

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 LOG0903"

---

Date: Sun, 1 Mar 2009 06:00:47 -0800  
Reply-To: "Josh D." <jd9622flh@YAHOO.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Josh D." <jd9622flh@YAHOO.COM>  
Subject: The President's Proposed 2010 Budget Would Allocate \$7 Billion  
for the Census  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=utf-8  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

"The President's Budget provides Commerce with the tools to meet its job-creation mission, to foster innovation and competitiveness at home and within the context of a global economy. In addition, Commerce has responsibility for the 2010 Decennial Census; monitoring climate change; and protecting natural resources.

The Budget provides the Census Bureau with over \$7 billion. It will increase funding for weather satellites and climate sensors, as well as related research, and will bolster our ability to address the climate crisis. Investments in American competitiveness range from support for the Technology Innovation Program and the Manufacturing Extension Partnership to funding for regional economic development and entrepreneurialism in distressed areas...."

"THE 2010 CENSUS Conducts the Decennial Census. Budget provides over \$7 billion so the Census Bureau will have the resources it needs to complete the 2010 Census effectively, efficiently, and on time."

[http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/assets/fy2010\\_factsheets/fy10\\_commerce.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/assets/fy2010_factsheets/fy10_commerce.pdf)

Josh De La Rosa

---

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: Sun, 1 Mar 2009 16:40:07 -0500  
Reply-To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Jan Werner <[jwerner@JWDP.COM](mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM)>  
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing  
Subject: Re: SMR Special Issue on Web Surveys  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
In-Reply-To: <[371487.12227.qm@web37001.mail.mud.yahoo.com](mailto:371487.12227.qm@web37001.mail.mud.yahoo.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

You can register for free access to Sage Sociology journals through  
April 6, 2009, including Sociological Methods & Research, at:  
<http://online.sagepub.com/cgi/freetrial>

Jan Werner

---

Paul DiPerna wrote:

> 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](mailto: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)

-----  
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, 3 Mar 2009 00:00:46 -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](mailto:colleen_porter@COX.NET)>

Subject: POQ's street rep

Comments: To: AAPORNET list <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Mime-Version: 1.0 (Apple Message framework v930.3)

Even though other people could do it, I try to pick my youngest  
daughter up from flute lessons myself, because she is in such a good

mood then and opens up to me about all kinds of things that would be met with eye rolling at other times. (Am I the only parent to struggle with unresponsive teenagers, who resorts to such stratagem?)

So today she was a cheerful chatterbox, and noticing the mail in the car asked, "I know I've been living with it all my life, but I've been starting to wonder, just what IS Public Opinion Quarterly?"

"Well, it's the official publication of the American Association for Public Opinion Research..."

"So kind of like Flute Talk, only for survey people?"

I tried to explain the concept of peer review, and she could kind of relate because she participates in a Creative Writing Workshop where they critique each other's work.

I shouldn't be in a hurry for her to grow up, because this was the daughter whose class I visited in 2d grade to give a demo about statistics, including graphing the incidence of blue M & Ms, with great suggestions from this list.

But her big brother is coming to AAPOR this year:)

Colleen Porter  
Gainesville, FL

(I know I owe y'all a summary of what I learned about surveying by text messaging, but I am waiting for a key person to get back into town.)

-----  
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, 3 Mar 2009 12:11:39 -0500  
Reply-To: Survey Practice <[survprac@INDIANA.EDU](mailto:survprac@INDIANA.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Survey Practice <[survprac@INDIANA.EDU](mailto:survprac@INDIANA.EDU)>  
Subject: February Survey Practice is Available  
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

(Please forgive the cross-postings.)

The two previous issues of Survey Practice focused on single topics - an analysis of election polling and the possible biases in list-assisted RDD sampling. The February 2009 issue has three articles on different topics.

First, Michael Link and colleagues describe the research they conducted looking at cell phone samples and address-based sampling. They propose that dual frame samples of landline and cell phone samples will not solve the cell phone problem. They show how address-based sampling might be the foundation for future telephone surveys.

Have you ever wondered about the overall effect of making extra call attempts in a telephone survey? Mohamed Qayad and colleagues describe a project where they extended the field period and made extra call attempts in the BRFSS. Overall, they show that the extra attempts improve the response rate and the ability to assign final dispositions to the sample.

The third article provides information about the overall costs of pre-paid incentives on response. A concern of many survey researchers is that pre-paid cash incentives may go to sample members who receive the incentive, but do not respond to the survey. Sean Hogan's research shows that for a sample of physicians, few non-respondents cashed their incentive check.

The articles can be found on the Survey Practice website:

[www.surveypactice.org](http://www.surveypactice.org)

As always we welcome your comments on Survey Practice.

John Kennedy  
Diane O'Rourke  
David Moore  
Andy Peytchev

[survprac@indiana.edu](mailto:survprac@indiana.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: Tue, 3 Mar 2009 17:04:36 -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: FW: WDRC Please work to Stop HR 801  
Comments: To: Michael Botchan <[mbotchan@uclink4.berkeley.edu](mailto:mbotchan@uclink4.berkeley.edu)>,  
Evan Seevak MD ACMC <[eseevak@acmedctr.org](mailto:eseevak@acmedctr.org)>,  
Warren Gold <[warren.gold@ucsf.edu](mailto:warren.gold@ucsf.edu)>,  
Warren Winkelstein <[winkelstein@yahoo.com](mailto:winkelstein@yahoo.com)>,  
Leonard Syme <[SLSyme@uclink4.berkeley.edu](mailto:SLSyme@uclink4.berkeley.edu)>,  
Richard Colby <[dick.colby@stockton.edu](mailto:dick.colby@stockton.edu)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

As AAPOR has recently been involved in censuring a researcher for failure in transparency, this issue may be of interest.

Marc

Marc Sapir MD, MPH  
510-848-3826

marcsapir@gmail.com

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

From: WDRC@yahoogroups.com [mailto:WDRC@yahoogroups.com] On Behalf Of  
Judy Bertelsen

Sent: Tuesday, March 03, 2009 11:13 AM

More on HR 801:

I just called my Congressman, Barbara Lee, and also John Conyers at the numbers listed below. Please consider doing that, too, to ask them to stop HR 801. The material below gives you suggested things to say, although I just talked directly and respectfully from the heart.

