opened? A couple folks who I'm working with argue for the latter. But my  
>understanding has been to use the 2,400 number and then consider bounces and  
>opt-outs/refusals..

>

>I can see a rationale to use the 500 number. The 1,900 people who screened  
>by subject line (presumably), or missed the email invite altogether, could  
>be a parallel to phone surveys and Caller ID effects on responses?

>

>Any references, thoughts, are all welcome on/off list.

>

> Thanks,

>

> Paul

>

>

>

> \_\_\_\_\_

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

-----  
Date: Sat, 14 Feb 2009 08:02:53 -0800

Reply-To: Paul DiPerna <[pd\\_wpa21@YAHOO.COM](mailto:pd_wpa21@YAHOO.COM)>

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

From: Paul DiPerna <[pd\\_wpa21@YAHOO.COM](mailto:pd_wpa21@YAHOO.COM)>

Subject: Re: Calculating response rates for online surveys

Comments: To: "Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D."

<[jonathan.brill.wh82@wharton.upenn.edu](mailto:jonathan.brill.wh82@wharton.upenn.edu)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Jonathan, thanks for your advice.. You and a number of other members have referred me to the Standard Definitions report on the AAPOR site, and I definitely plan to read this soon.

I'll clarify the distinction between response and cooperation rates as I report the numbers to the association's leadership. As of now this is an internal exercise and assessment for them.

I'm grateful to everyone sending suggestions on and off list. If it can be useful for others, below is a list of the references that have been passed along to me so far.

- Paul

---

Paul DiPerna  
cell/text: 202-641-1858  
email: [pd\\_wpa21@yahoo.com](mailto:pd_wpa21@yahoo.com)  
online ID: <http://claimid.com/pdiperna>

---

AAPOR Standard Definitions (2008, full report-PDF)

AAPOR website's Response Rates section

Katja Lozar Manfreda, Michael Bosnjak, Jernej Berzelak, Iris Haas and Vasja Vehovar (2008). Web Surveys Versus Other Survey Modes: A meta-analysis comparing response rates. International Journal of Market Research (subscription required for online access).

Don A. Dillman, Jolene D. Smyth, and Leah Melani Christian(2008). Internet, Mail, and Mixed-Mode Surveys: The Tailored Design Method.

Mick P. Couper (2008). Designing Effective Web Surveys.

Esomar World Research Codes & Guidelines (PDF)

Web Survey Methodology website

---

From: "Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D." <[jonathan.brill.wh82@wharton.upenn.edu](mailto:jonathan.brill.wh82@wharton.upenn.edu)>  
To: Paul DiPerna <[pd\\_wpa21@YAHOO.COM](mailto:pd_wpa21@YAHOO.COM)>; [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Sent: Friday, February 13, 2009 3:49:24 PM

Subject: Re: Calculating response rates for online surveys

Paul:

The response rate is the proportion of those sampled who participate, so it should be calculated on the 2,400 sent.

The cooperation rate is the proportion of those for whom contact has been confirmed who participate, so this is the survey performance statistic that involves the base of 500.

In my opinion, you cannot/should not assume people who did not open the e-mail screened based on the subject line of the e-mail. I do not believe that web survey technology allows the same kinds of informed estimates about the disposition codes of uncontacted sample cases that telephone survey technology does. In any case, I would urge you to read the AAPOR Standard Definitions paper available on the association's website. The direct link is below:

[http://www.aapor.org/uploads/Standard\\_Definitions\\_07\\_08\\_Final.pdf](http://www.aapor.org/uploads/Standard_Definitions_07_08_Final.pdf)

Regards,  
Jonathan

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.  
3 Oak Ridge Court  
Voorhees, New Jersey 08043  
Home: 856.772-9080  
Office: 856.772-9030  
E-mail: [jonathan.brill.wh82@wharton.upenn.edu](mailto:jonathan.brill.wh82@wharton.upenn.edu)  
Fax: 775.898-2651

View my professional profile:  
<http://www.linkedin.com/in/jonathanbrill>

----- Original Message ----- From: "Paul DiPerna" <[pd\\_wpa21@YAHOO.COM](mailto:pd_wpa21@YAHOO.COM)>  
To: <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
Sent: Friday, February 13, 2009 12:03 PM  
Subject: Calculating response rates for online surveys

Hi, I'm new to the list (and AAPOR) so I apologize ahead of time if this has been addressed in a previous thread.

Does anyone have recommended references/articles on online survey methodology, and particularly on response rates?

I also have a specific question based on a survey I'm currently running for an association. Using their own software (I think ConstantContact), the association sent an email invitation to approximately 2,400 members. Their software dashboard indicates that only about 500 members actually opened the email invites. We've obtained 124 responses so far on SurveyMonkey.

Do I calculate the response rate based on the 2,400 total sent, or the 500

opened? A couple folks who I'm working with argue for the latter. But my understanding has been to use the 2,400 number and then consider bounces and opt-outs/refusals..

I can see a rationale to use the 500 number. The 1,900 people who screened by subject line (presumably), or missed the email invite altogether, could be a parallel to phone surveys and Caller ID effects on responses?

Any references, thoughts, are all welcome on/off list.

Thanks,

Paul

---

Paul DiPerna  
cell/text: 202-641-1858  
email: pd\_wpa21@yahoo.com  
online ID: <http://claimid.com/pdiperna>

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

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

---

Date: Sat, 14 Feb 2009 12:34:31 -0500  
Reply-To: Paul J Lavrakas PhD <[pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET](mailto:pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Paul J Lavrakas PhD <[pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET](mailto:pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET)>  
Subject: Re: Calculating response rates for online surveys  
Comments: To: Paul DiPerna <[pd\\_wpa21@YAHOO.COM](mailto:pd_wpa21@YAHOO.COM)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[LISTSERV%200902131003347587.27D1@LISTS.ASU.EDU](mailto:LISTSERV%200902131003347587.27D1@LISTS.ASU.EDU)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

<http://poq.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/nfn065?ijkey=PBdZlZV5WUCbzAc&keytype=ref>

for the forthcoming article on web survey response rates from Callegaro and DiSogra in the latest special POQ issue

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Paul DiPerna



Sent: Friday, February 13, 2009 12:04 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Calculating response rates for online surveys

Hi, I'm new to the list (and AAPOR) so I apologize ahead of time if this has been addressed in a previous thread.

Does anyone have recommended references/articles on online survey methodology, and particularly on response rates?

I also have a specific question based on a survey I'm currently running for an association. Using their own software (I think ConstantContact), the association sent an email invitation to approximately 2,400 members. Their software dashboard indicates that only about 500 members actually opened the email invites. We've obtained 124 responses so far on SurveyMonkey.

Do I calculate the response rate based on the 2,400 total sent, or the 500 opened? A couple folks who I'm working with argue for the latter. But my understanding has been to use the 2,400 number and then consider bounces and opt-outs/refusals..

I can see a rationale to use the 500 number. The 1,900 people who screened by subject line (presumably), or missed the email invite altogether, could be a parallel to phone surveys and Caller ID effects on responses?

Any references, thoughts, are all welcome on/off list.

Thanks,

Paul

---

Paul DiPerna  
cell/text: 202-641-1858  
email: pd\_wpa21@yahoo.com  
online ID: <http://claimid.com/pdiperna>

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

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

---

Date: Mon, 16 Feb 2009 15:31:26 -0500  
Reply-To: Janice Ballou <[JBallou@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM](mailto:JBallou@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Janice Ballou <[JBallou@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM](mailto:JBallou@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM)>

Subject: Source Guide on Surveying Persons with Disabilities  
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

AAPOR Members

=20

The National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research funded =  
a  
Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on Disability Demographics =  
and  
Statistics (StatsRRTC) at Cornell University's Employment and Disability  
Institute. As a collaborator with the StatsRRTC, Mathematica Policy =  
Research,  
Inc. has worked on a project to identify the strengths and limitations =  
in  
existing disability data collection. Part of this effort, was to =  
provide an  
easily accessible source of research on the methodological issues =  
associated  
with surveying people with disabilities. The result of that effort is =  
the  
second edition of "Surveying Persons with Disabilities: A Source Guide." =  
This  
is a very useful resource that has over 225 references classified by 16  
topics that includes brief abstracts describing key information in these  
references. It's a very handy guide-and it's easily available at:

Surveying Persons with Disabilities: A Source Guide=20  
<http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/edicollect/1255/>

We view the Source Guide as a dynamic document and would welcome any  
suggestions for additions. Suggestions can be emailed to  
[jballou@mathematica-mpr.com](mailto:jballou@mathematica-mpr.com).

Janice Ballou

=20

Janice Ballou=20  
Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.=20  
P.O. Box 2393=20  
600 Alexander Park=20  
Princeton, NJ 08543-2393=20  
Phone: 609-750-4049=20  
Fax: 609-799-0005=20  
[jballou@mathematica-mpr.com](mailto:jballou@mathematica-mpr.com)

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

---

Date: Tue, 17 Feb 2009 09:31:58 -0500  
Reply-To: Kelly Foster <[kfoster@CUIOG.UGA.EDU](mailto:kfoster@CUIOG.UGA.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Kelly Foster <[kfoster@CUIOG.UGA.EDU](mailto:kfoster@CUIOG.UGA.EDU)>  
Organization: Carl Vinson Institute of Government  
Subject: SAPOR 1st Annual Mid-Year Event in Atlanta, Georgia  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Greetings!

We are excited to bring you a new event to stimulate conversation and encourage innovative ideas in survey research. This year, in addition to the SAPOR conference in October, we will be holding our 1st Annual Mid-Year Event in Atlanta, Georgia on March 26, 2009. The 1<sup>st</sup> Annual SAPOR Mid-Year Event will offer you the opportunity to network with other research professionals in various fields and give you the opportunity to get more information about the Annual SAPOR conference.

**\*Location\***

It will take place at the Sheraton Atlanta Hotel, 165 Courtland Street, Atlanta GA 30303.

**\*Agenda\***

This event will feature a short course presented 1pm-5pm. A cocktail reception will follow featuring live musical entertainment 5pm-6:30pm and a keynote speaker 6:30pm-8pm. The short course, *Cell Phones and Survey Research* will discuss issues associated with cell phones such as changes in telephone coverage, sampling frames, design options, operational concerns and legal issues. The most recent research on cell phone surveys will be presented along with advice for operational issues in conducting and executing a cell phone study. This course will be facilitated by John Hall a senior statistician at Mathematica Policy Research, Linda Piekarski Vice President of Database & Research\* with Survey Sampling International, Mario Callegaro a Survey Research Scientist at Knowledge Networks and Howard Fienberg\* \*\*Director of Government Affairs for the Marketing Research Association\*.

Brian Evans, a Survey Manager from RTI International, will serve as the Keynote Speaker during the cocktail reception. In his presentation, *Technological Solutions to Challenges in Survey Research*, he will

explore how advances in technology can assist in data collection efforts to improve response rates and the quality of the data collected. He will discuss how tools such as geospatial technology, digital photography, mapping applications, and Smart Phones, can be utilized to improve sample selection and precision, better analyze data, and improve participation rates in research studies.

\*SAPOR Website\*

Those who register before March 19 will receive the discounted rate of \$20 for students and \$40 for non-students. To get more information and register for this event please visit the SAPOR website at:

[\\_http://www.survey.uga.edu/sapor/\\_](http://www.survey.uga.edu/sapor/) . If you have any questions or want to get more information, please contact Kelly Foster at [kfoster@cviog.uga.edu](mailto:kfoster@cviog.uga.edu) .

--

---

Kelly N. Foster, M.S.  
Research Professional III, Survey Research Unit  
Governmental Services & Research Division  
Carl Vinson Institute of Government  
The University of Georgia  
201 North Milledge Avenue  
Athens, GA 30605-5482  
Office: 706-542-2495  
Fax: 706-542-9301  
[www.cviog.uga.edu](http://www.cviog.uga.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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Tue, 17 Feb 2009 13:22:05 -0500  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: UConn to close polling center  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

UConn to close polling center=20

<http://www.rep-am.com/news/doc49995bf3c5395093463878.txt>

=20

=20

Officials at the University of Connecticut say its polling center will

close in June because it has been running a \$700,000 deficit.

SNIP

=20

=20

A UConn official says the deficit comes on top of staffing changes that also would have made it difficult to continue the center's work.