Judy

~~~~~  
Here's the issue:

Right now, there's a proposal in Congress to forbid the government from requiring scientists who receive taxpayer funds for medical research to publish their findings openly on the Internet.

This ban on "open access publishing" (which is currently required) would result in a lot of government-funded research being published exclusively in for-profit journals -- inaccessible to the general public.

A new report by MAPLight.org shows that sponsors of this bill -- led by Rep. John Conyers -- received twice as much money from the publishing industry as those on the relevant committee who are not sponsors.

This is exactly the kind of money-for-influence scheme that constantly happens behind our backs, and the public gets hurt.

Can you join us in fighting back? Please call your local House member to ask them to oppose this bill--then call Rep. Conyers to ask him to drop it.

202-224-3121 - to call your local House member

202-225-3951 - to call Rep. Conyers

A study by MAPLight.org shows that sponsors of this bill received twice as much money from the publishing industry as those on the relevant committee who are not sponsors. This is exactly the kind of money-for-influence scheme that constantly happens behind our backs-and

the public gets hurt.

Who's against this bill? 33 U.S. Nobel laureates in science, 46 law professors, and groups like the American Library Association, and the Alliance for Taxpayer Access.

Help us take this first step by calling your representative now.

Thank you,

Japhet, Monica, Stephanie, Adam and the Change Congress team

P.S. The MAPLight.org study is available at:

[http://maplight.org/HR801\\_2009\\_Analysis](http://maplight.org/HR801_2009_Analysis)

=====  
Phone script for your member of Congress

"Hello, my name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I'd like to let Rep. [NAME] know that I, along with groups like the American Library Association, the Alliance For Taxpayer Access as well as 33 Nobel Laureates in science, oppose bill H.R. 801 the "Fair Copyright in Research Act," that will keep valuable tax-payer funded research inaccessible to the public online. This sort of life-saving research and information should be open for all to read on the Internet and not hidden from the public in for-profit journals.

I am deeply concerned about a new report from MAPLight.org showing that sponsors of this bill, led by Congressman Conyers, received twice as much money in campaign contributions, as those who are non-sponsors. This sort of influence-peddling is exactly what needs to be stopped in our government.

I'm calling to ask Rep. [NAME] to publicly put out a statement opposing H.R. 801. Can you please deliver that message?

Thank you for your time."

\_\_\_\_\_

Please. REMEMBER TO DELETE UNNECESSARY TEXT AND ADS when you reply. To respond to the entire listeserv, hit "REPLY ALL". If you click on "REPLY" your response will go only to the sender.

<<http://geo.yahoo.com/serv?s=97476590/grpId=10189172/grpspId=1705060136/msgId=20639/stime=1236107611>>

Your email settings: Individual Email|Traditional  
Change

<[http://groups.yahoo.com/group/WDRC/join;\\_ylc=X3oDMTJnMGIXb2gzBF9TAzk3NDc2NTkwBGdycElkAzEwMTg5MTcyBGdycHNwSWQDMTcwNTA2MDEzNgRzZWMDZnRyBHNsawNzdG5ncwRzdGltZQMxMjM2MTA3NjEx](http://groups.yahoo.com/group/WDRC/join;_ylc=X3oDMTJnMGIXb2gzBF9TAzk3NDc2NTkwBGdycElkAzEwMTg5MTcyBGdycHNwSWQDMTcwNTA2MDEzNgRzZWMDZnRyBHNsawNzdG5ncwRzdGltZQMxMjM2MTA3NjEx)> settings via the Web (Yahoo! ID required)

Change settings via email: Switch

<[mailto:WDRC-digest@yahoogroups.com?subject=Email Delivery: Digest](mailto:WDRC-digest@yahoogroups.com?subject=Email%20Delivery%3A%20Digest)>  
delivery to Daily Digest | Switch

<[mailto:WDRC-fullfeatured@yahoogroups.com?subject=Change Delivery Format: Fully Featured](mailto:WDRC-fullfeatured@yahoogroups.com?subject=Change%20Delivery%20Format%3A%20Fully%20Featured)> to Fully Featured

Visit

<[http://groups.yahoo.com/group/WDRC;\\_ylc=X3oDMTJlOGRIldXVoBF9TAzk3NDc2NTkwBGdycElkAzEwMTg5MTcyBGdycHNwSWQDMTcwNTA2MDEzNgRzZWMDZnRyBHNsawNocGYEc3RpbWUDMTIzNjEwNzYxMQ--](http://groups.yahoo.com/group/WDRC;_ylc=X3oDMTJlOGRIldXVoBF9TAzk3NDc2NTkwBGdycElkAzEwMTg5MTcyBGdycHNwSWQDMTcwNTA2MDEzNgRzZWMDZnRyBHNsawNocGYEc3RpbWUDMTIzNjEwNzYxMQ--)> Your Group | Yahoo! Groups Terms

<<http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/>> of Use | Unsubscribe

<<mailto:WDRC-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com?subject=Unsubscribe>>

-----

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, 4 Mar 2009 04:27:31 -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: New Tricks for Old - and New - Dogs | reference  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

This morning I came across Scott Keeter's commentary adapted from a speech he gave at the University of Tennessee. Very interesting.

<http://pewresearch.org/pubs/1138/survey-problems-new-techniques-communications-research>

--Excerpt--

Perhaps I should have entitled this "Old Tricks and New Tricks," since all of us, whatever our generation, have been given a legacy of tried-and-true methods for research -- and we may all be finding these a bit out-of-date.

Communication research is in a period of transformation. Both the phenomena we study and the tools we have to study it with are undergoing rapid change. Those of us in the trenches see the day to day change as making our jobs more difficult, but we should also not lose sight of the fact that there is an

exciting aspect to this change -- the object of our study is both more interesting and perhaps in some respects more amenable to study than ever before. I want to focus on four things today:

1. What is happening to our main methodology for studying human behavior, the survey.
2. The changing communications world that we are trying to study.
3. Some new sources of data about the communications world.
4. The downsides and upsides.

---

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> .  
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, 4 Mar 2009 12:02:27 -0700  
Reply-To: John Marcum <[jmarcum@CTR.PCUSA.ORG](mailto:jmarcum@CTR.PCUSA.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: John Marcum <[jmarcum@CTR.PCUSA.ORG](mailto:jmarcum@CTR.PCUSA.ORG)>  
Subject: Stamp Affixing Machine  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

We're interested in including stamped return envelopes instead of business reply envelopes with our mail surveys. Could anyone recommend a stamp affixing machine to automate the process of attaching the stamps to the return envelopes?

---

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, 4 Mar 2009 14:27:51 -0500  
Reply-To: Mark Blumenthal <[Mark@POLLSTER.COM](mailto:Mark@POLLSTER.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mark Blumenthal <[Mark@POLLSTER.COM](mailto:Mark@POLLSTER.COM)>  
Subject: Obama: Stock Market Like a Tracking Poll  
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



For those who may have missed it, President Obama yesterday analogized short term fluctuation in the stock market to political tracking polls:

What I'm looking at is not the day-to-day gyrations of the stock market, but the long-term ability for the United States and the entire world economy to regain its footing. And, you know, the stock market is sort of like a tracking poll in politics. You know, it bobs up and down day to day. And if you spend all your time worrying about that, then you're probably going to get the long-term strategy wrong.

(See video here: <http://bit.ly/csJBT> )

I'm wondering what the survey researchers and pollsters on this list think of the analogy?

Intent disclosed: I'd like to quote reactions on Pollster.com, so if you respond, please specify if you prefer to keep comments off the record.

--

Mark Blumenthal | Pollster.com  
600 New Hampshire Ave NW, Washington DC 20037 | o: 202-266-7384 m:  
202-607-4708

-----  
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, 4 Mar 2009 17:32:58 -0500  
Reply-To: Dave Howell <[dahowell@ISR.UMICH.EDU](mailto:dahowell@ISR.UMICH.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Dave Howell <[dahowell@ISR.UMICH.EDU](mailto:dahowell@ISR.UMICH.EDU)>  
Subject: Job Postings for CSES in Germany  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Dear AAPOR colleagues,

Please find below two job postings for GESIS in Germany, to work on the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems project (CSES; [www.cses.org](http://www.cses.org)). We would be appreciative if you would forward on the posting to any persons or email lists that might be interested in the positions.

Thanks, and best regards,  
-Dave  
David Howell  
Director of Studies, CSES

-----

GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences is a member of the

Leibniz Society. It has four sites in Germany and is funded jointly by the Federal Government and the Lander (federal states). GESIS ([www.gesis.org](http://www.gesis.org)) provides extensive research-based infrastructure services at the national and international level.

The department "Data Archive and Data Analysis" at the Cologne site invites applications for:

two Research Associates, Social Sciences  
(0.5 FTE initially for a period of 3 years from April 1st, 2009 until March 31, 2012, salary according to TV-L 13).

We intend to fill the positions as soon as possible.

Duties include processing and documenting the survey data of the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES, [www.cses.org](http://www.cses.org)) in order to prepare distribution of these data to primary researchers of the CSES and secondary analysts. Processing of the third CSES module (2006-2011) will be conducted in close cooperation with the Center for Political Studies (CPS) at the University of Michigan.

Postgraduates are expected to start a PhD thesis, preferably in the topical context of the current positions.

One successful applicant will be responsible for the data cleaning, control and consistent integration of national datasets. Excellent skills in quantitative social science methods, particularly in the analysis of international comparative data are essential. Reliable command of SPSS is a must, experience with SAS and STATA is an asset. Research work on this position would preferably have a strong methodological component, e.g. an emphasis on multi-level analysis.

The other successful applicant will be responsible for the data documentation and publication in various online distribution systems. The position requires very good skills in handling databases and HTML. Research or development work on this position would preferably focus on documentation and distribution systems for complex survey data, which meet the demands of data archiving processes as well as those of secondary analysts. Therefore, sound skills in quantitative social science methods are expected as well.

Successful applicants will have an excellent degree in the areas of Sociology, Political Science, or another relevant discipline. Excellent proficiency in the English language, reliability and accuracy, as well as the ability to work in an international team are essential. German legal requirements for the employment of disabled persons and regarding part-time work will be followed. GESIS supports equal career chances for men and women.

Please send your application under the keyword "Data processing CSES", by postal mail to GESIS, Postfach 410960, 50931 Koln, or by E-Mail to: [Doris.Lambertz@gesis.org](mailto:Doris.Lambertz@gesis.org)

Closing date for applications: March 18, 2009

//END OF EMAIL

---

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, 4 Mar 2009 17:51:01 -0500  
Reply-To: "Krotki, Karol" <[kkrotki@RTI.ORG](mailto:kkrotki@RTI.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Krotki, Karol" <[kkrotki@RTI.ORG](mailto:kkrotki@RTI.ORG)>  
Subject: 2009 Gertrude M. Cox Award - Call for Nominations  
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

Nominations Sought for the 2009 Gertrude M. Cox Award

=20

The Gertrude M. Cox Award Committee is seeking nominees for the 2009 Gertrude M Cox Award. The award was established in 2003 through a joint agreement between the Washington Statistical Society (WSS - the Washington DC area chapter of ASA) and Research Triangle Institute (RTI International). The award annually recognizes a statistician in early to mid-career (roughly less than 12 years after terminal degree) who has made significant contributions to one or more of the areas of applied statistics in which Gertrude Cox worked: survey methodology, experimental design, biostatistics, and statistical computing.=20

=20

The award is in memory of Gertrude M. Cox (1900-1978). In 1945 she became director of the Institute of Statistics of the Consolidated University of North Carolina and in 1947 she was a founding member of the Biometrics Society. In the 1950's, as Head of the Department of Experimental Statistics at North Carolina State College, she played a key role in establishing Mathematical Statistics and Biostatistics Departments at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and a Statistical Division at the newly founded RTI. In 1949 she became the first woman elected into the International Statistical Institute, in 1956 she was elected President of the American Statistical Association, and in 1975 she was elected to the National Academy of Sciences.

=20

The award is presented at the WSS Annual Dinner, usually held in June, with the recipient delivering the keynote address on a topic of general interest to the WSS membership.=20

=20

This award is made possible by funding from RTI International, and the recipient is chosen by a six person committee - three each from WSS and RTI. This year's committee consists of Paul Biemer, Nabil El-Khorazaty, Phil Kott (RTI Chair) from RTI and Michael P. Cohen, John Eltinge, and Karol Krotki (WSS Chair) from WSS. It consists of a \$1,000 honorarium, travel expenses to attend the WSS Annual Dinner, and a commemorative WSS plaque. Past recipients have been Sharon Lohr, Alan Zaslavsky, Tom Belin, Vance Berger, Francesca Domenici, and Thomas Lumley.

=20

Please email your nominations to Karol Krotki (kkrotki@rti.org) by March 31, 2009.

=20

Karol Krotki

Senior Research Statistician

RTI International

Statistics and Epidemiology

701 13th St. NW, Suite 750

Washington, DC 20005-3967

USA

=20

202-728-2485/866-RTI-1958of

703-209-7867cl

202-728-2095fx

kkrotki@rti.org

=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: Thu, 5 Mar 2009 07:09:23 -0500

Reply-To: Colleen Porter <colleen\_porter@COX.NET>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Colleen Porter <colleen\_porter@COX.NET>

Subject: Re: Stamp Affixing Machine

Comments: cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

In-Reply-To: <200903041914.n24IavfA017105@lists.asu.edu>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII; format=flowed; delp=yes  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Mime-Version: 1.0 (Apple Message framework v930.3)

Questions like this remind us why it is so valuable that researchers from all sectors participate in AAPOR. We academics don't have all the answers, because this question might never occur to us...

Academic research may have its downsides, what with IRB concerns, but there is always a ready supply of undergraduate students to perform such tasks for no or little cost.

Colleen Porter  
Gainesville, FL

On Mar 4, 2009, at 2:02 PM, John Marcum wrote:

> We're interested in including stamped return envelopes instead of  
> business  
> reply envelopes with our mail surveys. Could anyone recommend a stamp  
> affixing machine to automate the process of attaching the stamps to  
> the  
> return envelopes?

-----  
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, 5 Mar 2009 12:48:48 +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](mailto:mkshares@COMCAST.NET)>

Subject: Re: Stamp Affixing Machine

Comments: To: Colleen Porter <[colleen\\_porter@COX.NET](mailto:colleen_porter@COX.NET)>

Comments: cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

In-Reply-To:

<472082591.1971961236257288642.JavaMail.root@sz0107a.emeryville.ca.mail.comcast.net>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

This is something new from the USPS.=20

They sell pre-stamped envelopes. Quantities 5 or 500.=20

Cost is slightly above the cost of postage. Return address will need to be =  
added.=20

<http://shop.usps.com/webapp/wcs/stores/servlet/ProductCategoryDisplay?langI=d=3D-1&storeId=3D10001&catalogId=3D10152&categoryId=3D15602>

Nick

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

From: "Colleen Porter" <colleen\_porter@COX.NET>

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2009 6:09:23 AM GMT -06:00 US/Canada Central

Subject: Re: Stamp Affixing Machine

Questions like this remind us why it is so valuable that researchers from all sectors participate in AAPOR. We academics don't have all the answers, because this question might never occur to us....

Academic research may have its downsides, what with IRB concerns, but there is always a ready supply of undergraduate students to perform such tasks for no or little cost.

Colleen Porter  
Gainesville, FL

On Mar 4, 2009, at 2:02 PM, John Marcum wrote:

- > We're interested in including stamped return envelopes instead of business reply envelopes with our mail surveys. Could anyone recommend a stamp affixing machine to automate the process of attaching the stamps to the return envelopes?

-----  
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: Thu, 5 Mar 2009 14:49:03 -0500  
Reply-To: "Milton R. Goldsamt" <Miltrgold@COMCAST.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Milton R. Goldsamt" <Miltrgold@COMCAST.NET>

Subject: Lawmakers Seek to Make Census Bureau an Independent Agency  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Mime-Version: 1.0 (Apple Message framework v753.1)  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=WINDOWS-1252; delp=; format=flowed

=46from the Federal Daily of March 5, 2009:

## Lawmakers Seek to Make Census Bureau an Independent Agency

A bipartisan group of lawmakers introduced a bill that would, if passed into law, remove the Census Bureau from the Commerce Department and make it a separate, independent agency similar to NASA

or the National Archives. Reps. Carolyn B. Maloney, D-N.Y., Charles Gonzalez, D-Texas, Charlie Dent, R-Pa., and Jim Gerlach, R-Pa., on March 3 introduced the bill, the Restoring the Integrity of American Statistics Act (H.R. 1254). Because data generated by the Census Bureau is used to determine the representation of each state in the House of Representatives, its work must be above partisan reproach, Maloney said. Elevating the Census Bureau to the status of an independent body will allow it to conduct its 10-year planning, testing and execution process without interference, Maloney said. The work is too important to be a stepchild of a larger organization buffeted by year-to-year budget whims and political storms that every

cabinet agency is subject to. To see more, go to: <http://maloney.house.gov/index.php?option=content&task=view&id=1802&Itemid=61>.

Posted by Milton Goldsamt,

Milton R. Goldsamt, Ph.D.

Consulting Research Psychologist & Statistician  
Silver Spring, MD  
miltrgold@comcast.net

---

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, 5 Mar 2009 14:59:40 -0500  
Reply-To: Mark Blumenthal <Mark@POLLSTER.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mark Blumenthal <Mark@POLLSTER.COM>  
Subject: Re: Obama: Stock Market Like a Tracking Poll  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <c7c83ec0903041127v472602e5weafec7484acddac1@mail.gmail.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Just posted excerpts of your responses and my thoughts here:

[http://www.pollster.com/blogs/are\\_stocks\\_like\\_tracking\\_polls.php](http://www.pollster.com/blogs/are_stocks_like_tracking_polls.php)  
or  
<http://twurl.nl/e1vhnk>

Thanks to all that responded!

Mark

--

Mark Blumenthal | Pollster.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: Thu, 5 Mar 2009 15:25:41 -0500  
Reply-To: [jeffrey.c.moore@CENSUS.GOV](mailto:jeffrey.c.moore@CENSUS.GOV)  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Jeffrey C. Moore" <[jeffrey.c.moore@CENSUS.GOV](mailto:jeffrey.c.moore@CENSUS.GOV)>  
Subject: Re: Lawmakers Seek to Make Census Bureau an Independent Agency  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
In-Reply-To: <E127229C-CA38-4A04-B204-7230EBD32942@comcast.net>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=UTF-8  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

DISCLAIMER: The following views are the author's alone, and do not necessarily represent the official views or positions of the U.S. Census Bureau.

Good plan, IMHO. But, man I find the choice of the word "Restoring" in the bill's title offensive. And without, I would submit, basis -- I would like to see a shred of evidence that the Census Bureau's integrity needs to be restored. "Strengthening" -- who could oppose that? "Maintaining," "defending," "protecting" -- sure; fine. But "restoring" is not necessary, thank you.



End of brief rant; thanks for the few seconds of your time.

-- Jeff Moore --

"Milton R.  
Goldsamt"  
<Miltrgold@COMCAS T.NET> To  
AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Sent by: AAPORNET cc  
<AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>  
Subject  
Lawmakers Seek to Make Census  
Bureau an Independent Agency  
03/05/2009 02:49  
PM

Please respond to  
"Milton R.  
Goldsamt"  
<Miltrgold@COMCAS  
T.NET>

From the Federal Daily of March 5, 2009:

### Lawmakers Seek to Make Census Bureau an Independent Agency

A bipartisan group of lawmakers introduced a bill that would, if passed into law, remove the Census Bureau from the Commerce Department and make it a separate, independent agency similar to NASA or the National Archives. Reps. Carolyn B. Maloney, D-N.Y., Charles Gonzalez, D-Texas, Charlie Dent, R-Pa., and Jim Gerlach, R-Pa., on March 3 introduced the bill, the Restoring the Integrity of American Statistics Act (H.R. 1254). Because data generated by the Census Bureau is used to determine the representation of each state in the House of Representatives, its work must be above partisan reproach, Maloney said. "Elevating the Census Bureau to the status of an independent body will allow it to conduct its 10-year planning, testing and execution process without interference," Maloney said. "The work is too important to be a stepchild of a larger organization" buffeted by year-to-year budget whims and political storms that every cabinet agency is subject to. To see more, go to: <http://maloney.house.gov/index.php?option=content&task=view&id=1802&Itemid=61>.

Posted by Milton Goldsamt,

Milton R. Goldsamt, Ph.D.

Consulting Research Psychologist & Statistician  
Silver Spring, MD  
miltrgold@comcast.net

-----  
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: Thu, 5 Mar 2009 20:59:20 -0500  
Reply-To: Tom Guterbock <[tmg1p@VIRGINIA.EDU](mailto:tmg1p@VIRGINIA.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Tom Guterbock <[tmg1p@VIRGINIA.EDU](mailto:tmg1p@VIRGINIA.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: public source of price per interview in the us (fwd) (fwd)  
Comments: To: AAPORnet List server <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Disposition: inline  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

This failed to post last month, so I am resending it now to the net.  
Tom G.

----- Forwarded Message -----  
Date: Thursday, February 12, 2009 9:24 PM -0500  
From: [tmg1p@virginia.edu](mailto:tmg1p@virginia.edu)  
To: AAPORnet List server <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
Subject: Re: public source of price per interview in the us (fwd)

Hello Peter, wie geht's?

What can be priced with fair accuracy is the price of telephone interviewing. The basic cost unit is: one hour of calling effort from one interviewer at a CATI station, including long distance phone charges. When I comparison shopped a few years ago (when I needed to outsource some

overflow calling for my center), prices ranged from \$26 an hour up to the \$32 per hour that would be charged by my own shop and on up to as much as \$42 dollars in higher-priced calling labs. (At the time, prices in Canada were lower due to a favorable exchange rate.) Prices at very large firms oriented to Federal grant funded work were decidedly higher, and the lowest U.S. prices were in the big calling houses in Utah and California. These prices convert to price per interview if you are willing to make an assumption about how many completions will be attained per hour. For a general household survey using an RDD methodology and no significant screenout criteria (i.e. qualification rate near 100%), rates of completion range between 1.3 per hour for government or academic sponsored surveys of 15-20 minutes to 1.0 per hour or less with commercial sponsorship. Bottom line: an eighteen minute phone interview conducted by a decent quality shop costs between \$25 and \$35 each, not including project costs at the front and back end.