Information from The Associated Press=20

=20

=20

--=20

Leo G. Simonetta

Director of Research

Art & Science Group

6115 Falls Road, Suite 101=20

Baltimore, MD 21209=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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Tue, 17 Feb 2009 15:08:58 -0500

Reply-To: Janice Ballou <[JBallou@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM](mailto:JBallou@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM)>

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

From: Janice Ballou <[JBallou@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM](mailto:JBallou@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM)>

Subject: Source Guide on Surveying Persons with Disabilities

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

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

=20

AAPOR Members

=20

The National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research funded =

a  
Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on Disability Demographics =  
and  
Statistics (StatsRRTC) at Cornell University's Employment and Disability  
Institute. As a collaborator with the StatsRRTC, Mathematica Policy =  
Research,  
Inc. has worked on a project to identify the strengths and limitations =  
in  
existing disability data collection. Part of this effort, was to =  
provide an  
easily accessible source of research on the methodological issues =  
associated  
with surveying people with disabilities. The result of that effort is =  
the  
second edition of "Surveying Persons with Disabilities: A Source Guide." =  
This  
is a very useful resource that has over 225 references classified by 16  
topics that includes brief abstracts describing key information in these  
references. It's a very handy guide-and it's easily available at:

Surveying Persons with Disabilities: A Source Guide=20  
<http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/edicollect/1255/>

We view the Source Guide as a dynamic document and would welcome any  
suggestions for additions. Suggestions can be emailed to  
[jballou@mathematica-mpr.com](mailto:jballou@mathematica-mpr.com).

Janice Ballou

=20

Janice Ballou=20  
Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.=20  
P.O. Box 2393=20  
600 Alexander Park=20  
Princeton, NJ 08543-2393=20  
Phone: 609-750-4049=20  
Fax: 609-799-0005=20  
[jballou@mathematica-mpr.com](mailto:jballou@mathematica-mpr.com)

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

=====  
Date: Wed, 18 Feb 2009 07:51:25 -0500  
Reply-To: Colleen Porter <[colleen\\_porter@COX.NET](mailto:colleen_porter@COX.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>

From: Colleen Porter <colleen\_porter@COX.NET>  
Subject: reporting back, visual response scales  
Comments: To: AAPORNET list <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
Mime-Version: 1.0 (Apple Message framework v930.3)  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII; format=flowed; delpsp=yes  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Thanks for all the help I got from the list about using a visual response scale with a lower literacy population.

I was reminded about the body of literature out there regarding the "feeling thermometer" and also the "ladder " image and "smiley face scale." There is also a +/- scale that was validated in England, a 7-point scale with + and - signs of varying graphic intensity.

I was cautioned to use an odd number for the scale in order to provide a true midpoint, and to test it for culturally sensitivity in the target population--which is a bigger deal than it first seems: we've done a lot of work in South Florida with Cubans, Puerto Ricans and Columbians, but the migrant farm workers are more Mexican, Honduran, and less likely to have their families with them.

Two references were suggested:

Color, labels, and interpretive heuristics for response scales.  
Roger Tourangeau, Mick P. Couper and Frederick Conrad.  
Public Opinion Quarterly 71.1 (Spring 2007): p91(22)

Helping respondents get it right the first time: the influence of words, symbols, and graphics in web surveys.  
Leah Melani Christian, Don A. Dillman and Jolene D. Smyth.  
Public Opinion Quarterly 71.1 (Spring 2007): p113(13)

Many thanks,

Colleen Porter  
Gainesville, FL

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Date: Wed, 18 Feb 2009 10:09:47 -0500  
Reply-To: [colleen\\_porter@COX.NET](mailto:colleen_porter@COX.NET)  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Colleen Porter <colleen\_porter@COX.NET>  
Subject: Re: reporting back, visual response scales  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
In-Reply-To: <200902181251.n117G2nP029482@lists.asu.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=utf-8  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Just in case anyone else hadn't realized....

An off-list response informed me that the much-awaited 3d Edition of "Internet, Mail, and Mixed-Mode Surveys: The Tailored Design Method," this volume authored by Don A. Dillman, Jolene D. Smyth, and Leah Melani Christian is now available.

It's reportedly an 85% revision over the previous edition, and Don has been raving for years about the new research that went into the book.

(I know we are all careful not to use AAPORnet to sell products, but I consider this a public service announcement.)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Wed, 18 Feb 2009 15:40:24 -0500  
Reply-To: Matthew Jans <[mattjans@ISR.UMICH.EDU](mailto:mattjans@ISR.UMICH.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Matthew Jans <[mattjans@ISR.UMICH.EDU](mailto:mattjans@ISR.UMICH.EDU)>  
Subject: AAPOR Recognizes Student Paper Award Winners from Regional Chapters

Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU), [smsnet@umich.edu](mailto:smsnet@umich.edu)

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

As AAPOR's Student Liaison, it's with great pleasure that I congratulate my fellow students who are this year's student paper competition winners from four of AAPOR's regional affiliate chapters. As a busy student myself, I know how hard it can be to make time for conference submissions, let alone submitting to student paper competitions. Students who manage to meet these goals AND have papers of such high quality that they win these competitions earn my sincere admiration.=20

=20

This year's paper titles and authors' names are listed below. Abstracts can be found below my signature.=20

=20

These authors have been invited to present their award-winning papers at the annual AAPOR conference in Hollywood, FL this year. Keep an eye out for them and congratulate the winners personally if you see them.=20



=20

PAPOR (Pacific Association for Public Opinion Research)

Title: Overreporting of voting participation as a function of identity salience

Author: Philip Brenner, University of Wisconsin - Madison

=20

SAPOR (Southern Association for Public Opinion Research)

Title: It's All Relative: Party Polarization, Alienation, and Trust in Government

Author: Scott O'Brien, University of North Carolina

=20

DC-AAPOR (The Washington-Baltimore Chapter of the American Association for Public Opinion Research)

Title: When Deliberation Divides: Processes Underlying Mobilization to Collective Action

Author: Magdalena Wojcieszak, University of Pennsylvania

=20

MAPOR (Midwest Association for Public Opinion Research)

Title: Effects of Gain-Loss News Framing and Political Ideology on Audience Sympathy

Authors: Melissa Gotlieb, University of Wisconsin-Madison; Itay Gabay, University of Wisconsin-Madison; Stephanie Edgerly, University of Wisconsin-Madison

=20

---

Matt Jans

AAPOR Student Liaison

PhD Program in Survey Methodology

Institute for Social Research

University of Michigan

mattjans@isr.umich.edu <mailto:mattjans@isr.umich.edu>=20

<http://sitemaker.umich.edu/mattjans>  
<<http://sitemaker.umich.edu/mattjans>>=20

P Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail=20

=20

=20

PAPOR (Pacific Association for Public Opinion Research)

=20

Title: Overreporting of voting participation as a function of identity salience

Author: Philip Brenner, University of Wisconsin - Madison

Abstract: In this paper, I test two explanations of the overreporting of voting participation, applying both an impression management (IM) approach and an approach based in Stryker's identity theory (1980). Using voting verification data, a mode experiment and a "natural" experiment of social presence from the American National Election Studies over a series of five elections (1978, 1980, 1984, 1988, and 1990), I apply a series of logistic regression models estimating the propensity to overreport in light of IM and identity factors. The model findings suggest that while IM understandings fit the phenomenon of overreporting quite poorly, a conceptualization of self-reported voting as a measure of identity salience can help us to better understand why respondents overreport their voting in terms of the extensive and intensive commitments one has to a civic identity.

=20

SAPOR (Southern Association for Public Opinion Research)

=20

Title: It's All Relative: Party Polarization, Alienation, and Trust in Government

Author: Scott O'Brien, University of North Carolina

Abstract: This paper analyzes polarization and alienation as competing predictors of trust in government. I define "alienation" as perceived ideological proximity to each political party. I define "polarization" as the perceived ideological distance between the parties. Using the cumulative ANES, I find strong support for alienation effects but not for polarization effects; ideological positions of the parties only matter relative to citizens' personal ideological placements. I find this relationship is robust across both time and measures of trust. In addition, I suggest that alienation is misspecified in the literature as

a citizen's ideological distance from the closest political party only.

Ideological distance from both major parties should and do matter when it comes to explaining trust in the American context.

=20

DC-AAPOR (The Washington-Baltimore Chapter of the American Association for Public Opinion Research)

=20

Title: When Deliberation Divides: Processes Underlying Mobilization to Collective Action

Author: Magdalena Wojcieszak, University of Pennsylvania

Abstract: May deliberation on a contentious political issue increase polarization or intensify conflicts between oppositional factions? Drawing on quasi experimental data from participants in structured, moderated and heterogeneous face-to-face deliberations on sexual minority rights in Poland (n = 3182) and using Structural Equation Modeling, this study shows that disagreement perceived during deliberations mobilizes strongly opinionated participants to public and potentially confrontational political actions around sexual minority rights.

Perceived disagreement also evokes the sense of a collective action frame among those participants, and - through the evoked collective action frame - further mobilizes them to both communicative as well as to public and confrontational actions. Theoretical and practical implications for deliberation, social movements and ideologically polarized societies are discussed.=20

=20

MAPOR (Midwest Association for Public Opinion Research)

=20

Title: Effects of Gain-Loss News Framing and Political Ideology on Audience Sympathy

Authors: Melissa Gotlieb, University of Wisconsin-Madison; Itay Gabay, University of Wisconsin-Madison; Stephanie Edgerly, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Abstract: Although research on the effects of gain-loss framing and its relevance to decision making has been prolific in the fields of psychology, economics, and health (see Kuhberger, 1998 for a meta-analysis of gain-loss framing effects research), it has largely been ignored in the context of news effects research (for notable exceptions, see Schuck & De Vreese, 2006; Shah et al., 2004). As such, this paper extends Kahneman and Tversky's (1979, 1984) work on the

effects of gain-loss framing to the context of news effects on audience sympathy as well as the way in which political ideology might condition this effect.

=20

**Gain-Loss Framing.** Under conditions involving risky choices, prospect theory predicts that decision making will be contingent upon whether options are framed in terms of their associated gains or losses, or more generally their advantages or disadvantages. Across multiple experiments, Kahneman and Tversky (1979) find that gain frames result in risk aversion, while loss frames result in risk seeking, thus increasing the likelihood of favoring the alternative over the status quo. Although a plethora of research supports a strong, consistent effect of gain framing on risk aversion, the effects of loss framing on audience outcomes is less stable. Specifically, studies have shown that when information is framed in terms of loss, the emphasis on negative outcomes leaves individuals conflicted over potential trade-offs (Schneider, 1992). As such, loss frames are associated with more effortful processing of the information (e.g., Dunegan, 1993; Fisher, Jonas, Frey, & Kastenmuller, 2007; Lopes, 1987). We extend this line of reasoning to predict that loss frames will be related to sympathetic feelings for the involved parties.

=20

**Audience Characteristics.** Scholars examining news effects on public opinion and decision making have shown that news effects do not occur in isolation; rather, they are conditioned by audience predispositions (e.g., Entman, 1989; Zaller, 1992). Specifically, Zaller (1992) examines ideology as a key intervening variable between media messages and audience attitudes (p. 23). Thus, we expect that political ideology will influence the impact of news framing on audience sympathy.

=20

**Method.** The data for this study were collected by means of an experiment embedded in a web-based survey of students. Respondents were randomly assigned to view a broadcast news story that framed policy options related to the issue of providing health care in terms of either gains or losses. Measures of audience sympathy for individuals depicted in the news story who stand to gain (or lose) from either the existing policy (e.g., business owners) or proposed legislation to change the existing policy (e.g., new employees) were included in the posttest.

=20

**Results and Discussion.** The effects of audience characteristics and gain-loss framing were examined using regression analysis. Those who were female, high in issue importance, maternalism, and liberal ideology were more likely to sympathize with the new employee, while those who were low in issue importance and high in conservative ideology were likely to sympathize with the business owner. In terms of gain-loss framing, exposure to the loss frame predicted sympathy for the new

employee but not the business owner. We also found a significant interaction between political ideology and news frame such that liberals exposed to the loss frame were most sympathetic to the new employee, while conservatives exposed to a loss frame were most sympathetic to the business owner. Although our findings do not support an overall main effect of the frame on sympathy for the business owner among our student sample, we do find an effect of the loss frame among those who identify as conservative.

=20

We propose future research that extends our findings to examine audience sympathy as a potential mediator between news frames and citizen engagement.