My point is that phone interviewing is in fact a commodity that is competitively sold by a large number of competing firms and it has a clear and knowable price. You need but a few assumptions to turn the market price-per-hour into a useful cost per interview.

Also, I would venture to say that Jon Krosnick's figure of \$1,000 each for in-person interviews is very high, although I'm sure it is based on a real study that had costs of that scale. Assuming that interview subjects are reachable through local travel, I think in-person CAPI interviewing costs three to four times what a phone survey would cost, assuming one is working from a simple address sampling frame (without the need for field listing). To me, \$125-\$200 per interview would be realistic figures. But you can be sure that if you look at one of NORC or RTI's or Westat's big studies and divide the total cost by the N of completes, you'll arrive at a much higher number, closer to what Jon cited. There's a lot in those study costs, I believe, besides the interviewing itself (e.g., generous incentive payments to respondents), so here a lot depends on what one considers as part of the 'cost per interview'.

I'd be interested if others think these estimates are realistic and current.

Tom

--On Tuesday, February 10, 2009 1:54 PM -0700 Peter Mohler  
<peter.mohler@UNI-MANNHEIM.DE> wrote:

- > 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
- > surveysâ?"face-to-face interviews yield 80 percent response ratesâ?"but
- > 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 saidâ?"what 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.  
> confidential.  
>  
> 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.

----- End Forwarded Message -----

Thomas M. Guterbock                      Voice: (434)243-5223  
Director                      CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222  
Center for Survey Research              FAX: (434)982-5524  
University of Virginia      EXPRESS DELIVERY: 2400 Old Ivy Road  
P. O. Box 400767                      Suite 212  
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767      Charlottesville, VA 22903  
e-mail: [TomG@virginia.edu](mailto:TomG@virginia.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:      Fri, 6 Mar 2009 07:28:58 -0800  
Reply-To:   "Josh D." <[jd9622flh@YAHOO.COM](mailto:jd9622flh@YAHOO.COM)>  
Sender:     AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From:      "Josh D." <[jd9622flh@YAHOO.COM](mailto:jd9622flh@YAHOO.COM)>  
Subject:    Re: Lawmakers Seek to Make Census Bureau an Independent Agency  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[E127229C-CA38-4A04-B204-7230EBD32942@comcast.net](mailto:E127229C-CA38-4A04-B204-7230EBD32942@comcast.net)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=utf-8  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

I ran a simple search on this topic and found two interesting points.

The GOP's support for the initiative:  
<http://www.gop.gov/presidentsday/census/letter>

AmStats' support for the initiative:  
<http://www.amstat.org/outreach/pdfs/ASAHR7069Senate.pdf>

Does AAPOR have an official stance?

--- On Thu, 3/5/09, Milton R. Goldsamt <Miltrgold@COMCAST.NET> wrote:  
From: Milton R. Goldsamt <Miltrgold@COMCAST.NET>  
Subject: Lawmakers Seek to Make Census Bureau an Independent Agency  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Date: Thursday, March 5, 2009, 2:49 PM

From the Federal Daily of March 5, 2009:

### Lawmakers Seek to Make Census Bureau an Independent Agency

A bipartisan group of lawmakers introduced a bill that would, if passed into law, remove the Census Bureau from the Commerce Department and make it a separate, independent agency similar to NASA or the National Archives. Reps. Carolyn B. Maloney, D-N.Y., Charles Gonzalez, D-Texas, Charlie Dent, R-Pa., and Jim Gerlach, R-Pa., on March 3 introduced the bill, the Restoring the Integrity of American Statistics Act (H.R. 1254). Because data generated by the Census Bureau is used to determine the representation of each state in the House of Representatives, its work must be above partisan reproach, Maloney said. Elevating the Census Bureau to the status of an independent body will allow it to conduct its 10-year planning, testing and execution process without interference, Maloney said. The work is too important to be a stepchild of a larger organization buffeted by year-to-year budget whims and political storms that every cabinet agency is subject to. To see more, go to: <http://maloney.house.gov/index.php?option=content&task=view&id=1802&Itemid=61>.

Posted by Milton Goldsamt,

Milton R. Goldsamt, Ph.D.

Consulting Research Psychologist & Statistician  
Silver Spring, MD  
[miltrgold@comcast.net](mailto:miltrgold@comcast.net)

-----  
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)  
=0A=0A=0A

-----  
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, 6 Mar 2009 11:18:13 -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: REMINDER: Call for Nominations for the 2009 AAPOR Book Award  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

## CALL FOR NOMINATIONS: 2009 AAPOR BOOK AWARD

Eligibility for the AAPOR Book Award includes any book in the fields of public opinion and/or survey methods that was published no later than 2005.

Of note, books in the list of "Fifty Books That Have Significantly Shaped Public Opinion Research, 1946-1995" already have been recognized by AAPOR and are not eligible for the annual book award.

The following criteria will be the basis for making an award to a book or monograph:

1. The excellence of exposition, ideas, and methods.
2. The monograph's impact with respect to:
  - a. stimulating theoretical or empirical research;
  - b. influencing the way researchers think about or conduct research on public opinion and/or survey methodology;

c. significantly influencing broader understanding of the theory or methods of public opinion; and/or

d. advancing the state of the art or practice of survey methodology.

3. Its lasting value, as indicated by (for example) the judgments of peers and citation in the literature.

Any AAPOR member can submit nominations. These should identify the monograph and provide a brief discuss on how it meets the criteria listed above. Monographs or edited volumes by AAPOR and non-AAPOR members are eligible for the award.

Recognition will be in the form of plaques for each of the author(s) (or editor(s), in the case of an edited volume).

Send nominations to Paul J. Lavrakas at [pjlavrak@optonline.net](mailto:pjlavrak@optonline.net). The deadline for nominations this year is March 13.

Previous AAPOR Book Award Winners:

2004, John R. Zaller; *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion* (1992: Cambridge University Press)

2005, Howard Schuman, Charlotte Steeh, Lawrence Bobo, and Maria Krysan; *Racial Attitudes in America: Trends and Interpretations* (1997: Harvard University Press)

2006, Roger Tourangeau, Lance J. Rips, and Kenneth Rasinski; *The Psychology of Survey Response* (2000: Cambridge University Press)

2007, Michael X. Delli Carpini and Scott Keeter; What Americans Know About Politics and Why It Matters (1996: Yale University Press)

2008, Robert M. Groves and Mick P. Couper; Nonresponse in Household Interview Survey (1998: John Wiley & Sons)

-----  
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, 6 Mar 2009 13:17:30 -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: REMINDER: Call for Nominations for the 2009 AAPOR Book Award  
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've been asked to clarify the time eligibility for the AAPOR book award.

All the eligible books to be considered this year (2009) need to have been published prior to 2006.

That's to make sure there's been adequate time for their impact to have been established.

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Paul J Lavrakas PhD  
Sent: Friday, March 06, 2009 11:18 AM  
To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Subject: REMINDER: Call for Nominations for the 2009 AAPOR Book Award

**CALL FOR NOMINATIONS: 2009 AAPOR BOOK AWARD**

Eligibility for the AAPOR Book Award includes any book in the fields of public opinion and/or survey methods that was published no later than 2005.



Of note, books in the list of "Fifty Books That Have Significantly Shaped Public Opinion Research, 1946-1995" already have been recognized by AAPOR and are not eligible for the annual book award.

The following criteria will be the basis for making an award to a book or monograph:

1. The excellence of exposition, ideas, and methods.
2. The monograph's impact with respect to:
  - a. stimulating theoretical or empirical research;
  - b. influencing the way researchers think about or conduct research on public opinion and/or survey methodology;
  - c. significantly influencing broader understanding of the theory or methods of public opinion; and/or
  - d. advancing the state of the art or practice of survey methodology.
3. Its lasting value, as indicated by (for example) the judgments of peers and citation in the literature.

Any AAPOR member can submit nominations. These should identify the monograph and provide a brief discuss on how it meets the criteria listed above. Monographs or edited volumes by AAPOR and non-AAPOR members are eligible for the award.

Recognition will be in the form of plaques for each of the author(s) (or editor(s), in the case of an edited volume).

Send nominations to Paul J. Lavrakas at [pjlavrak@optonline.net](mailto:pjlavrak@optonline.net). The deadline for nominations this year is March 13.

Previous AAPOR Book Award Winners:

2004, John R. Zaller; The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion (1992: Cambridge University Press)

2005, Howard Schuman, Charlotte Steeh, Lawrence Bobo, and Maria Krysan; Racial Attitudes in America: Trends and Interpretations (1997: Harvard University Press)

2006, Roger Tourangeau, Lance J. Rips, and Kenneth Rasinski; The Psychology of Survey Response (2000: Cambridge University Press)

2007, Michael X. Delli Carpini and Scott Keeter; What Americans Know About Politics and Why It Matters (1996: Yale University Press)

2008, Robert M. Groves and Mick P. Couper; Nonresponse in Household Interview Survey (1998: John Wiley & Sons)

-----  
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: Fri, 6 Mar 2009 14:33:16 -0500  
Reply-To: Phillip Downs <[pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM](mailto:pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Phillip Downs <[pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM](mailto:pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM)>  
Subject: Persuasion research  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

A client is totally psyched about persuasion research to measure the impact of some brand creative elements.

I'm not sold on it. Anyone care to speak of the virtues of persuasion research?

Thanks, Phillip

Phillip Downs, Ph.D.

Senior Partner | Kerr & Downs Research  
Professor of Marketing | Florida State University  
800.564.3182 | 850.906.3112 (f)

littleKDRclean

-----  
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, 6 Mar 2009 16:45:34 -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: AAPOR and the New Hampshire Primary  
Comments: To: [howard schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>](mailto:howard schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>)  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[49A75271.4030809@umich.edu](mailto:49A75271.4030809@umich.edu)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=windows-1252; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

It has now been over a week since Howard Schuman posted this on AAPORNET and there has been no response whatsoever from anyone connected with the investigation, if there is in fact still an ongoing investigation.

As with the recent "censure" of Gilbert Burnham, I'm afraid that I see more evidence of a distressing lack of transparency from AAPOR Council.

Jan Werner

\_\_\_\_\_

howard schuman wrote:

- > 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  
> misprediction 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)

>  
>

-----  
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, 6 Mar 2009 15:46:15 -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