=20

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Wed, 18 Feb 2009 16:06:17 -0500  
Reply-To: Nancy Whelchel <[nlwhelch@GW.FIS.NCSU.EDU](mailto:nlwhelch@GW.FIS.NCSU.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nancy Whelchel <[nlwhelch@GW.FIS.NCSU.EDU](mailto:nlwhelch@GW.FIS.NCSU.EDU)>  
Subject: tax laws for incentives  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Hello helpful AAPORites,  
Can someone please summarize the tax laws that apply to the use of survey = incentives? Let's say my client wants to offer a random drawing for some = amount of money (check or gift card) to be awarded to some number of = people in the survey population. Regardless of the dubious effect of the = incentive, what IRS bureaucracy is involved for all parties? Is there an = amount of money that can let you legitimately by-pass the IRS?

=20

Thanks,  
Nancy (who should probably know this but has managed to avoid the issue = all these years)

=20

=20

\*\*\*\*\*

Nancy Whelchel, Ph.D.  
Assistant Director for Survey Research  
University Planning and Analysis  
Box 7002=20

NCSU  
Raleigh, NC 27695-7002  
919-515-4184  
Nancy\_Whelchel@ncsu.edu=20

\*\*\*\*\*

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Wed, 18 Feb 2009 16:51:58 -0500  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Survey: What do Iran and Alabama share? Religiosity  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Survey: What do Iran and Alabama share? Religiosity

By Adelle M. Banks,  
Religion News Service

Baptists in Tuscaloosa and Muslims in Tehran might not seem to have much in common, but Alabama and Iran do agree on one thing: the importance of religion.

Nearly identical percentages of people in both locations - 82% of Alabamians and 83% of Iranians - say religion is an important part of their daily lives.

The comparisons come from the Gallup Poll, which recently compiled findings about the importance of faith to individuals in all 50 states and 143 countries.

SNIP

[http://www.usatoday.com/news/religion/2009-02-18-states-countries-survey\\_N.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/news/religion/2009-02-18-states-countries-survey_N.htm)  
or  
<http://tinyurl.com/adwpza>

--

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

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Thu, 19 Feb 2009 06:51:38 -0700  
Reply-To: John Fries <[jfries@AARP.ORG](mailto:jfries@AARP.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: John Fries <[jfries@AARP.ORG](mailto:jfries@AARP.ORG)>  
Subject: IVR Recommendations  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

I have a colleague interested in possibly using IVR to conduct a series of  
short surveys (5-7 minutes max including demos) about public policy  
issues. I have steered them to some of the literature surrounding the use  
of IVR for survey research, but they were also hoping to talk to a couple  
of firms who actually use this method. Knowing not all facilities that use

IVR are as good as others, I was hoping maybe someone on the list could  
offer a recommendation or two of good companies who have successfully used  
IVR in this capacity.

Thanks in advance for any help you can offer.

John

---  
John Fries  
Senior Research Advisor  
Organizational and Tracking Research, AARP  
601 E St., N.W., Washington, DC 20049  
Phone: 202-434-6313 | eMail: [jfries@aarp.org](mailto:jfries@aarp.org)

-----  
If you can't explain it simply, you don't understand it well enough.  
-- Albert Einstein  
-----

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Thu, 19 Feb 2009 08:53:41 -0500

Reply-To: Howard Fienberg <[howard.fienberg@MRA-NET.ORG](mailto:howard.fienberg@MRA-NET.ORG)>

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

From: Howard Fienberg <[howard.fienberg@MRA-NET.ORG](mailto:howard.fienberg@MRA-NET.ORG)>

Subject: Re: IVR Recommendations

Comments: To: John Fries <[jfries@AARP.ORG](mailto:jfries@AARP.ORG)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

John, you should suggest that your colleague review the MRA 1-pager on =  
automated polling best practices -- it will give an idea of =  
legal/ethical practices he should be looking for in an IVR provider.

=20

[http://www.cmor.org/pdf/robopoll\\_mrar\\_best\\_practices.pdf](http://www.cmor.org/pdf/robopoll_mrar_best_practices.pdf)

=20

Sincerely,

Howard Fienberg

Director of Government Affairs

Marketing Research Association (MRA)

[howard.fienberg@mra-net.org](mailto:howard.fienberg@mra-net.org)

1111 16th St. NW, Suite 120

Washington, DC 20036

(202) 775-5170

Fax: (202) 775-5172

<http://www.mra-net.org> <<http://www.mra-net.org/>>=20

<http://www.cmor.org> <<http://www.cmor.org/>>=20

---

From: AAPORNET on behalf of John Fries

Sent: Thu 2/19/2009 8:51 AM

To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

Subject: IVR Recommendations

I have a colleague interested in possibly using IVR to conduct a series =

of

short surveys (5-7 minutes max including demos) about public policy  
issues. I have steered them to some of the literature surrounding the =

use

of IVR for survey research, but they were also hoping to talk to a =

couple

firms who actually use this method. Knowing not all facilities that use

IVR are as good as others, I was hoping maybe someone on the list could

offer a recommendation or two of good companies who have successfully =

used

IVR in this capacity.



Thanks in advance for any help you can offer.

John

---

John Fries  
Senior Research Advisor  
Organizational and Tracking Research, AARP  
601 E St., N.W., Washington, DC 20049  
Phone: 202-434-6313 | eMail: [jfries@aarp.org](mailto:jfries@aarp.org)

-----  
=E2EURoeIf you can't explain it simply, you don't understand it well =  
enough.=E2EUR=9D  
-- Albert Einstein

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

=====  
Date: Thu, 19 Feb 2009 16:06:26 +0100  
Reply-To: Edith de Leeuw <[edithl@XS4ALL.NL](mailto:edithl@XS4ALL.NL)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Edith de Leeuw <[edithl@XS4ALL.NL](mailto:edithl@XS4ALL.NL)>  
Subject: Re: IVR Recommendations  
Comments: To: John Fries <[jfries@AARP.ORG](mailto:jfries@AARP.ORG)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[LISTSERV%200902190651383241.66E4@LISTS.ASU.EDU](mailto:LISTSERV%200902190651383241.66E4@LISTS.ASU.EDU)>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Darby Miller Steiger and Beverly Conroy wrote a very clear overview of IVR for the International Handbook of Survey Methodology. On the accompanying web site, they placed some very useful material too: See <http://www.xs4all.nl/~edithl/surveyhandbook/contents.htm> (chapter 15).

I advice contacting Darby for more more details.

Warm regards Edith

Prof. dr. Edith D. de Leeuw

Department of Methodology and Statistics  
Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences  
Utrecht University

e-mail [edithl@xs4all.nl](mailto:edithl@xs4all.nl)

At 06:51 AM 2/19/2009 -0700, John Fries wrote:

>I have a colleague interested in possibly using IVR to conduct a series of  
>short surveys (5-7 minutes max including demos) about public policy  
>issues. I have steered them to some of the literature surrounding the use  
>of IVR for survey research, but they were also hoping to talk to a couple  
>firms who actually use this method. Knowing not all facilities that use  
>IVR are as good as others, I was hoping maybe someone on the list could  
>offer a recommendation or two of good companies who have successfully used  
>IVR in this capacity.

>  
>Thanks in advance for any help you can offer.

>  
>John

>  
>---

>John Fries  
>Senior Research Advisor  
>Organizational and Tracking Research, AARP  
>601 E St., N.W., Washington, DC 20049  
>Phone: 202-434-6313 | eMail: [jfries@aarp.org](mailto:jfries@aarp.org)

>-----  
>â€œIf you can't explain it simply, you don't understand it well enough.â€  
>-- Albert Einstein

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

---

Date: Thu, 19 Feb 2009 10:20:57 -0500  
Reply-To: [boyds1@ohio.edu](mailto:boyds1@ohio.edu)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Sara Boyd <[boyds1@OHIO.EDU](mailto:boyds1@OHIO.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: IVR Recommendations  
Comments: To: "Ani Ruhil (OAK)" <[ruhil@ohio.edu](mailto:ruhil@ohio.edu)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[5.1.0.14.2.20090219160217.02ed7900@pop.xs4all.nl](mailto:5.1.0.14.2.20090219160217.02ed7900@pop.xs4all.nl)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I would much appreciate an answer to these questions.

1. Has anyone used Synovate's online panels for surveys targeting households, and were you pleased with the effective sample you ended up with?
2. Are there other sources you'd recommend for purchasing online panels?

Thanks, Sara Boyd

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

---

Date: Thu, 19 Feb 2009 12:09:15 -0500  
Reply-To: Micheline Blum <[micheline.blum@BARUCH.CUNY.EDU](mailto:micheline.blum@BARUCH.CUNY.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Micheline Blum <[micheline.blum@BARUCH.CUNY.EDU](mailto:micheline.blum@BARUCH.CUNY.EDU)>  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

I am looking for suggestions for methodology and questions for a survey of employees in the mental health division of a public hospital. This is an institution with a troubled history of staff and patient problems, poor management, and mistrust at all levels. We clearly want to protect the confidentiality of the staff and to encourage honest responses. The purpose is not to grade the institution, but to make suggestions to improve it.=20

=20

I will be extremely grateful for any experiences or suggestions AAPOR members can share with me.

=20

Thanks.

=20

=20

=20

Micheline Blum

Director

Baruch College Survey Research

School of Public Affairs

Baruch College/CUNY

646-660-6795

micheline.blum@baruch.cuny.edu

=20

=20

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

---

Date: Mon, 23 Feb 2009 13:55:06 -0500  
Reply-To: Masahiko Aida <[maida@GQRR.COM](mailto:maida@GQRR.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Masahiko Aida <[maida@GQRR.COM](mailto:maida@GQRR.COM)>  
Subject: FW: Intro for Cell survey and current residence question  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

It appears it did not go through the list for some reason, let me try again.

=20

=20

---

From: Masahiko Aida=20  
Sent: Friday, February 13, 2009 6:00 PM  
To: '[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)'  
Subject: Intro for Cell survey and current residence question

=20

Hello

=20

We started cell phone supplement for one of our political surveys, and we are thinking about how to create good introduction for cell phone survey.

=20

(1) Have anyone tried testing different introduction to cell phone survey and compared which one is more effective? (in terms of introduction with higher corporation?) We are offering \$10 incentive upon completion. We kind of made up current introduction, if you are willing to share your intro, please let me know by replying here or off-line, I would be happy to feedback what I learned.

=20

=20

(CELL SAMPLE) Hello, my name is (caller name). I'm calling for xxxx . I would like to ask you a few questions concerning the problems facing our nation, state and local communities. I am NOT selling anything, and I will NOT ask you for a donation. I know I am calling you on a cell phone, as a small token of our appreciation for your time, we will pay all eligible respondents 10 dollars for participating in this survey.=20

=20

(CELL SAMPLE) If you are currently driving a car or doing any activity that requires your full attention, I need to call you back at a later time. Are you able to safely talk right now? (IF RESPONDENT SAYS IT IS NOT A GOOD TIME, TRY TO ARRANGE A TIME TO CALL BACK AND TERMINATE)

=20

(2) Also as you all know, current residence and areacode in cell frame are not necessarily well linked. We are asking respondents where they live in the survey because as a political polling firm their location of residency (actually location of registration) is of substantive interest for us.

=20

We are currently asking County of registration, and as I check frequency of dk/na, looks like many people manage to report their county of registration, but our team also wonders ZIP code might be easier to respond. Have any one asked current location of residence or similar question?

=20

Many thanks

=20

Masahiko=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: Mon, 23 Feb 2009 16:14:25 -0500  
Reply-To: Nancy Whelchel <nlwhelch@GW.FIS.NCSU.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Nancy Whelchel <nlwhelch@GW.FIS.NCSU.EDU>  
Subject: info: tax laws for incentives  
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=UTF-8  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Thanks for all the replies to my request for information on tax issues related to incentives. Several people asked me to post what I learned, so here's a quick summary.

The short version: The organization providing the incentives is responsible for filing a 1099 form only if the cash-value of the incentive for any given individual is \$600 or more in a calendar year. (And, because someone asked, that information is listed as the dollar amount in Box 3 of the 1099, for prizes and awards.)

The longer version: For a state university it is perhaps more complicated than for others. The person awarding the incentive is responsible for providing the Accounting office a list of the names, faculty/staff/student ID (or, if not available, SSN), permanent mailing address, and the amount of the incentive, for each person receiving an incentive. If that person is a current employee, the incentive is considered wages in kind, and the cash amount awarded (either in cash or gift card) is noted on the recipients next pay stub as taxable income, and all taxes are taken out at that time. If the incentive is not cash or a gift card, the value of the incentive is essentially listed as a fringe benefit in the next pay period, and appropriate FICA taxes are taken out.

If the person is a student, the Accounting office simply keeps track of the student's earnings and submits a 1099 form if the earnings reach \$600 in a calendar year. This also applies to incentives used for surveys of alumni.

Recipients are responsible for claiming the incentives as taxable income, regardless of the amount.

If anyone knows anything to the contrary, or has something to add, please let me know!

Thanks,  
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

\*\*\*\*\*

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

Date: Mon, 23 Feb 2009 17:12:29 -0500  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Words fail me (almost)  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Those of you who haven't been reading pollster.com since the election  
might want to drop by and take a look at today's postings.

=20

(I was originally going to use "Pollster fight" as the subject line.)

=20

--=20

Leo G. Simonetta

Director of Research

Art & Science Group

6115 Falls Road, Suite 101=20

Baltimore, MD 21209=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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Tue, 24 Feb 2009 13:54:59 +0000  
Reply-To: "nickp@marketsharescorp.com" <[mkshares@COMCAST.NET](mailto:mkshares@COMCAST.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>

From: "nickp@marketsharescorp.com" <mkshares@COMCAST.NET>  
Subject: Rewarding Bad Behavior  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>, ".nick"  
<nickp@marketsharescorp.com>  
In-Reply-To:  
<485786679.1440291235483222140.JavaMail.root@sz0107a.emeryville.ca.mail.comcas  
t.net>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=utf-8  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Last week CNBC's Rick Santelli said that homeowners who bought homes they could not afford should not be rewarded for bad behavior. Robert Gibbs said that Santelli did not know what he was talking about. For those in the process of polling this subject there may be more to this than is now being covered. Gibbs may be right.

Consider Home Equity Loans versus Mortgages. This comes from a March, 2007 FRB paper by Alan Greenspan and James Kennedy: According to our estimates, discretionary extraction of home equity accounts for about four-fifths of the rise in home mortgage debt since 1990. Equity extraction resulting from home sales reflects largely realized capital gains, whereas home equity loans and cash-out refinancings are extractions of unrealized capital gains. A footnote explains The remaining fifth includes mortgages to finance the purchase of new homes.

Source, see reference: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mortgage\\_equity\\_withdrawal](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mortgage_equity_withdrawal)

If accurate, this means that most of the equity decline did not come from the purchase of homes people could not afford but from banks promoting a product that effectively reduced or eliminated home equity that led to the credit crisis we are now facing. This means that banks were either Enablers or Predators. (I lean toward the latter.)

Mortgage brokers peddle home equity loans as well, presumably with no adverse consequences except in cases of fraud - if discoverable. There may be something wrong with a system that excludes originators from risk when loans go bad.

Comments?



Nick Panagakis=20

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Tue, 24 Feb 2009 09:37:31 -0500  
Reply-To: [colleen\\_porter@COX.NET](mailto:colleen_porter@COX.NET)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Colleen Porter <[colleen\\_porter@COX.NET](mailto:colleen_porter@COX.NET)>  
Subject: Re: Rewarding Bad Behavior  
Comments: To: "nickp@marketsharescorp.com" <[mkshares@COMCAST.NET](mailto:mkshares@COMCAST.NET)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[200902241355.n1O7R1b0029926@lists.asu.edu](mailto:200902241355.n1O7R1b0029926@lists.asu.edu)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=utf-8  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Just wanted to add that my views on the lending industry were much influenced by Danna Moore's (Washington State) poster at AAPOR in OC on predatory lending practices.

It was a real eye opener.

We don't have too many economists in AAPOR, not near enough it now seems, but she is one who has expertise in this area.

Colleen Porter  
Gainesville, FL  
(who baked a King Cake for Mardi Gras, feeling much closer to those festivities having been there last May)

---- "nickp@marketsharescorp.com" <[mkshares@COMCAST.NET](mailto:mkshares@COMCAST.NET)> wrote:  
> Last week CNBC's Rick Santelli said that homeowners who bought homes they c=  
> ould not afford should not be rewarded for bad behavior. Robert Gibbs said =  
> that Santelli did not know what he was talking about. For those in the proc=  
> ess of polling this subject there may be more to this than is now being cov=  
> ered. Gibbs my be right.=20  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> Consider Home Equity Loans versus Mortgages. This comes from a March, 2007 =

> FRB paper by Alan Greenspan and James Kennedy: According to our estimates, discretionary extraction of home equity accounts for about four-fifths of the rise in home mortgage debt since 1990. Equity extraction resulting from home sales reflects largely realized capital gains, whereas home equity loans and cash-out refinancings are extractions of unrealized capital gains. A footnote explains The remaining fifth includes mortgages to finance the purchase of new homes.

> Source, see reference: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mortgage\\_equity\\_withdrawal](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mortgage_equity_withdrawal)

> If accurate, this means that most of the equity decline did not come from the purchase of homes people could not afford but from banks promoting a product that effectively reduced or eliminated home equity that led to the credit crisis we are now facing. This means that banks were either Enablers or Predators. (I lean toward the latter.)

> Mortgage brokers peddle home equity loans as well, presumably with no adverse consequences except in cases of fraud - if discoverable. There may be something wrong with a system that excludes originators from risk when loans go bad.

> Comments?

> Nick Panagakis

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

Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Tue, 24 Feb 2009 10:33:25 -0500

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

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

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

Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing

Subject: Re: Rewarding Bad Behavior

Comments: To: "nickp@marketsharescorp.com" <[mkshares@COMCAST.NET](mailto:mkshares@COMCAST.NET)>

Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

In-Reply-To:

<1556816667.1443061235483699768.JavaMail.root@sz0107a.emeryville.ca.mail.comca

st.net>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

For some insight into the social and economic forces behind the current situation, I suggest reading this article in the December 2008 Atlantic:

<http://www.theatlantic.com/doc/200812/blodget-wall-street>

I'd also suggest reading George Packer's "The Ponzi State" in the February 9 New Yorker magazine:

[http://www.newyorker.com/reporting/2009/02/09/090209fa\\_fact\\_packer](http://www.newyorker.com/reporting/2009/02/09/090209fa_fact_packer)  
(registration required).

It's easy to blame predatory lenders, but they only exist insofar as government regulation allows them, or even encourages them to, and that in turn derives from the political environment and how popular attitudes have evolved toward government and regulation in recent decades.

Jan Werner

---

nickp@marketsharescorp.com wrote:

> Last week CNBC's Rick Santelli said that homeowners who bought homes

> they could not afford should not be rewarded for bad behavior. Robert

> Gibbs said that Santelli did not know what he was talking about. For

> those in the process of polling this subject there may be more to

> this than is now being covered. Gibbs may be right.

>

>

>

>

> Consider Home Equity Loans versus Mortgages. This comes from a March,

> 2007 FRB paper by Alan Greenspan and James Kennedy: "According to our

> estimates, discretionary extraction of home equity accounts for about

> four-fifths of the rise in home mortgage debt since 1990. Equity

> extraction resulting from home sales reflects largely realized

> capital gains, whereas home equity loans and cash-out refinancings

> are extractions of unrealized capital gains." A footnote explains

> "The remaining fifth includes mortgages to finance the purchase of

> new homes."

>

> Source, see reference:

> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mortgage\\_equity\\_withdrawal](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mortgage_equity_withdrawal)

>

>

>

> If accurate, this means that most of the equity decline did not come

> from the purchase of homes people could not afford but from banks

> promoting a product that effectively reduced or eliminated home

> equity that led to the credit crisis we are now facing. This means

> that banks were either Enablers or Predators. (I lean toward the

> latter.)

>

>  
>  
> Mortgage brokers peddle home equity loans as well, presumably with no  
> adverse consequences except in cases of fraud - if discoverable.  
> There may be something wrong with a system that excludes originators  
> from risk when loans go bad.

>  
>  
>  
>  
> Comments?

>  
>  
>  
>  
> Nick Panagakis

>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> ----- Archives:  
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> Vacation hold? Send email  
> to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Tue, 24 Feb 2009 12:39:14 -0500  
Reply-To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jan Werner <[jwerner@JWDP.COM](mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM)>  
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing  
Subject: How to build "public opinion" one question at a time  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=windows-1252; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

This was the headline from a poll released by Rasmussen yesterday:

55% Say Government Mortgage Help Rewards Bad Behavior

[http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public\\_content/business/econ\\_survey\\_toplines/february\\_2009/toplines\\_mortgage\\_bailout\\_february\\_21\\_22\\_2009](http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public_content/business/econ_survey_toplines/february_2009/toplines_mortgage_bailout_february_21_22_2009)  
(or: <http://tinyurl.com/abkeqb> )

And here is the sequence of questions asked to obtain that result:

1\* Would you favor or oppose a plan for the federal government to pay off up to \$100,000 of the mortgage balance owed by every single homeowner in America?

33% Favor  
51% Oppose  
16% Not sure

2\* Okay... Would you favor or oppose a plan for the federal government to pay off a portion of the mortgages only for people who can't afford their current mortgage payments?

32% Favor  
53% Oppose  
15% Not sure

3\* Some people say that having the government subsidize mortgage payments for financially troubled homeowners puts the government in the position of rewarding bad behavior. Is the government rewarding bad behavior when it provides subsidies to those who are most at risk of losing their homes?

55% Yes, the government is rewarding bad behavior  
32% No  
14% Not sure

-----

... and when did you stop beating your wife Mr. Rasmussen?

Jan Werner

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Tue, 24 Feb 2009 10:08:04 -0800  
Reply-To: "Michael Sullivan (michaelsullivan)"  
<[michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM](mailto:michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Michael Sullivan (michaelsullivan)"  
<[michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM](mailto:michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM)>  
Subject: Re: How to build "public opinion" one question at a time  
Comments: To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com), [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

In-Reply-To: <49A430C2.6000509@jwdp.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I suspect it would be difficult to ask that question in a way that didn't result in a highly negative response. There is no question that assisting parties who got into trouble with their mortgage is rewarding bad behavior on the part of most of the people who are under water and their lenders. I would be surprised if a substantial majority of the population did not think so based on the coverage of this issue in the press alone. A more interesting question is how much support for the action depends on the respondent's perception that property values in their neighborhood are being seriously eroded by the presence of foreclosures in the immediate vicinity and their assessment of the likelihood that the proposed program will prevent their home from losing more value in the future. Of course, that would require us to be interested in actually providing useful input into the political decision making process rather than just grabbing headlines.

MS

Michael J. Sullivan, Ph.D.  
Chairman  
Freeman, Sullivan & Co.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jan Werner

Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2009 9:39 AM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: How to build "public opinion" one question at a time

This was the headline from a poll released by Rasmussen yesterday:

55% Say Government Mortgage Help Rewards Bad Behavior

[http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public\\_content/business/econ\\_survey\\_toplines/february\\_2009/toplines\\_mortgage\\_bailout\\_february\\_21\\_22\\_2009](http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public_content/business/econ_survey_toplines/february_2009/toplines_mortgage_bailout_february_21_22_2009)  
(or: <http://tinyurl.com/abkeqb> )

And here is the sequence of questions asked to obtain that result:

1\* Would you favor or oppose a plan for the federal government to pay off up to \$100,000 of the mortgage balance owed by every single homeowner in America?

33% Favor

51% Oppose

16% Not sure

2\* Okay... Would you favor or oppose a plan for the federal government to pay off a portion of the mortgages only for people who can't afford

their current mortgage payments?

32% Favor  
53% Oppose  
15% Not sure

3\* Some people say that having the government subsidize mortgage payments for financially troubled homeowners puts the government in the position of rewarding bad behavior. Is the government rewarding bad behavior when it provides subsidies to those who are most at risk of losing their homes?

55% Yes, the government is rewarding bad behavior 32% No 14% Not sure

-----

... and when did you stop beating your wife Mr. Rasmussen?