Ready to build a great career with a great company? Look no further. Abt SR=BI, a well known research consulting firm specializing in public policy and= opinion surveys, is seeking a Technical Project Manager to work closely wi= th our clients, market research project managers, and developers to formula= te technical solutions to the clients business needs. This position will b= e based out of one of our Midwest or East Coast offices.

The Technical Project Manager position requires a solid understanding of st= atistical and data management. Successful candidates must be action orient= ed, capable of independently solving complex problems and able to communica= te clearly and effectively to both technical and business audiences.

In this position, your duties will include working closely with clients, ma=

market research project managers, and developers to formulate and communicate requirements to the developer based on the clients' needs. You will also periodically and systemically perform quality control checks on data, and work with developers to create customized data reports, including web based tools.

#### Desired Qualifications:

- \* 5+ years of relevant experience working with complex data sets and organizing data in an accessible manner
- \* Experience in statistical and data management software (SAS, SPSS, Excel, Access); SQL a plus
- \* Strong client communication skills (specifically, experience helping non-technical clients understand complex systems, and translating client requirements into actionable functionality that can be built)
- \* Bachelor's degree in a technical discipline a plus

Abt SRBI offers challenges, opportunity, diversity and growth. You'll enjoy a dynamic, fast-paced work environment, the best people in the industry and a benefits package with options to meet your needs. Please send resume and salary requirements to [m.hahn@srbi.com](mailto:m.hahn@srbi.com). For additional information about Abt SRBI, please visit our website at [www.srbi.com](http://www.srbi.com).

Abt SRBI is an equal opportunity employer.

-----  
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, 6 Mar 2009 16:55:43 -0500  
Reply-To: "Murray, Patrick" <[pdmurray@MONMOUTH.EDU](mailto:pdmurray@MONMOUTH.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Murray, Patrick" <[pdmurray@MONMOUTH.EDU](mailto:pdmurray@MONMOUTH.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: AAPOR and the New Hampshire Primary  
Comments: To: "[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)" <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
In-Reply-To: <[49B1997E.4080209@jwdp.com](mailto:49B1997E.4080209@jwdp.com)>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I attended an NYAAPOR event about a year ago on this topic and heard then that the report was imminent. The main pollster who has some data on this (and said they were going to release it) is Gallup.

Perhaps AAPOR members who are considering supporting Frank Newport for AAPOR president can let Frank know their vote is conditional on the release of his panel data!

[That was a joke, by the way!]

Patrick Murray  
Polling Institute  
Monmouth University

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Jan Werner  
Sent: Friday, March 06, 2009 4:46 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: AAPOR and the New Hampshire Primary

It has now been over a week since Howard Schuman posted this on AAPORNET and there has been no response whatsoever from anyone connected with the investigation, if there is in fact still an ongoing investigation.

As with the recent "censure" of Gilbert Burnham, I'm afraid that I see more evidence of a distressing lack of transparency from AAPOR Council.

Jan Werner

---

howard schuman wrote:

- > 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)
- >

>

-----  
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: Fri, 6 Mar 2009 16:19:31 -0600  
Reply-To: "Newport, Frank" <[Frank\\_Newport@GALLUP.COM](mailto:Frank_Newport@GALLUP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Newport, Frank" <[Frank\\_Newport@GALLUP.COM](mailto:Frank_Newport@GALLUP.COM)>  
Subject: Re: AAPOR and the New Hampshire Primary  
Comments: To: "Murray, Patrick" <[pdmurray@MONMOUTH.EDU](mailto:pdmurray@MONMOUTH.EDU)>,  
"AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
In-Reply-To: <[15918838F471304998EDDD30F539F3A80103BF8AEC74@WLB-EXCH-VS-02.monmouth.edu](mailto:15918838F471304998EDDD30F539F3A80103BF8AEC74@WLB-EXCH-VS-02.monmouth.edu)>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Just as a clarification, I should note that Gallup provided the AAPOR Ad Hoc Committee on the 2008 Presidential Primary Polling committee with everything we have on the New Hampshire primary -- including respondent level datasets, interviewer variables, complete questionnaires/question wording, and weighting specifications.

We are happy to support the work of the committee and look forward to their analysis and conclusions.

Frank Newport  
Editor in Chief  
The Gallup Poll

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

From: AAPORNET [[mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)] On Behalf Of Murray, Patrick  
Sent: Friday, March 06, 2009 4:56 PM  
To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Subject: Re: AAPOR and the New Hampshire Primary

I attended an NYAAPOR event about a year ago on this topic and heard then that the report was imminent. The main pollster who has some data on this (and said they were going to release it) is Gallup.

Perhaps AAPOR members who are considering supporting Frank Newport for AAPOR president can let Frank know their vote is conditional on the release of his

panel data!

[That was a joke, by the way!]

Patrick Murray  
Polling Institute  
Monmouth University

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Jan Werner  
Sent: Friday, March 06, 2009 4:46 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: AAPOR and the New Hampshire Primary

It has now been over a week since Howard Schuman posted this on AAPORNET and there has been no response whatsoever from anyone connected with the investigation, if there is in fact still an ongoing investigation.

As with the recent "censure" of Gilbert Burnham, I'm afraid that I see more evidence of a distressing lack of transparency from AAPOR Council.

Jan Werner

---

howard schuman wrote:

- > 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
- > misprediction 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

>

>

-----  
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.

-----  
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, 6 Mar 2009 17:36:49 -0500

Reply-To: "Murray, Patrick" <[pdmurray@MONMOUTH.EDU](mailto:pdmurray@MONMOUTH.EDU)>

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

From: "Murray, Patrick" <[pdmurray@MONMOUTH.EDU](mailto:pdmurray@MONMOUTH.EDU)>

Subject: Re: AAPOR and the New Hampshire Primary

Comments: To: "Newport, Frank" <[Frank\\_Newport@gallup.com](mailto:Frank_Newport@gallup.com)>, "AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>

In-Reply-To:

<[A7DE36A5A918084FB6EF54C0BD480752166E3B040B@EXCHNG5.noam.gallup.com](mailto:A7DE36A5A918084FB6EF54C0BD480752166E3B040B@EXCHNG5.noam.gallup.com)>

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

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Thanks Frank. Always a stand-up guy.

Patrick

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

From: Newport, Frank [[mailto:Frank\\_Newport@gallup.com](mailto:Frank_Newport@gallup.com)]

Sent: Friday, March 06, 2009 5:20 PM

To: Murray, Patrick; [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

Subject: RE: AAPOR and the New Hampshire Primary

Just as a clarification, I should note that Gallup provided the AAPOR Ad Hoc Committee on the 2008 Presidential Primary Polling committee with everything we have on the New Hampshire primary -- including respondent level datasets, interviewer variables, complete questionnaires/question wording, and weighting specifications.

We are happy to support the work of the committee and look forward to their analysis and conclusions.

Frank Newport  
Editor in Chief  
The Gallup Poll

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Murray, Patrick  
Sent: Friday, March 06, 2009 4:56 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: AAPOR and the New Hampshire Primary

I attended an NYAAPOR event about a year ago on this topic and heard then that the report was imminent. The main pollster who has some data on this (and said they were going to release it) is Gallup.

Perhaps AAPOR members who are considering supporting Frank Newport for AAPOR president can let Frank know their vote is conditional on the release of his panel data!

[That was a joke, by the way!]

Patrick Murray  
Polling Institute  
Monmouth University

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Jan Werner  
Sent: Friday, March 06, 2009 4:46 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: AAPOR and the New Hampshire Primary

It has now been over a week since Howard Schuman posted this on AAPORNET and there has been no response whatsoever from anyone connected with the investigation, if there is in fact still an ongoing investigation.

As with the recent "censure" of Gilbert Burnham, I'm afraid that I see more evidence of a distressing lack of transparency from AAPOR Council.

Jan Werner

---

howard schuman wrote:

- > 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

> misprediction 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)

>  
>

-----  
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.

-----  
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 Mar 2009 01:00:35 -0500  
Reply-To: Tom Guterbock <[tmg1p@VIRGINIA.EDU](mailto:tmg1p@VIRGINIA.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Tom Guterbock <[tmg1p@VIRGINIA.EDU](mailto:tmg1p@VIRGINIA.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Effect of phrase "In your opinion..."  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
Comments: cc: debby kermer <[dk5h@virginia.edu](mailto:dk5h@virginia.edu)>  
In-Reply-To: <[LISTSERV%200902271337531001.296C@LISTS.ASU.EDU](mailto:LISTSERV%200902271337531001.296C@LISTS.ASU.EDU)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Content-Disposition: inline

Sometimes the phrase serves an important purpose. We recently conducted a mail-out survey of scientists involved with IRB matters. Some have served on 'Data Safety Monitoring Boards' while others have never served or perhaps not even heard of these boards. The questionnaire had some questions about respondents' experiences on these boards, but then switched to questions about what they thought should be the rules and procedures followed on these boards. Then there were some more specific questions about prior experiences, applicable only to those who had served. We wanted to get answers on the opinion items even from those who had never served. When we pre-tested the questionnaire, there was apparent confusion about what we wanted. We added 'In your opinion,' bolded and italicized, at the start of each of those questions and it appears that this clarified the questions (based on the lack of inappropriate skips in the production data).

So, I would just say that the phrase can be quite helpful in a survey context where questions switch from factual reporting to attitudinal questions (and back?). I would agree that there is danger of overuse, especially in an oral interview.

My 2c.

Tom

--On Friday, February 27, 2009 1:37 PM -0700 "Margaret R. Roller" <rnr@ROLLERRESEARCH.COM> wrote:

> 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  
> rnr@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)

Thomas M. Guterbock                      Voice: (434)243-5223  
Director                                  CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222  
Center for Survey Research              FAX: (434)982-5524  
University of Virginia      EXPRESS DELIVERY: 2400 Old Ivy Road

P. O. Box 400767 Suite 212  
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767 Charlottesville, VA 22903  
e-mail: TomG@virginia.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: Sat, 7 Mar 2009 09:35:53 -0500  
Reply-To: fred goldner <[fgoldner@COMCAST.NET](mailto:fgoldner@COMCAST.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: fred goldner <[fgoldner@COMCAST.NET](mailto:fgoldner@COMCAST.NET)>  
Subject: Re: AAPOR and the New Hampshire Primary  
Comments: To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com), [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; format=flowed; charset="Windows-1252";  