Jan Werner

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Tue, 24 Feb 2009 10:35:25 -0800  
Reply-To: "Pollack, Lance" <[Lance.Pollack@UCSF.EDU](mailto:Lance.Pollack@UCSF.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Pollack, Lance" <[Lance.Pollack@UCSF.EDU](mailto:Lance.Pollack@UCSF.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: How to build "public opinion" one question at a time  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: A<[F90D102CAA90F547B081DE4C879A009C025694EA@ex-be-012-sfo.shared.themessagecenter.com](mailto:F90D102CAA90F547B081DE4C879A009C025694EA@ex-be-012-sfo.shared.themessagecenter.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Pollsters may have to consider that the general public is simply too ill-equipped to contribute substantially to the public discourse about means. My personal perception is that there is public consensus that one of the ways to "fix" the economy is to prevent foreclosures and "fix" all the "bad" mortgages. Then you ask, help the lenders? NO! Oh, then

help the borrowers? NO! Okay, then the best action to take would be...what?

The truth is, in tough times it is a lot easier to be in opposition. All you have to do is say no, don't do this, don't do that. Too expensive! Too risky! Fine, then what would you DO! Not, what goal are you trying to accomplish, but what would you DO to accomplish that goal. Those are the questions that need answering, but more often than not those questions are not even asked!

I am reminded of public opinion polls telling Clinton to "handle" the crisis in (name the former province of Yugoslavia of your choice) without sending troops, risking American lives, or spending money. The public seemed to say "just make it go away" with no real concern about the connection between eggs and omelets.

I think the case here, again, is that public opinion surveys can assess goals and optimism and leadership, but I don't think it is going to be that helpful about means. They are all painful. Perhaps a more "forced choice" approach is required to make people choose among all our wonderfully unpalatable choices (which, by the way, should not exclude doing nothing).

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

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Michael Sullivan (michaelsullivan)  
Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2009 10:08 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: How to build "public opinion" one question at a time

I suspect it would be difficult to ask that question in a way that didn't result in a highly negative response. There is no question that assisting parties who got into trouble with their mortgage is rewarding bad behavior on the part of most of the people who are under water and their lenders. I would be surprised if a substantial majority of the population did not think so based on the coverage of this issue in the press alone. A more interesting question is how much support for the action depends on the respondent's perception that property values in their neighborhood are being seriously eroded by the presence of foreclosures in the immediate vicinity and their assessment of the likelihood that the proposed program will prevent their home from losing more value in the future. Of course, that would require us to be interested in actually providing useful input into the political decision making process rather than just grabbing headlines.



MS

Michael J. Sullivan, Ph.D.  
Chairman  
Freeman, Sullivan & Co.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jan Werner  
Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2009 9:39 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: How to build "public opinion" one question at a time

This was the headline from a poll released by Rasmussen yesterday:

55% Say Government Mortgage Help Rewards Bad Behavior

[http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public\\_content/business/econ\\_survey\\_toplines/february\\_2009/toplines\\_mortgage\\_bailout\\_february\\_21\\_22\\_2009](http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public_content/business/econ_survey_toplines/february_2009/toplines_mortgage_bailout_february_21_22_2009)  
(or: <http://tinyurl.com/abkeqb> )

And here is the sequence of questions asked to obtain that result:

1\* Would you favor or oppose a plan for the federal government to pay off up to \$100,000 of the mortgage balance owed by every single homeowner in America?

33% Favor  
51% Oppose  
16% Not sure

2\* Okay... Would you favor or oppose a plan for the federal government to pay off a portion of the mortgages only for people who can't afford their current mortgage payments?

32% Favor  
53% Oppose  
15% Not sure

3\* Some people say that having the government subsidize mortgage payments for financially troubled homeowners puts the government in the position of rewarding bad behavior. Is the government rewarding bad behavior when it provides subsidies to those who are most at risk of losing their homes?

55% Yes, the government is rewarding bad behavior 32% No 14% Not sure

-----

... and when did you stop beating your wife Mr. Rasmussen?

Jan Werner

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Tue, 24 Feb 2009 13:40:03 -0500  
Reply-To: [rfunk787@AOL.COM](mailto:rfunk787@AOL.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "G. Ray Funkhouser" <[rfunk787@AOL.COM](mailto:rfunk787@AOL.COM)>  
Subject: Re: How to build "public opinion" one question at a time  
Comments: To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com), [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[49A430C2.6000509@jwdp.com](mailto:49A430C2.6000509@jwdp.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="utf-8"

It's not completely worthless. At least this poll might provide an estimate of how many "homeowners" mortgages are under water. Apparently, about 32 - 33%. Or would those figures also include "compassionate" people who aren't currently paying any Federal income tax? Hmm -- complicated . . . Yes, AAPOR needs more economists.

Ray Funkhouser

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

From: Jan Werner <[jwerner@JWDP.COM](mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM)>  
To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Sent: Tue, 24 Feb 2009 12:39 pm  
Subject: How to build "public opinion" one question at a time

This was the headline from a poll released by Rasmussen yesterday:

55% Say Government Mortgage Help Rewards Bad Behavior

[http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public\\_content/business/econ\\_survey\\_toplines/february\\_2009/toplines\\_mortgage\\_bailout\\_february\\_21\\_22\\_2009](http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public_content/business/econ_survey_toplines/february_2009/toplines_mortgage_bailout_february_21_22_2009)

(or: <http://tinyurl.com/abkeqb>)

And here is the sequence of questions asked to obtain that result:

1\* Would you favor or oppose a plan for the federal government to pay off up to \$100,000 of the mortgage balance owed by every single

homeowner in America?

33% Favor

51% Oppose

16% Not sure

2\* Okay? Would you favor or oppose a plan for the federal government to

pay off a portion of the mortgages only for people who can't afford

their current mortgage payments?

32% Favor

53% Oppose

15% Not sure

3\* Some people say that having the government subsidize mortgage

payments for financially troubled homeowners puts the government in the=C2=  
=A0

position of rewarding bad behavior. Is the government rewarding bad=C2=A0

behavior when it provides subsidies to those who are most at risk of=C2=A0

losing their homes?=C2=A0  
=C2=A0

55% Yes, the government is rewarding bad behavior=C2=A0

32% No=C2=A0

14% Not sure=C2=A0  
=C2=A0

-----C2=A0  
=C2=A0

... and when did you stop beating your wife Mr. Rasmussen?=C2=A0  
=C2=A0

Jan Werner=C2=A0  
=C2=A0

-----=C2=A0

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>=C2=A0

Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:=C2=A0

set aapornet nomail=C2=A0

On your return send this: set aapornet mail=C2=A0

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.=C2=A0

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)=  
=C2=A0

=20

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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, 24 Feb 2009 12:33:13 -0600  
Reply-To: Robert Godfrey <holbein@CHARTER.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Robert Godfrey <holbein@CHARTER.NET>  
Subject: Re: How to build "public opinion" one question at a time  
Comments: To: jwerner@jwdp.com, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
In-Reply-To: <49A430C2.6000509@jwdp.com>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1" ; format="flowed"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Reporting from other polling on the same issue is here:

[http://www.talkingpointsmemo.com/archives/2009/02/dangerous\\_brew.php](http://www.talkingpointsmemo.com/archives/2009/02/dangerous_brew.php)

Robert Godfrey

At 12:39 PM -0500 2/24/09, Jan Werner wrote:

>This was the headline from a poll released by Rasmussen yesterday:

>  
> 55% Say Government Mortgage Help Rewards Bad Behavior

>  
>[http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public\\_content/business/econ\\_survey\\_toplines/february\\_2009/toplines\\_mortgage\\_bailout\\_february\\_21\\_22\\_2009](http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public_content/business/econ_survey_toplines/february_2009/toplines_mortgage_bailout_february_21_22_2009)

>(or: <http://tinyurl.com/abkeqb> )

>  
>And here is the sequence of questions asked to obtain that result:

>  
>1\* Would you favor or oppose a plan for the federal government to pay  
>off up to \$100,000 of the mortgage balance owed by every single  
>homeowner in America?

>  
>33% Favor  
>51% Oppose  
>16% Not sure

>  
>2\* Okay Would you favor or oppose a plan for the federal government to  
>pay off a portion of the mortgages only for people who can't afford  
>their current mortgage payments?

>  
>32% Favor  
>53% Oppose  
>15% Not sure

>  
>3\* Some people say that having the government subsidize mortgage  
>payments for financially troubled homeowners puts the government in the  
>position of rewarding bad behavior. Is the government rewarding bad  
>behavior when it provides subsidies to those who are most at risk of  
>losing their homes?

>  
>55% Yes, the government is rewarding bad behavior  
>32% No

>14% Not sure  
>  
>-----  
>  
>... and when did you stop beating your wife Mr. Rasmussen?  
>  
>Jan Werner  
>  
>-----  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Tue, 24 Feb 2009 14:05:06 -0500  
Reply-To: "Edward C. Ratledge" <[ratledge@UDEL.EDU](mailto:ratledge@UDEL.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Edward C. Ratledge" <[ratledge@UDEL.EDU](mailto:ratledge@UDEL.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: How to build "public opinion" one question at a time  
Comments: To: "AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Being "under water" certainly is not randomly distributed. Where you live w=  
ill certainly impact the response.

Ed Ratledge

Case-Shiller Housing Index 2000-2008

[cid:image003.jpg@01C99688.E5707180]

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Tue, 24 Feb 2009 11:33:24 -0800  
Reply-To: [Doug.A.Strand@KP.ORG](mailto:Doug.A.Strand@KP.ORG)

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Douglas Strand <Doug.A.Strand@KP.ORG>  
Subject: Re: How to build "public opinion" one question at a time  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
In-Reply-To: <49A430C2.6000509@jwdp.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="ISO-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

It seems like most of the posters who are replying missing the original point. If this was the sequence of questions in the survey, it is an excellent example of how not to do a survey. On this particular one, at least, Rasmussen should be excoriated.

Douglas Strand, Ph.D.  
Consultant  
National Market Research  
Kaiser Foundation Health Plan  
1 Kaiser Plaza  
Oakland, CA 94612  
Phone: 510-271-5603  
E-mail: doug.a.strand@kp.org  
Fax: 510- 267-2130

NOTICE TO RECIPIENT: If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, you are prohibited from sharing, copying, or otherwise using or disclosing its contents. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately by reply e-mail and permanently delete this e-mail and any attachments without reading, forwarding or saving them. Thank you.

Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>  
Sent by: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
02/24/2009 09:39 AM  
Please respond to  
jwerner@jwdp.com

To  
AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
cc

Subject  
How to build "public opinion" one question at a time

This was the headline from a poll released by Rasmussen yesterday:

55% Say Government Mortgage Help Rewards Bad Behavior

<http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public/content/business/economy/survey/toplines/february2009/toplines/mortgage/bailout/february2122009>

(or: <http://tinyurl.com/abkeqb> )

And here is the sequence of questions asked to obtain that result:

1\* Would you favor or oppose a plan for the federal government to pay off up to \$100,000 of the mortgage balance owed by every single homeowner in America?

33% Favor  
51% Oppose  
16% Not sure

2\* Okay? Would you favor or oppose a plan for the federal government to pay off a portion of the mortgages only for people who can't afford their current mortgage payments?

32% Favor  
53% Oppose  
15% Not sure

3\* Some people say that having the government subsidize mortgage payments for financially troubled homeowners puts the government in the position of rewarding bad behavior. Is the government rewarding bad behavior when it provides subsidies to those who are most at risk of losing their homes?

55% Yes, the government is rewarding bad behavior  
32% No  
14% Not sure

-----

... and when did you stop beating your wife Mr. Rasmussen?

Jan Werner

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

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



Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Tue, 24 Feb 2009 11:57:39 -0800  
Reply-To: "Michael Sullivan (michaelsullivan)"  
<[michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM](mailto:michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Michael Sullivan (michaelsullivan)"  
<[michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM](mailto:michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM)>  
Subject: Re: How to build "public opinion" one question at a time  
Comments: To: [Doug.A.Strand@KP.ORG](mailto:Doug.A.Strand@KP.ORG), [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[OFCA1A9F84.76550B1B-ON88257567.006B32A6-88257567.006B6DBA@kp.org](mailto:OFCA1A9F84.76550B1B-ON88257567.006B32A6-88257567.006B6DBA@kp.org)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Leading like so many things in life, is often in the eye of the beholder. Could be leading plays a part in the response. Could be it doesn't. Before we start excoriating people, we should have a pretty good idea that the structure of the survey actually influenced the outcome. I think it is quite possible it did not. It is an interesting question rather than a fact.

MS

Michael J. Sullivan, Ph.D.  
Chairman  
Freeman, Sullivan & Co.

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

From: AAPORNET [[mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)] On Behalf Of Douglas Strand  
Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2009 11:33 AM  
To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Subject: Re: How to build "public opinion" one question at a time

It seems like most of the posters who are replying missing the original point. If this was the sequence of questions in the survey, it is an excellent example of how not to do a survey. On this particular one, at least, Rasmussen should be excoriated.

Douglas Strand, Ph.D.  
Consultant  
National Market Research  
Kaiser Foundation Health Plan  
1 Kaiser Plaza  
Oakland, CA 94612  
Phone: 510-271-5603  
E-mail: [doug.a.strand@kp.org](mailto:doug.a.strand@kp.org)

Fax: 510- 267-2130

NOTICE TO RECIPIENT: If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, you are prohibited from sharing, copying, or otherwise using or disclosing its contents. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately by reply e-mail and permanently delete this e-mail and any attachments without reading, forwarding or saving them. Thank you.

Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>  
Sent by: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
02/24/2009 09:39 AM  
Please respond to  
jwerner@jwdp.com

To  
AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
cc

Subject  
How to build "public opinion" one question at a time

This was the headline from a poll released by Rasmussen yesterday:

55% Say Government Mortgage Help Rewards Bad Behavior

[http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public\\_content/business/econ\\_survey\\_toplines/february\\_2009/toplines\\_mortgage\\_bailout\\_february\\_21\\_22\\_2009](http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public_content/business/econ_survey_toplines/february_2009/toplines_mortgage_bailout_february_21_22_2009)

(or: <http://tinyurl.com/abkeqb> )

And here is the sequence of questions asked to obtain that result:

1\* Would you favor or oppose a plan for the federal government to pay off up to \$100,000 of the mortgage balance owed by every single homeowner in America?

33% Favor  
51% Oppose  
16% Not sure

2\* Okay? Would you favor or oppose a plan for the federal government to pay off a portion of the mortgages only for people who can't afford their current mortgage payments?

32% Favor  
53% Oppose  
15% Not sure

3\* Some people say that having the government subsidize mortgage payments for financially troubled homeowners puts the government in the position of rewarding bad behavior. Is the government rewarding bad behavior when it provides subsidies to those who are most at risk of losing their homes?

55% Yes, the government is rewarding bad behavior  
32% No  
14% Not sure

-----  
... and when did you stop beating your wife Mr. Rasmussen?

Jan Werner

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Date: Tue, 24 Feb 2009 15:50:16 -0500  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Building a better question  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<I was going to keep silent, honest I was.>

=20

If those are the best questions the survey industry can come up with I'd be shocked. =20

=20

I'd rather see a bunch of "Some people say X Other people say Y" questions.

=20

Certainly this question could use an argument from the other side:

=20

3\* Some people say that having the government subsidize mortgage payments for financially troubled homeowners puts the government in the position of rewarding bad behavior. Is the government rewarding bad behavior when it provides subsidies to those who are most at risk of losing their homes?

=20

=20

=20

--=20

Leo G. Simonetta

Director of Research

Art & Science Group

6115 Falls Road, Suite 101=20

Baltimore, MD 21209=20

=20

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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, 24 Feb 2009 14:48:37 -0800  
Reply-To: Jennifer Franz <jdfranz@JDFRANZ.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Jennifer Franz <jdfranz@JDFRANZ.COM>  
Subject: Polls on Public Employees  
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Greetings -=20

Does anyone have or is anyone aware of polls on attitudes toward public = employees? The colleague who is asking is interested specifically in = the attitudes of Californians toward State employees, but more general = approaches would be of interest as well.

Thank you!

Jennifer Franz

Jennifer D. Franz, Ph.D.  
President  
JD Franz Research, Inc.  
(916) 614-8777 Voice  
(916) 614-8765 Fax

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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, 24 Feb 2009 19:52:06 -0800  
Reply-To: Paul DiPerna <pd\_wpa21@YAHOO.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Paul DiPerna <pd\_wpa21@YAHOO.COM>  
Subject: SMR Special Issue on Web Surveys  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

This latest issue of Sociological Methods & Research may be of interest to some members here..

<http://smr.sagepub.com/current.dtl>

Best,

Paul

---

Paul DiPerna  
cell/text: 202-641-1858  
email: pd\_wpa21@yahoo.com  
online ID: <http://claimid.com/pdiperna>

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Wed, 25 Feb 2009 09:17:52 -0600  
Reply-To: Peter Miller <[p-miller@NORTHWESTERN.EDU](mailto:p-miller@NORTHWESTERN.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Peter Miller <[p-miller@NORTHWESTERN.EDU](mailto:p-miller@NORTHWESTERN.EDU)>  
Subject: Special Issue of POQ on Web Surveys  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

In addition to the recently announced issue of Sociological Methods and Research, it happens that there is also a special issue of \*Public Opinion Quarterly\* on web surveys, available on the AAPOR website at no charge to all interested readers, courtesy of AAPOR and Oxford University Press.

--

Peter V. Miller  
Department of Communication Studies  
Northwestern University  
Vice-President, American Association for Public Opinion Research  
[p-miller@northwestern.edu](mailto:p-miller@northwestern.edu)

---

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

---

Date: Wed, 25 Feb 2009 09:42:31 -0800  
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <[lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM](mailto:lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leora Lawton <[lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM](mailto:lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM)>  
Subject: encryption  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0

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

I have a client who knows nothing about encryption but whose client wants us to use pgp to send files. I want to use WinZip's AES encryption because it's convenient and seems like a reasonable standard. It's customer satisfaction survey data, not a file of social security and bank account numbers. Am I being reasonable?

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> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Wed, 25 Feb 2009 13:02:22 -0600  
Reply-To: Jeannetta Smiley <[jsmiley@GOAMP.COM](mailto:jsmiley@GOAMP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jeannetta Smiley <[jsmiley@GOAMP.COM](mailto:jsmiley@GOAMP.COM)>  
Subject: Job Listing  
Comments: To: "[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)" <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

[cid:image001.jpg@01C99749.4CA442D0]

Research Analyst- Global Media & Communications

InterMedia is a leading global research, evaluation and consulting firm specializing in the field of media and communications. Based in Washington, D.C. and the U.K., InterMedia staff and associates have decades of accumulated research and consulting experience and vast geographical expertise spanning 100 countries around the world.

We have an exciting opportunity for a Research Analyst whose focus is media, audience and communication trends in transitional and developing countries worldwide. This person will play a key part in mining InterMedia's rich survey data archive and qualitative research to produce detailed country analyses for a major new project aimed at the international development sector.

The ideal candidate will have the following qualifications:

## Knowledge & Skills

- \* Strong ability to analyze and synthesize quantitative and qualitative, as well as primary and secondary, research data
- \* Deep interest in and knowledge of media and communications (including, but not limited to, the rapid changes in global media industries, technology, audience attitudes and behavior, etc.)
- \* Strong written communication skills, notably in producing compelling reports in both print and electronic format. Web content production skills are a significant plus.
- \* Ability to work with colleagues and clients of diverse professional and cultural backgrounds
- \* Strong proficiency in Microsoft Office applications (particularly a demonstrated mastery of Excel and PowerPoint) and SPSS (or other statistical analysis software), and Adobe Suite applications such as Photoshop and Illustrator. Experience with Web content management systems is also desirable.
- \* Proven ability to work to multiple and tight deadlines
- \* Overseas experience, foreign language ability and strong interest in international issues are pluses.

## Education & Experience

- \* Bachelor's plus 4-5 years experience in a relevant field, or Master's plus 1-2 years experience. Desired degree areas: communications, social science, international relations.
- \* Professional experience in research, analysis and reporting with an emphasis on making meaning out of data and delivering actionable recommendations
- \* Previous experience producing analytical content under demanding and regular deadlines
- \* Proven ability to work with large and complex data sets
- \* Experience living, studying and/or working abroad a plus

## Characteristics

- \* Innate curiosity; passion for research, analysis and delivering insights to clients
- \* Team player



- \* Self-starter; shows initiative; works independently

InterMedia offers an excellent compensation and benefits package, a casual and friendly work environment, and a convenient downtown location.

We invite qualified candidates to email your cover letter and resume to [ranalyst@intermedia.org](mailto:ranalyst@intermedia.org) or fax to 866-500-4095.

EOE/M/F/V/D

---

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Wed, 25 Feb 2009 13:03:52 -0600

Reply-To: Jeannetta Smiley <[jsmiley@GOAMP.COM](mailto:jsmiley@GOAMP.COM)>

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

From: Jeannetta Smiley <[jsmiley@GOAMP.COM](mailto:jsmiley@GOAMP.COM)>

Subject: Job Listing

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

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

### Senior Analyst-African Media/Development Communications

InterMedia is a leading global research, evaluation and consulting firm specializing in the field of media and communications. Based in Washington, D.C. and the U.K., InterMedia staff and associates have decades of accumulated research and consulting experience and vast geographical expertise spanning 100 countries around the world.

Recently, we were awarded a contract which has led us to seek a qualified candidate to join our team as a consultant with the role of Senior Analyst.

This consultant will assist with in-depth analysis of media attitudes and communication behavior based on quantitative and qualitative studies in countries throughout Sub-Saharan Africa. This is a highly visible role working closely with a dedicated research team and producing analytical reports for broad consumption throughout the development community and could potentially evolve into a staff position.

### Key Requirements:

### Knowledge & Skills

- \* Strong ability to analyze and synthesize quantitative and qualitative, as well as primary and secondary research data

- \* Deep interest in and knowledge of media, communication and development

ment trends and issues throughout Sub-Saharan Africa

- \* Superior analytical, problem solving and quantitative skills, with ability to carry out advanced statistical analysis
- \* Advanced proficiency with statistical analysis software (SPSS preferred), spreadsheets, databases, word processing and presentation software
- \* Demonstrated ability to present research findings in clear, compelling, user-friendly and graphically interesting ways
- \* Strong oral and written communication skills
- \* Ability to work with colleagues and clients of diverse professional and cultural backgrounds
- \* Ability to work to multiple and tight deadlines
- \* Knowledge of local African languages a plus

#### Education & Experience

- \* A minimum of a Master's Degree in communications, political or social science, international relations, or related field, plus 10 years of professional experience; higher education may substitute for some years of experience
- \* Professional experience in research, analysis and reporting with an emphasis on insight generation
- \* Proven ability to work with large and complex data sets
- \* Experience living, studying and/or working abroad a plus

#### Characteristics

- \* Innate curiosity; passion for research, analysis and delivering insights to clients
- \* Commitment to quality and accuracy
- \* Team player; self-starter; shows initiative; works independently

Qualified candidates should send their letter of interest and resume to [amcahr@intermedia.org](mailto:amcahr@intermedia.org) <<mailto:amcahr@intermedia.org>>.  
EOE/M/F/V/D

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

---

---

Date: Wed, 25 Feb 2009 14:48:49 -0500  
Reply-To: "Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D."  
<jonathan.brill.wh82@wharton.upenn.edu>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D."  
<jonathan.brill.wh82@WHARTON.UPENN.EDU>  
Subject: Re: encryption  
Comments: To: Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; format=flowed; charset="iso-8859-1";  
reply-type=original  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Leora,

From a human subjects protection perspective, I think the risk you expose respondents to is negligible using AES encryption. So, from a human subjects perspective with me sitting as the judge and jury, you are not being unreasonable.

However, there may be some reason the client's client wants you to use PGP (which, by the way, stands for "Pretty Good Priivacy"). Perhaps it is the tracing feature that PGP provides. This freeware program not only uses encryption technology, but it also authenticates the communication from the sender with a digital signature linked to the e-mail address and computer processor from which it was sent. I do not believe AES encryption does this. Perhaps there is a corporate security policy or, if IRB supervision is involved, some IRB or regulatory body requirement for the digital signatory security as well as encryption.

In any case, PGP is freeware, so it should not be hard to comply.

Regards,  
Jonathan

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.  
SBU Head, Marketing Research Consulting & Operations  
Satyam Computer Services Ltd.  
3 Oak Ridge Court  
Voorhees, NJ 08043  
Telephone: 856.772-9030  
Fax: 775.898-2651  
Business cell: 856.673-8092  
Business e-mail: Jonathan\_Brill@satyam.com  
Alternate e-mail: jonathan.brill.wh82@wharton.upenn.edu

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

From: "Leora Lawton" <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>  
To: <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
Sent: Wednesday, February 25, 2009 12:42 PM  
Subject: encryption

>I have a client who knows nothing about encryption but whose client wants  
>us  
> to use pgp to send files. I want to use WinZip's AES encryption because  
> it's  
> convenient and seems like a reasonable standard. It's customer  
> satisfaction  
> survey data, not a file of social security and bank account numbers. Am I  
> being reasonable?