reply-type=response  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I had it on my calender to send the same message as Jan's today .except to  
add that the lack of any response calls into question whether any member of  
our present Council ever looks at or uses APPORNET

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

From: "Jan Werner" <[jwerner@JWDP.COM](mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM)>  
To: <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
Sent: Friday, March 06, 2009 4:45 PM  
Subject: Re: AAPOR and the New Hampshire Primary

> It has now been over a week since Howard Schuman posted this on AAPORNET  
> and there has been no response whatsoever from anyone connected with the  
> investigation, if there is in fact still an ongoing investigation.

>  
> As with the recent "censure" of Gilbert Burnham, I'm afraid that I see  
> more evidence of a distressing lack of transparency from AAPOR Council.

>  
> Jan Werner

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

> howard schuman wrote:

>> 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  
>> misprediction 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)

>>  
>>  
>  
> -----  
> 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, 7 Mar 2009 09:46:26 -0500  
Reply-To: Richard Kulka <[Richard\\_Kulka@ABTASSOC.COM](mailto:Richard_Kulka@ABTASSOC.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Richard Kulka <[Richard\\_Kulka@ABTASSOC.COM](mailto:Richard_Kulka@ABTASSOC.COM)>  
Subject: AAPOR and the New Hampshire Primary--Update  
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

Dear Fellow AAPORites:

We appreciate the concerns of members about the status of the Association's report on the 2008 Presidential primary polls, and we can certainly understand frustrations expressed by Howard Schuman and others about the delay in its completion and release. We want to assure you that the committee commissioned to do the report has worked diligently and with great care, and the report has been drafted. It will be discussed by the Executive Council at the end of next week, and the report has also been sent out to the organizations whose work is discussed in the report for comment. We anticipate that the final report will be released soon after the Council discussion, no later than the end of this month.

Additional updates on some of the other questions raised, either explicitly or implicitly, will be forthcoming sooner from the current three presidents. Thank you for your patience and for nudging us all at times as appropriate.

Best wishes,

Dick Kulka

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](http://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> .  
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, 7 Mar 2009 14:06:15 -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: Re: AAPOR and the New Hampshire Primary--Update]  
Comments: To: [aapor](mailto:aapor@aapor.net) <[aapor@aapor.net](mailto:aapor@aapor.net)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

It is good to read Dick Kulka's message about the report on the Primary Polls, especially the promise that a report will be released by the end of March. It's a little late in terms of my own original inquiries, which arose while starting a course on the 2008 election. At that point the recent New Hampshire Primary (more than later Primaries) had raised serious questions from students because of the previous success of some polls with regard to the Iowa caucus vote, the anticipation especially by Obama supporters about the first real Primary, the fact that so many major polls were on the ground in New Hampshire, the almost unanimous failure of poll projections, and the plethora of explanations offered in the days following the vote. A dispassionate sorting of evidence, even if unlikely to be conclusive, was much needed at that point.

I am still puzzled at the reluctance of the AAPOR Council to provide clear and prompt information to those it represents over the many months after a committee was created and a report promised. As AAPOR President





>  
>

-----  
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, 7 Mar 2009 17:02:15 -0500  
Reply-To: fred goldner <[fgoldner@COMCAST.NET](mailto:fgoldner@COMCAST.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: fred goldner <[fgoldner@COMCAST.NET](mailto:fgoldner@COMCAST.NET)>  
Subject: Re: AAPOR and the New Hampshire Primary--Update]  
Comments: To: howard schuman <[hschuman@UMICH.EDU](mailto:hschuman@UMICH.EDU)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; format=flowed; charset="iso-8859-1";  
reply-type=response  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

AAPOR has not only increased in size and complications but also has become narrower in focus since Howard was elected President ( in a landside against a weak opponent).

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

From: "howard schuman" <[hschuman@UMICH.EDU](mailto:hschuman@UMICH.EDU)>  
To: <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
Sent: Saturday, March 07, 2009 2:06 PM  
Subject: Re: AAPOR and the New Hampshire Primary--Update]

> It is good to read Dick Kulka's message about the report on the Primary  
> Polls, especially the promise that a report will be released by the end  
> of March. It's a little late in terms of my own original inquiries,  
> which arose while starting a course on the 2008 election. At that point  
> the recent New Hampshire Primary (more than later Primaries) had  
> raised serious questions from students because of the previous success  
> of some polls with regard to the Iowa caucus vote, the anticipation  
> especially by Obama supporters about the first real Primary, the fact  
> that so many major polls were on the ground in New Hampshire, the almost  
> unanimous failure of poll projections, and the plethora of explanations  
> offered in the days following the vote. A dispassionate sorting of  
> evidence, even if unlikely to be conclusive, was much needed at that  
> point.

>  
> I am still puzzled at the reluctance of the AAPOR Council to provide  
> clear and prompt information to those it represents over the many months  
> after a committee was created and a report promised. As AAPOR President  
> some years back--admittedly a long time ago, after the Fall of the Roman  
> Empire but well before the 2008 election--I think we took it for granted  
> that providing information to members about Council business was part of  
> the job, even though individual reputations were to be respected and  
> treated as confidential. Of course, life was simpler in those days--I  
> recently read that when Harry Truman's term as President ended, he  
> didn't leave Washington on Air Force One, but instead he and Bess simply  
> got into their car and drove home to Missouri on their own, no Secret



>>  
>  
> -----  
> 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: Sun, 8 Mar 2009 17:53:06 -0400  
Reply-To: Shawn Neidorf <[sneidorf@PEWRESEARCH.ORG](mailto:sneidorf@PEWRESEARCH.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Shawn Neidorf <[sneidorf@PEWRESEARCH.ORG](mailto:sneidorf@PEWRESEARCH.ORG)>  
Subject: disposition codes for a Web survey  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Good afternoon,

I have followed with interest the recent posts about Web surveys, =  
response rates and disposition codes. As it happens, I am working on =  
disposition codes for a survey I have conducted for my dissertation, and =  
I want to make sure I assign disposition codes correctly. In light of =  
the sampling procedures and invitation procedures I used, I am a little =  
uncertain what to do in some cases. I was hoping someone would be =  
willing to talk through/e-mail through some of the specifics with me =  
privately.=20

Some details:

The survey was of people working in an industry. I took a systematic =  
sample from a well regarded directory of people who work in the field, =  
though recent economic conditions have meant a good number of people =  
have been laid off since the directory was published (directory data =  
collected in mid-late 2007 for mid-2008 publication). I know this could =  
affect some the eligibility determinations. I also used an electronic =  
directory to pull a supplementary sample of minority workers, as they =  
are underrepresented in the field. For this, I used a list of names from =  
the Census that are most common among Asian Americans, Hispanics and =  
African Americans. If a worker in the field had such a last name and =  
wasn't already in the sample from the paper directory draw, he or she =  
was added in this draw from an electronic directory of all workers in =  
the field.=20

I sent an e-mail notification without any login information (i.e. no URL =  
or login code) to each person to let him or her know a little about the =  
survey and to let him or her know to expect a letter via U.S. mail with =  
more details about the survey. (I sent these messages the morning after =  
the invitation letters were mailed.) Follow-up reminders after the U.S. =

mail letter were sent via e-mail. I know that many of the e-mail =  
messages were not deliverable from the records kept by the survey =  
hosting service (which I used to send the e-mails as well). Also, more =  
than 100 letters sent by U.S. mail bounced back for various reasons =  
(some with more detailed information provided by USPS, some without it).

I want to be very sure that I assign the proper codes for =  
non-respondents, determine eligibility correctly and calculate the =  
response rate properly. If someone were willing to discuss this with me =  
in more detail, I would be greatly appreciative! Also, if anyone can =  
point me to any publications, etc., that address these particular issues =  
directly, I'd be very grateful.

Thanks very much!

Shawn Neidorf

P.S. Please note: I subscribe to AAPORNET through my work e-mail =  
account, but as this is a personal project, I'd appreciate it if =  
correspondence regarding this matter were sent to me at =  
shawn.neidorf@gmail.com. I also can be reached at 708-261-9156.

---

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 Mar 2009 08:21:48 -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: Email-Only Adults  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Fellow AAPORNetters,

First a quick thank you for all the very help responses, recommendations,=  
=20  
etc. to my request about IVR. I was able to pass my colleague some very=20=  
  
good leads.

Now I find myself moving from IVR to email...or rather the consideration =  
of=20  
email only adults. Our tracking team here at AARP is working on a short=20=  
  
technology series for inclusion in our ongoing core telephone survey, and=  
=20

in it we ask our target population about internet use in the past month.

We recently began considering/debating whether it was worthwhile=20 distinguishing those who use the Internet for email only from those who=20=

actually visit websites for other reasons (or do any number of other onli=  
ne=20

activities), particularly given our target population is adults 45+ with=20=

particular emphasis on those over 50. Unfortunately we don't have the=20=

time/space to ask about a range of online activities to ferret some of th=  
is=20

out in the survey.

I am already in contact with folks at the Pew Internet Project and have n=  
o=20

doubt they will prove very helpful, but I figured I would check with=20  
AAPORNet as well to see if anyone has any data on this group (size,=20  
characteristics, etc.) or any experience identifying/studying them.=20

As always, thanks in advance for any and all help.

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)

-----  
=E2=80=9CIf you can't explain it simply, you don't understand it well eno=  
ugh.=E2=80=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.

=====  
Date: Mon, 9 Mar 2009 15:16:24 -0400

Reply-To: "Becker, Risa" <[Risa.Becker@MEDIAMARK.COM](mailto:Risa.Becker@MEDIAMARK.COM)>

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

From: "Becker, Risa" <[Risa.Becker@MEDIAMARK.COM](mailto:Risa.Becker@MEDIAMARK.COM)>

Subject: Re: Email-Only Adults

Comments: To: John Fries <[jfries@AARP.ORG](mailto:jfries@AARP.ORG)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

In-Reply-To: A<[LISTSERV%200903090821487175.9A4C@LISTS.ASU.EDU](mailto:LISTSERV%200903090821487175.9A4C@LISTS.ASU.EDU)>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Hi John -