>  
> 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> .  
> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Thu, 26 Feb 2009 11:46:37 -0500  
Reply-To: [colleen\\_porter@COX.NET](mailto:colleen_porter@COX.NET)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Colleen Porter <[colleen\\_porter@COX.NET](mailto:colleen_porter@COX.NET)>  
Subject: data from text messaging on cell phones  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=utf-8  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Has anyone conducted a survey via text messaging with cell phones? We're considering this for a future project and would appreciate learning about how this is done, what software is needed to capture the data, costs/benefits, and so on.

Many thanks,  
Colleen

Colleen K. Porter, M.A.

Coordinator/Communication Specialist  
Southeast Center for Research to Reduce Disparities in Oral Health  
"Taking the bite out of head and neck cancer"  
<http://www.dental.ufl.edu/Offices/TakeTheBite/>  
University of Florida, College of Dentistry  
US Mail: Box 103628, Gainesville, FL 32610-3628  
Physical Location: 1329 SW 16th Street, Room 5180  
Gainesville, FL 32608

PHONE 352-273-5983  
CELL 352-215-1192  
FAX 352-273-5985  
[cporter@dental.ufl.edu](mailto:cporter@dental.ufl.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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Thu, 26 Feb 2009 14:14:37 -0500  
Reply-To: Howard Fienberg <[howard.fienberg@MRA-NET.ORG](mailto:howard.fienberg@MRA-NET.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Howard Fienberg <[howard.fienberg@MRA-NET.ORG](mailto:howard.fienberg@MRA-NET.ORG)>  
Subject: Re: data from text messaging on cell phones  
Comments: To: [colleen\\_porter@COX.NET](mailto:colleen_porter@COX.NET), [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: A<20090226114637.4QFJD.116052.imal@eastrmwml38>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Colleen, you should keep in mind the unsettled legal environment for text messaging.

The court system remains divided on whether or not the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA) -- which requires prior express consent for any calls to cellular phones with any form of automation (like a computer) -- and/or the CAN-SPAM Act -- which restricts the sending of unsolicited commercial email -- apply to the sending of text messages.

For some related guidance, see MRA's 1-pager on Cell phone research best practices: [http://www.cmor.org/pdf/cellphone\\_mra\\_best\\_practices.pdf](http://www.cmor.org/pdf/cellphone_mra_best_practices.pdf)

Sincerely,  
Howard Fienberg  
Director of Government Affairs  
Marketing Research Association (MRA)  
[howard.fienberg@mra-net.org](mailto:howard.fienberg@mra-net.org)  
1111 16th St. NW, Suite 120  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 775-5170  
Fax: (202) 775-5172  
<http://www.mra-net.org>  
<http://www.cmor.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. MRA 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 Colleen Porter  
Sent: Thursday, February 26, 2009 11:47 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: data from text messaging on cell phones

Has anyone conducted a survey via text messaging with cell phones?  
We're considering this for a future project and would appreciate learning about how this is done, what software is needed to capture the data, costs/benefits, and so on.

Many thanks,  
Colleen

Colleen K. Porter, M.A.  
Coordinator/Communication Specialist  
Southeast Center for Research to Reduce Disparities in Oral Health  
"Taking the bite out of head and neck cancer"  
<http://www.dental.ufl.edu/Offices/TakeTheBite/>  
University of Florida, College of Dentistry US Mail: Box 103628,  
Gainesville, FL 32610-3628 Physical Location: 1329 SW 16th Street,  
Room 5180 Gainesville, FL 32608

PHONE 352-273-5983  
CELL 352-215-1192  
FAX 352-273-5985  
cporter@dental.ufl.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](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Thu, 26 Feb 2009 15:21:52 -0500  
Reply-To: Paul J Lavrakas PhD <[pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET](mailto:pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Paul J Lavrakas PhD <[pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET](mailto:pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET)>  
Subject: Re: data from text messaging on cell phones  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <20090226114637.4QFJD.116052.imal@eastrmwml38>

MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="UTF-8"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

In our AAPOR cell Phone Task Force report, issued last spring we warned (p. 28):

#### Text Messaging

In theory, an advance text message to a cell phone number might serve the same purpose as an advance letter mailed to a landline respondent. However, legal barriers currently exist in the U.S. to sending unsolicited text messages. Before the new U.S. laws were enacted, some researchers incorporated advance text messaging into their survey designs. Although the results suggested that sending a text message did not increase cooperation rates, knowing whether the message was actually delivered to a cell phone helped to reduce the cases of unknown eligibility. If the legal landscape in the U.S. happens to change, advance text messaging may become a viable medium to increase contact and response rates in cell phone surveys.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Colleen Porter  
Sent: Thursday, February 26, 2009 11:47 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: data from text messaging on cell phones

Has anyone conducted a survey via text messaging with cell phones? We're considering this for a future project and would appreciate learning about how this is done, what software is needed to capture the data, costs/benefits, and so on.

Many thanks,  
Colleen

Colleen K. Porter, M.A.  
Coordinator/Communication Specialist  
Southeast Center for Research to Reduce Disparities in Oral Health  
"Taking the bite out of head and neck cancer"  
<http://www.dental.ufl.edu/Offices/TakeTheBite/>  
University of Florida, College of Dentistry  
US Mail: Box 103628, Gainesville, FL 32610-3628  
Physical Location: 1329 SW 16th Street, Room 5180  
Gainesville, FL 32608

PHONE 352-273-5983  
CELL 352-215-1192  
FAX 352-273-5985  
cporter@dental.ufl.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](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Thu, 26 Feb 2009 15:45:16 -0500  
Reply-To: [colleen\\_porter@COX.NET](mailto:colleen_porter@COX.NET)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Colleen Porter <[colleen\\_porter@COX.NET](mailto:colleen_porter@COX.NET)>  
Subject: Re: data from text messaging on cell phones  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[200902261650.n1QGnwBo002255@lists.asu.edu](mailto:200902261650.n1QGnwBo002255@lists.asu.edu)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=utf-8  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

In response to some of the comments, the project I am envisioning would not involve unsolicited text messages, so that is not so much a concern. Subjects would be consented in writing, then receive a prepaid cell phone that they use to answer survey questions, and then get to keep, along with a bonus of a few hundred minutes beyond the survey requirements.

The reason for using text messaging rather than a laptop or handheld computer is that the target population likely already has some familiarity with text messaging, and is more comfortable with that format.

Thus it would be used in settings where audioCASI might be used, but utilizing a more familiar modality.

But how to get from this great idea to having it happen is beyond me, so any advice on the nuts and bolts is most welcome.

Colleen

---- Colleen Porter <[colleen\\_porter@COX.NET](mailto:colleen_porter@COX.NET)> wrote:

> Has anyone conducted a survey via text messaging with cell phones? We're considering this for a future project and would appreciate learning about how this is done, what software is needed to capture the data, costs/benefits, and so on.

>

> Many thanks,

> Colleen

>

> Colleen K. Porter, M.A.

> Coordinator/Communication Specialist

> Southeast Center for Research to Reduce Disparities in Oral Health

> "Taking the bite out of head and neck cancer"

> <http://www.dental.ufl.edu/Offices/TakeTheBite/>

> University of Florida, College of Dentistry

> US Mail: Box 103628, Gainesville, FL 32610-3628

> Physical Location: 1329 SW 16th Street, Room 5180

> Gainesville, FL 32608

>

> PHONE 352-273-5983



> CELL 352-215-1192  
> FAX 352-273-5985  
> cporter@dental.ufl.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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Thu, 26 Feb 2009 18:20:33 -0600  
Reply-To: Howard Gordon <[hgordon@GRFILTD.COM](mailto:hgordon@GRFILTD.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Howard Gordon <[hgordon@GRFILTD.COM](mailto:hgordon@GRFILTD.COM)>  
Subject: Effect of phrase "In your opinion..."  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

What is your observation/experience on the effect of the phrase in a question: "In your opinion.?"

The introductory phrase often used for measuring consumer perception is "In your opinion, what do you think.?"

The phrase "In your opinion." should only be used for perception/opinion questions - not knowledge questions. Isn't this correct?

The purpose of such a question using the phrase "In your opinion." is to help make it easy for the respondent to respond to a stimulus based on whatever feeling the respondent has, however marginal the feeling is. We are trying to learn how the respondent perceives a piece of copy.e.g. In your opinion, what do you think this copy is telling you? (Closed end question with two alternatives plus a don't know option).

Some critics say the phrase "In your opinion." encourages guessing, speculation and simply gets the respondent to flip mental coin.

What's your take on the use of the phrase in perception questions "In your opinion.?"

Howard

Howard Gordon

GRFI Ltd.

Chicago

312-856-2153

hgordon@grfiltd.com

hgordon1962@kellogg.northwestern.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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

---

Date: Fri, 27 Feb 2009 00:24:03 +0000  
Reply-To: "Moon, Nick (GfK NOP, UK)" <[nick.moon@GFK.COM](mailto:nick.moon@GFK.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Moon, Nick (GfK NOP, UK)" <[nick.moon@GFK.COM](mailto:nick.moon@GFK.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Effect of phrase "In your opinion..."  
Comments: To: Howard Gordon <[hgordon@GRFILTD.COM](mailto:hgordon@GRFILTD.COM)>, "AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
In-Reply-To: <[E1LcqSv-0000yE-7s@cl33.gs02.gridserver.com](mailto:E1LcqSv-0000yE-7s@cl33.gs02.gridserver.com)>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Apart from anything else, you can be sure that such a tautology will annoy any pedants among your respondents, with a possible negative impact on survey quality. You may also have to prime interviewers on what to say if a smart-aleck respondent says "suppose I was thinking in someone else's opinion?"

I can see the point of trying to encourage those with weakly held opinions to voice them, but (maybe it's a Brit thing) this seems a very clumsy construction to me

---

From: AAPORNET [[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)] On Behalf Of Howard Gordon [[hgordon@GRFILTD.COM](mailto:hgordon@GRFILTD.COM)]  
Sent: 27 February 2009 00:20  
To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Subject: Effect of phrase "In your opinion..."

What is your observation/experience on the effect of the phrase in a question: "In your opinion.?"

The introductory phrase often used for measuring consumer perception is "In your opinion, what do you think.?"

The phrase "In your opinion." should only be used for perception/opinion questions - not knowledge questions. Isn't this correct?

The purpose of such a question using the phrase "In your opinion." is to help make it easy for the respondent to respond to a stimulus based on whatever feeling the respondent has, however marginal the feeling is. We are trying to learn how the respondent perceives a piece of copy.e.g. In your opinion, what do you think this copy is telling you? (Closed end question with two alternatives plus a don't know option).

Some critics say the phrase "In your opinion." encourages guessing, speculation and simply gets the respondent to flip mental coin.

What's your take on the use of the phrase in perception questions "In your opinion.?"

Howard

Howard Gordon

GRFI Ltd.

Chicago

312-856-2153

hgordon@grfiltd.com

hgordon1962@kellogg.northwestern.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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

Consider the environment before printing this email

\*\*\*\*\*

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

\*\*\*\*\*

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

\*\*\*\*\*

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

\*\*\*\*\*

GfK NOP Limited, Ludgate House, 245 Blackfriars Road, London SE1 9UL  
Place of registration: England and Wales  
Company number: 2512551  
Registered office: GfK NOP Limited, 14 New Street, London, EC2M 4HE

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

-----  
Date: Thu, 26 Feb 2009 21:39:45 -0500  
Reply-To: howard schuman <[hschuman@UMICH.EDU](mailto:hschuman@UMICH.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: howard schuman <[hschuman@UMICH.EDU](mailto:hschuman@UMICH.EDU)>  
Subject: AAPOR and the New Hampshire Primary  
Comments: To: aapor <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=windows-1252; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

In January of 2008 all the major polls were seriously wrong in predicting the results for the New Hampshire Primary. Various reasons were given at the time, including last minute changes in voting preferences, miscalculations of Likely Voter models, underlying racial prejudice, etc.

Uncertainty about the interpretation of the widespread failure was treated at the time as serious—almost on the order of the Truman-Dewey miscalculation of 1948—and AAPOR therefore set up an official committee of relevant experts to examine the various explanations being offered, to gather whatever evidence was obtainable, and to provide a balanced

report for members and the public.