Since AARP is a client of MRI's, some of the information you're interested in, you may already have access to. In MRI's Fall 08 report, we show the following:

| Age       | % accessing Internet, last 30 days | Of those |
|-----------|------------------------------------|----------|
| 45-54     | 76.3%                              |          |
| 3.5%      |                                    |          |
| 55-64     | 66.7%                              |          |
| 4.4%      |                                    |          |
| Men 65+   | 37.2%                              | 5.7%     |
| Women 65+ | 33.5%                              |          |
| 10.5%     |                                    |          |

Hope this is helpful.. Feel free to contact us for additional information.

Risa Becker  
VP Research Operations  
Mediamark Research & Intelligence  
212 884 9282

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu]On Behalf Of John Fries  
Sent: Monday, March 09, 2009 11:22 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Email-Only Adults

Fellow AAPORNetters,

First a quick thank you for all the very help responses, recommendations, etc. to my request about IVR. I was able to pass my colleague some very good leads.

Now I find myself moving from IVR to email...or rather the consideration of email only adults. Our tracking team here at AARP is working on a short technology series for inclusion in our ongoing core telephone survey, and in it we ask our target population about internet use in the past month.

We recently began considering/debating whether it was worthwhile distinguishing those who use the Internet for email only from those who actually visit websites for other reasons (or do any number of other online activities), particularly given our target population is adults 45+ with particular emphasis on those over 50. Unfortunately we don't have the time/space to ask about a range of online activities to ferret some of this out in the survey.

I am already in contact with folks at the Pew Internet Project and have no doubt they will prove very helpful, but I figured I would check with

AAPORNet as well to see if anyone has any data on this group (size, characteristics, etc.) or any experience identifying/studying them.

As always, thanks in advance for any and all help.

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)

-----  
âEURoIf you can't explain it simply, you don't understand it well enough.âEUR  
-- 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: Mon, 9 Mar 2009 13:20:37 -0700  
Reply-To: Joel Moskowitz <[jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU](mailto:jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
Comments: RFC822 error: <W> MESSAGE-ID field duplicated. Last occurrence was retained.  
From: Joel Moskowitz <[jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU](mailto:jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU)>  
Subject: American Religious Identification Survey  
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: quoted-printable

The results of the American Religious=20  
Identification Survey (ARIS 2008) appear in more=20  
than 390 news stories today. The study reports=20  
dramatic differences over time regarding=20  
religious identification among American adults. I=20  
am curious whether AAPOR members believe that=20  
18-year trend data (1990, 2001, 2008) from these=20  
national telephone surveys can be meaningfully interpreted.

The ARIS 2008 results were based on telephone=20  
surveys of 54,461 respondents sampled via RDD=20

supplemented by cell-phone samples. Neither the=20  
press release, nor the summary report provides=20  
much detail about the methods but indicates that=20  
they were similar to those employed in the=20  
previous surveys (see below). To bolster the=20  
study's legitimacy, the authors state, "The value=20  
of this unique series of national surveys, which=20  
allows scientific monitoring of change over time,=20  
has been recognized by the U.S. Bureau of the=20  
Census ... and so has incorporated NSRI/ARIS=20  
findings into its official publication the=20  
Statistical Abstract of the United States since=20  
2003." (This claim is true for the 2008 edition=20  
of the Statistical Abstract (see Table=20  
74:=20  
<http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/2008/tables/08s0074.pdf>=20  
, but not for the 2009 edition which is based on=20  
another survey(Table 74:=20  
<http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/tables/09s0074.pdf> ).

Some methodologic information is available online=20  
for ARIS 2001. This study was based on data from=20  
two national omnibus survey efforts: EXCEL, "the=20  
research industry=92s largest telephone omnibus=20  
service" ("the call rule is an original plus four=20  
attempts"), and ACCESS. "These surveys are=20  
operated and overseen by ICR personnel." For=20  
details on the ARIS 2001 survey methods=20  
(including a response rate calculation), see=20  
<http://prog.trincoll.edu/ISSSC/DataArchive/index.asp> .

Following is one of the more than 390 news reports on the ARIS 2008:

=3D=3D=3D

More Americans say they have no religion

Rachel Zoll, Associated Press, Mar 9, 2009

A wide-ranging study on American religious life=20  
found that the Roman Catholic population has been=20  
shifting out o of the Northeast to the Southwest,=20  
the percentage of Christians in the nation has=20  
declined and more people say they have no religion at all.

Fifteen percent of respondents said they had no=20  
religion, an increase from 14.2 percent in 2001=20  
and 8.2 percent in 1990, according to the=20  
American Religious Identification Survey.

Northern New England surpassed the Pacific=20  
Northwest as the least religious region, with=20  
Vermont reporting the highest share of those=20  
claiming no religion, at 34 percent. Still, the=20



study found that the numbers of Americans with no religion rose in every state.

"No other religious bloc has kept such a pace in every state," the study's authors said.

In the Northeast, self-identified Catholics made up 36 percent of adults last year, down from 43 percent in 1990. At the same time, however, Catholics grew to about one-third of the adult population in California and Texas, and one-quarter of Floridians, largely due to Latino immigration, according to the research.

Nationally, Catholics remain the largest religious group, with 57 million people saying they belong to the church. The tradition gained 11 million followers since 1990, but its share of the population fell by about a percentage point to 25 percent.

Christians who aren't Catholic also are a declining segment of the country.

In 2008, Christians comprised 76 percent of U.S. adults, compared to about 77 percent in 2001 and about 86 percent in 1990. Researchers said the dwindling ranks of mainline Protestants, including Methodists, Lutherans and Episcopalians, largely explains the shift. Over the last seven years, mainline Protestants dropped from just over 17 percent to 12.9 percent of the population.

The report from The Program on Public Values at Trinity College in Hartford, Conn., surveyed 54,461 adults in English or Spanish from February through November of last year. It has a margin of error of plus or minus 0.5 percentage points. The findings are part of a series of studies on American religion by the program that will later look more closely at reasons behind the trends.

The current survey, being released Monday, found traditional organized religion playing less of a role in many lives. Thirty percent of married couples did not have a religious wedding ceremony and 27 percent of respondents said they did not want a religious funeral.

About 12 percent of Americans believe in a higher power but not the personal God at the core of monotheistic faiths. And, since 1990, a slightly greater share of respondents said they were part of new religious movements, including Scientology, Wicca and Santeria.

The study also found signs of a growing influence

of churches that either don't belong to a denomination or play down their membership in a religious group.

Respondents who called themselves "non-denominational Christian" grew from 0.1 percent in 1990 to 3.5 percent last year. Congregations that most often use the term are megachurches considered "seeker sensitive." They use rock style music and less structured prayer to attract people who don't usually attend church. Researchers also found a small increase in those who prefer being called evangelical or born-again, rather than claim membership in a denomination.

Evangelical or born-again Americans make up 34 percent of all American adults and 45 percent of all Christians and Catholics, the study found. Researchers found that 18 percent of Catholics consider themselves born-again or evangelical and nearly 39 percent of mainline Protestants prefer those labels. Many mainline Protestant groups are riven by conflict over how they should interpret what the Bible says about relationships, salvation and other issues.

The percentage of Pentecostals remained mostly steady since 1990 at 3.5 percent, a surprising finding considering the dramatic spread of the tradition worldwide. Pentecostals are known for a spirited form of Christianity that includes speaking in tongues and a belief in modern-day miracles.

Mormon numbers also held steady over the period at 1.4 percent of the population, while the number of Jews who described themselves as religiously observant continued to drop, from 1.8 percent in 1990 to 1.2 percent, or 2.7 million people, last year. Researchers plan a broader survey on people who consider themselves culturally Jewish but aren't religious.

The study found that the percentage of Americans who identified themselves as Muslim grew to 0.6 percent of the population, while growth in Eastern religions such as Buddhism slightly slowed. On the Net:

\* Press Release:

[http://www.google.com/url?q=3Dhttp://www.americanreligionsurvey-aris.org/&u=sg=3DAFQjCNEZIClhnE\\_hghOkaN-QGh4rBS-7EQ](http://www.google.com/url?q=3Dhttp://www.americanreligionsurvey-aris.org/&u=sg=3DAFQjCNEZIClhnE_hghOkaN-QGh4rBS-7EQ)<http://www.americanreligionsurvey-aris.org/>

\* Summary Report:

[http://b27.cc.trincoll.edu/weblogs/AmericanReligionSurvey-ARIS/reports/ARIS\\_Report\\_2008.pdf](http://b27.cc.trincoll.edu/weblogs/AmericanReligionSurvey-ARIS/reports/ARIS_Report_2008.pdf)

=3D=3D=3D

## Research Design

ARIS 2008 is the third in a landmark time series of large, nationally representative surveys that track changes in the religious loyalties of the U.S. adult population within the 48 contiguous states from 1990 to 2008. The 2001 and 2008 surveys are replicas of the 1990 survey, and are led by the same academic research team using an identical methodology of random-digit-dialed telephone interviews (RDD) and the same unprompted, open-ended key question "What is your religion, if any?" Interviewers did not prompt or offer a suggested list of potential answers. Moreover, the self-description of respondents was not based on whether established religious bodies or institutions considered them to be members. To the contrary, the surveys sought to determine whether the respondents regarded themselves as adherents of a religious community. The surveys tap subjective rather than objective standards of religious identification. The value of this unique series of national surveys, which allows scientific monitoring of change over time, has been recognized by the U.S. Bureau of the Census. The Bureau itself is constitutionally precluded from such an inquiry into religion, and so has incorporated NSRI/ARIS findings into its official publication the Statistical Abstract of the United States since 2003.

The key religion question is part of an inquiry that also probes a range of socio-demographic, political, social, and life-cycle issues as well as attitudes that add richness to the main findings. These responses reveal the nation's pattern of religious beliefs, behaviors and belonging. The ARIS 2008 survey was carried out from February through November 2008 and collected answers from 54,461 respondents who were questioned in English or Spanish. In order to fill the information gap on the growing number of people who do not have a landline but use cellular telephones mainly or exclusively, we supplemented the traditional RDD sample with a separate national cell phone survey. Results for the ARIS key open-ended question on religious self-identification indicate no statistically significant differences between the RDD sample and the cell phone sample.<sup>1</sup> ARIS 2001 interviewed 50,281 respondents and the 1990 NSRI interviewed 113,713 respondents. The huge number of cases in