The fact that final predictions of the election outcome in November 2008 were generally close to the mark did not make the need for the report on New Hampshire unnecessary for those interested in the validity of sample surveys, especially but not only pre-election polls.

At several points between January of 2008 and the end of 2009, AAPOR Presidents and others in official positions in AAPOR have been asked about the promised report. Each time some assurance was offered that a report was almost ready. It is unfortunate that now well over a year since the New Hampshire Primary, no report has been issued.

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

---

Date: Fri, 27 Feb 2009 10:39:00 -0000  
Reply-To: [Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK](mailto:Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Iain Noble <[Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK](mailto:Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK)>  
Subject: Re: Effect of phrase "In your opinion..."  
Comments: To: [nick.moon@GFK.COM](mailto:nick.moon@GFK.COM), [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: A<2421C36E5E6F844386642A142EB3E5720127436A0D63@EUKSNT-EXCRMB-1.UK.CRWW.GFK>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

In my opinion the phrase in itself is harmless, a piece of conversational lubrication where the purpose is a ritual one rather than requiring (or receiving) detailed scrutiny of the possible meaning of the phrase. There's a number of such phrases in the language.

The problems start in interviews if you use it repeatedly or in conjunction with other similar phrases as in the example given.

Sometimes we're far more at risk from pedantic researchers than pedantic respondents.

Of course YMMV.

Iain Noble  
Department for Children, Schools and Families  
Young People Analysis Division - Youth Research Team,

4th Floor, Sanctuary Buildings  
Great Smith Street  
London SW1P 3BT

0207 925 6226

Mobile: 0753 832 8523

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

>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Moon, Nick (GfK  
NOP,  
>UK)

>Sent: 27 February 2009 00:24

>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

>Subject: Re: Effect of phrase "In your opinion..."

>

>Apart from anything else, you can be sure that such a tautology will  
annoy any pedants

>among your respondents, with a possible negative impact on survey  
quality. You may also

>have to prime interviewers on what to say if a smart-aleck respondent  
says "suppose I was

>thinking in someone else's opinion?"

>

>I can see the point of trying to encourage those with weakly held  
opinions to voice them, but

>(maybe it's a Brit thing) this seems a very clumsy construction to me

>

>

---

>From: AAPORNET [AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Howard Gordon

>[hgordon@GRFILTD.COM]

>Sent: 27 February 2009 00:20

>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

>Subject: Effect of phrase "In your opinion..."

>

>What is your observation/experience on the effect of the phrase in a

>question: "In your opinion.?"

>

>

>

>The introductory phrase often used for measuring consumer perception is  
"In

>your opinion, what do you think.?"

>

>

>

>The phrase "In your opinion." should only be used for  
perception/opinion

>questions - not knowledge questions. Isn't this correct?

>

>

>

>The purpose of such a question using the phrase "In your opinion." is  
to

>help make it easy for the respondent to respond to a stimulus based on

>whatever feeling the respondent has, however marginal the feeling is.

We are

>trying to learn how the respondent perceives a piece of copy.e.g. In

your

>opinion, what do you think this copy is telling you? (Closed end question  
>with two alternatives plus a don't know option).  
>  
>  
>  
>Some critics say the phrase "In your opinion." encourages guessing, speculation and simply gets the respondent to flip mental coin.  
>  
>  
>  
>What's your take on the use of the phrase in perception questions "In your opinion.?"  
>  
>  
>  
>Howard  
>  
>  
>  
>Howard Gordon  
>  
>GRFI Ltd.  
>  
>Chicago  
>  
>312-856-2153  
>  
>hgordon@grfild.com  
>  
>hgordon1962@kellogg.northwestern.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  
>  
>Consider the environment before printing this email  
>  
>\*\*\*\*\*  
>Any views or opinions are solely those of the author  
>and do not necessarily represent those of GfK NOP or  
>any of its associated companies.  
>\*\*\*\*\*  
>The information transmitted is intended only for the  
>person or entity to which it is addressed and may  
>contain confidential and/or privileged material. If  
>you are not the intended recipient of this message,  
>please do not read, copy, use or disclose this

>communication and notify the sender immediately.  
>It should be noted that any review, retransmission,  
>dissemination or other use of, or taking action in reliance  
>upon, this information by persons or entities other than  
>the intended recipient is prohibited.  
>\*\*\*\*\*  
>Recipients are warned that GfK NOP cannot guarantee that  
>attachments or enclosures are secure or error-free as  
>information could be intercepted, corrupted, or contain viruses  
>\*\*\*\*\*  
>GfK NOP Limited,Ludgate House,245 Blackfriars Road,London SE1 9UL  
>Place of registration:England and Wales  
>Company number:2512551  
>Registered office:GfK NOP Limited,14 New Street,London,EC2M 4HE  
>  
>-----  
>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  
>  
>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 2007/11/0032.) 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 virus scanning service supplied by Cable&Wireless in partnership with  
MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2007/11/0032.) 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>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Fri, 27 Feb 2009 15:27:27 -0500  
Reply-To: Jim Ellis <[jme2ce@VIRGINIA.EDU](mailto:jme2ce@VIRGINIA.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jim Ellis <[jme2ce@VIRGINIA.EDU](mailto:jme2ce@VIRGINIA.EDU)>  
Subject: Effects on response rates of public reporting of survey data  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0



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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hello AAPOR list:

I am posting this for a colleague of mine at another location.

Can anyone point me to examples of how, in surveys of the job performance of specific named individuals, moving from a data reporting process that holds all results confidential (as if they were part of a personnel file) to a more public process (say, a website reporting aggregate average ratings of job performance on various dimensions) has affected or not affected response rates to the survey?

The context here is an ongoing survey of professional and non-professional groups who are asked to rate the performance of named individuals as part of the performance evaluation process for those individuals. The evaluated individuals are government employees. Aggregated results are supplied to elected officials who have some say in re-appointment of the evaluated individuals. Do response rates differ if the aggregated results are handled confidentially as opposed to reporting them as public documents?

Thanks for any information or references you can point me to.

Jim

Jim Ellis

Director of Research

Center for Survey Research

University of Virginia

434-243-5224

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Fri, 27 Feb 2009 13:37:53 -0700  
Reply-To: "Margaret R. Roller" <[rmr@ROLLERRESEARCH.COM](mailto:rmr@ROLLERRESEARCH.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Margaret R. Roller" <[rmr@ROLLERRESEARCH.COM](mailto:rmr@ROLLERRESEARCH.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Effect of phrase "In your opinion..."  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Intuitively the question "In your opinion...tell me what you think" is redundant (if not awkward). And in the example you give it is really not the correct question. It sounds like you are giving two answer options (plus a don't know). So you are really not asking their opinion of what the ad conveys but rather "which of the following comes closest to your interpretation of the advertising message" (or whatever). I tend to reserve "In your opinion..." to attitudinal questions that are open-ended in nature and are truly interested in the respondent's thoughts on an issue.

--  
Margaret R. Roller  
Roller Marketing Research  
[rmr@rollerresearch.com](mailto:rmr@rollerresearch.com)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Sat, 28 Feb 2009 07:55:18 -0500  
Reply-To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jan Werner <[jwerner@JWDP.COM](mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM)>  
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing  
Subject: Re: Effects on response rates of public reporting of survey data  
Comments: To: Jim Ellis <[jme2ce@VIRGINIA.EDU](mailto:jme2ce@VIRGINIA.EDU)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[011e01c99919\\$cf11eb60\\$6d35c220\\$@edu](mailto:011e01c99919$cf11eb60$6d35c220$@edu)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

About 20 years ago, I worked on a project to rate several hundred local branches of a large bank using customer surveys at each branch. The design and methodology were more rigorous and thorough than your typical customer satisfaction survey and the results were both informative and well supported by data collected by the bank through other means.

However, the bank used the survey data to rank branch performance and based part of the allocation of performance bonuses for managers on those rankings. This resulted in lawsuits from some managers who thought they did not receive the bonus they should have and challenged the process. This in turn resulted in a long legal battle that had the side effect of souring relations between my client (the prime contractor for the surveys) and the bank.

While this does not quite parallel the situation you describe, you might well face similar reactions from those whose ox is gored by the results of the surveys.

I don't know whether this would affect initial response rates, but any dissatisfaction with effects attributed to the results could certainly be expected to have a major effect on subsequent surveys. What should be of greater concern is whether information about how the results are to be used might skew the answers of those who do respond.

Jan Werner

---

Jim Ellis wrote:

> Hello AAPOR list:

>

>

> I am posting this for a colleague of mine at another location.

>

>

> Can anyone point me to examples of how, in surveys of the job performance of  
> specific named individuals, moving from a data reporting process that holds  
> all results confidential (as if they were part of a personnel file) to a  
> more public process (say, a website reporting aggregate average ratings of  
> job performance on various dimensions) has affected or not affected response  
> rates to the survey?

>

>

>

> The context here is an ongoing survey of professional and non-professional  
> groups who are asked to rate the performance of named individuals as part of  
> the performance evaluation process for those individuals. The evaluated  
> individuals are government employees. Aggregated results are supplied to  
> elected officials who have some say in re-appointment of the evaluated  
> individuals. Do response rates differ if the aggregated results are handled  
> confidentially as opposed to reporting them as public documents?



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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Thanks for taking the time to respond, Jan. I had a similar experience under contract to a financial services firm that used client surveys to rank brokers and peg bonuses to the rankings -- so mean ratings of categorical items that differed by .01 could and did affect the rankings, as did numbers of completions, variation within completions for different brokers, etc. The client was not that interested in fuzziness, though. I found myself in the position of being the survey guy saying "Hey, it's only a survey, don't use it like that, include other measures as part of a more holistic process" and then some of them started to wonder why I did not support the service I was selling. It was one of the experiences that led me to conclude there are two models of the working relationship that clients come in with: the collaborative model (client and survey shop partner on a "voyage of discovery" that can be messy and slow, but leads to real learning) and the business model (client drops off shirts [survey project] for dry cleaning [processing] and expects them back in X days at X price, no variations). Both are legitimate in their own ways and have their appropriate uses, but if you approach the project using the collaborative model and your client was expecting the business model, the client wonders if you know how to do your job and it can get difficult.

I agree with your last point, too. I had wondered if there would be a substantive effect on responses if respondents knew they would be used more publicly, outside the context of a more private performance review. My first thought was that it would be a "chilling effect" but I suppose one could imagine the opposite.

Jim

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jan Werner

Sent: Saturday, February 28, 2009 7:55 AM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: Re: Effects on response rates of public reporting of survey data

About 20 years ago, I worked on a project to rate several hundred local branches of a large bank using customer surveys at each branch. The design and methodology were more rigorous and thorough than your typical customer satisfaction survey and the results were both informative and well supported by data collected by the bank through other means.

However, the bank used the survey data to rank branch performance and based part of the allocation of performance bonuses for managers on those rankings. This resulted in lawsuits from some managers who thought they did not receive the bonus they should have and challenged the process. This in turn resulted in a long legal battle that had the side effect of souring relations between my client (the prime contractor for the surveys) and the bank.

While this does not quite parallel the situation you describe, you might well face similar reactions from those whose ox is gored by the results of the surveys.

I don't know whether this would affect initial response rates, but any dissatisfaction with effects attributed to the results could certainly be expected to have a major effect on subsequent surveys. What should be of greater concern is whether information about how the results are to be used might skew the answers of those who do respond.

Jan Werner

---

Jim Ellis wrote:

> Hello AAPOR list:

>

>

> I am posting this for a colleague of mine at another location.

>

>

> Can anyone point me to examples of how, in surveys of the job performance of

> specific named individuals, moving from a data reporting process that holds

> all results confidential (as if they were part of a personnel file) to a

> more public process (say, a website reporting aggregate average ratings of

> job performance on various dimensions) has affected or not affected response

> rates to the survey?

>

>

>

> The context here is an ongoing survey of professional and non-professional

> groups who are asked to rate the performance of named individuals as part of

> the performance evaluation process for those individuals. The evaluated

> individuals are government employees. Aggregated results are supplied to

> elected officials who have some say in re-appointment of the evaluated

> individuals. Do response rates differ if the aggregated results are handled

> confidentially as opposed to reporting them as public documents?

>

>

>

> Thanks for any information or references you can point me to.

>

>

>

> Jim

>

>

>

> Jim Ellis

>

> Director of Research

>

> Center for Survey Research

>  
> University of Virginia  
>  
> 434-243-5224  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>  
>

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