these surveys provides unparalleled, in-depth profiles of the social make-up of religious groups and detailed geographical coverage with a high degree of statistical precision and a standard error of under 0.5 percent for the full sample in 2008.

As one might expect with over 220,000 interviews recorded over three surveys, the ARIS respondents offered a vast number of theological, religious and denominational responses to our key question. These open-ended answers have to be aggregated down to a manageable number of categories for analytical purposes. This requires using a simplified aggregation that helps highlight the major trends in religious sentiments across five major theological blocs as utilized in Tables 1, 2 and 12. The category Catholic is comprised of (1) Roman Catholics, (2) Eastern Rites Catholics, and (3) all others who used the term "Catholic" in their response. The "Other Christians" bloc is composed of all non-Catholic respondents who self-identified with a religious group which claims to be Christian as well as any theological term that related to Christianity. The "Other Religions" bloc comprises all the other faiths, world religions and religious groups that are not Christian. The "Nones" are an amalgamation of all the respondents who provided answers to our key question which identified them as having no religious identity or connection. The most common response was "None" or "No Religion." This bloc can be described as the non-religious, irreligious and anti-religious bloc. It includes anti-clerical theists, but the majority are non-theists. For reasons of scientific integrity we have also included data on the "Unknown" category, composed of those who said they did not know the answer to our key religion question and those who refused to reply to our key question. We have no religious identification data on this population but we do have demographic and attitude data.

A further re-classification of the responses that offers a finer-grained taxonomy identifying religious traditions and some of the larger religious groups is provided in Table 3 and other subsequent tables. However, this summary is just the tip of the iceberg of statistical data on a much larger number of religious groups than can be handled here and many more social variables than are highlighted here. The 1990 and 2001 studies were fully analyzed and reported in *One Nation under God: Religion in Contemporary American Society* (1993) and *Religion in a Free*

Market: Religious and Non-Religious Americans (2006).2

1 Detailed analysis of the religious and=20 socio-demographic profiles of the cell phone=20 users will be provided in a later report.

2 Barry A. Kosmin and Seymour P. Lachman, One=20 Nation under God: Religion in Contemporary=20 American Society, New York, Harmony Press, 1993;=20 Barry A. Kosmin and Ariela Keysar, Religion in a=20 Free Market: Religious and Non-Religious=20 Americans, Ithaca, N.Y., Paramount Market Publishing, 2006.  
<http://b27.cc.trincoll.edu/weblogs/AmericanReligionSurvey-ARIS/reports/methods.html>=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, 9 Mar 2009 16:41:54 -0500  
Reply-To: Kerryann DiLoreto <[kdiloret@SSC.WISC.EDU](mailto:kdiloret@SSC.WISC.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Kerryann DiLoreto <[kdiloret@SSC.WISC.EDU](mailto:kdiloret@SSC.WISC.EDU)>  
Subject: Job Posting: University of Wisconsin Survey Center - Madison  
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

The University of Wisconsin Survey Center in Madison, Wisconsin has posted the position of CAPI Field Supervisor for the Wisconsin Longitudinal Study (WLS). For more information, please visit:

[http://www.ohr.wisc.edu/pvl/pv\\_061357.html](http://www.ohr.wisc.edu/pvl/pv_061357.html)

Kerryann DiLoreto  
Project Director  
University of Wisconsin Survey Center  
1800 University Avenue  
Madison, WI 53726  
608-265-6598  
[kdiloret@ssc.wisc.edu](mailto:kdiloret@ssc.wisc.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: Mon, 9 Mar 2009 20:28:21 -0400  
Reply-To: Keith Neuman <[Keith.Neuman@ENVIRONICS.CA](mailto:Keith.Neuman@ENVIRONICS.CA)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>

From: Keith Neuman <Keith.Neuman@ENVIRONICS.CA>  
Subject: Looking for interviewer training resources  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

I am looking for proven, time-tested resources for training interviewers (for telephone surveys), including manuals, books, online resources or courses.

=20

Any suggestions would be most appreciated. Feel free to post on AAPORNET (so others can benefit) or send directly to me at keith.neuman@environics.ca

=20

Thanks in advance,

=20

Keith Neuman, Ph.D.=20  
Group Vice President - Public Affairs=20  
Environics Research Group=20  
613-230-5089=20  
keith.neuman@environics.ca=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, 9 Mar 2009 20:35:41 -0400  
Reply-To: Colleen Porter <colleen\_porter@COX.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Colleen Porter <colleen\_porter@COX.NET>  
Subject: Re: Looking for interviewer training resources  
Comments: To: Keith Neuman <Keith.Neuman@ENVIRONICS.CA>  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
In-Reply-To: <200903100028.n29KEYTR027706@lists.asu.edu>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII; format=flowed; delp=yes  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Mime-Version: 1.0 (Apple Message framework v930.3)

"Telephone Interviewer's Handbook: How to Conduct Standardized Conversations" by Patricia A. Gwartyney is excellent.

On Mar 9, 2009, at 8:28 PM, Keith Neuman wrote:

> I am looking for proven, time-tested resources for training  
> interviewers  
> (for telephone surveys), including manuals, books, online resources or  
> courses.

>  
>=20

>  
> Any suggestions would be most appreciated. Feel free to post on  
> AAPORNET (so others can benefit) or send directly to me at  
> keith.neuman@environics.ca

>  
>=20

>  
> Thanks in advance,

>  
>=20

>  
> Keith Neuman, Ph.D.=20  
> Group Vice President - Public Affairs=20  
> Environics Research Group=20  
> 613-230-5089=20  
> keith.neuman@environics.ca=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.

-----  
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, 9 Mar 2009 21:17:25 -0400  
Reply-To: Paul Braun <[pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM](mailto:pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Paul Braun <[pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM](mailto:pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Looking for interviewer training resources  
Comments: To: Keith Neuman <[Keith.Neuman@ENVIRONICS.CA](mailto:Keith.Neuman@ENVIRONICS.CA)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[471392587B216240A006DD8BD56246AB5A1E0C@cx41.800onemail.com](mailto:471392587B216240A006DD8BD56246AB5A1E0C@cx41.800onemail.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Keith,

CMOR produces a set of materials which are excellent

Cmor.org

Regards

Paul

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Keith Neuman

Sent: Monday, March 09, 2009 8:28 PM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: Looking for interviewer training resources

I am looking for proven, time-tested resources for training interviewers (for telephone surveys), including manuals, books, online resources or courses.

Any suggestions would be most appreciated. Feel free to post on AAPORNET (so others can benefit) or send directly to me at keith.neuman@environics.ca

Thanks in advance,

Keith Neuman, Ph.D.  
Group Vice President - Public Affairs  
Environics Research Group  
613-230-5089  
keith.neuman@environics.ca

-----  
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: Mon, 9 Mar 2009 21:24:06 -0400  
Reply-To: [slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu](mailto:slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu)  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Susan Losh <[slosh@FSU.EDU](mailto:slosh@FSU.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Looking for interviewer training resources  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>



In-Reply-To: <D20FAE1F-C16B-46CD-80B5-003FD85ED747@cox.net>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Disposition: inline  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

My manual that I used to train over 300 interviewers for both face to face and telephone is back online in the link below: "Everything you ever wanted to know about interviewing and needed to learn how to ask":

<http://mailer.fsu.edu/~slosh/MethodsInterviewersManual.html>

Susan

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

From: Colleen Porter <colleen\_porter@COX.NET>  
Date: Monday, March 9, 2009 8:36 pm  
Subject: Re: Looking for interviewer training resources  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

> "Telephone Interviewer's Handbook: How to Conduct Standardized  
> Conversations" by Patricia A. Gwartney is excellent.

>  
> On Mar 9, 2009, at 8:28 PM, Keith Neuman wrote:

>  
>> I am looking for proven, time-tested resources for training  
>> interviewers  
>> (for telephone surveys), including manuals, books, online  
> resources or  
>> courses.

>>  
>>=20  
>>  
>> Any suggestions would be most appreciated. Feel free to post on  
>> AAPORNET (so others can benefit) or send directly to me at  
>> keith.neuman@environics.ca

>>  
>>=20  
>>  
>> Thanks in advance,

>>  
>>=20  
>>  
>> Keith Neuman, Ph.D.=20  
>> Group Vice President - Public Affairs=20  
>> Environics Research Group=20  
>> 613-230-5089=20  
>> keith.neuman@environics.ca=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.  
>  
> -----  
> 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: Tue, 10 Mar 2009 03:41:31 -0400  
Reply-To: Eric Plutzer <[exp12@PSU.EDU](mailto:exp12@PSU.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Eric Plutzer <[exp12@PSU.EDU](mailto:exp12@PSU.EDU)>  
Subject: American Religious Identification Survey  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: [AAPORNET%200903092100012562.A1D4@LISTS.ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET%200903092100012562.A1D4@LISTS.ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=utf-8

Joel and colleagues,

I have not read the full report and state-by-state estimation is trickier to get right (one really needs different post-stratification weights in each state).

But the overall trend is consistent with results from major face to face surveys like the GSS. According to the GSS, the "no religion" category represented about 6-8% of the adult population in the 70s and 80s, started moving up in the early and mid 1990s, and has been about 14-17% in the 2000s,

with some indication of continued increase between 2004 and 2008.

\*

What this means is another story. It could represent a fundamental change in values for about 10% of the public. Or it could represent the fact that many disaffected church-goers in the 1970s attended for a variety of reasons related to family or community expectations and these folks no longer go through the motions.

- Eric

----- Forwarded message -----

Date: Mon, 9 Mar 2009 13:20:37 -0700  
From: Joel Moskowitz <jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU>  
Subject: American Religious Identification Survey

The results of the American Religious Identification Survey (ARIS 2008) appear in more than 390 news stories today. The study reports dramatic differences over time regarding religious identification among American adults. I am curious whether AAPOR members believe that 18-year trend data (1990, 2001, 2008) from these national telephone surveys can be meaningfully interpreted.

---

Eric Plutzer, Guest Researcher (until Aug 2009)  
Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung  
Reichpietschufer 50  
10785 Berlin  
Tel: +49-30-25491-375

and  
Academic Director, Survey Research Center  
The Pennsylvania State University

-----  
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, 10 Mar 2009 09:58:44 -0400  
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: Looking for interviewer training resources  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: A<[042701c9a11d\\$fc66705b00a8c0@BRICORP.com](mailto:042701c9a11d$fc66705b00a8c0@BRICORP.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

The 2nd edition of the CMOR-MRA Interviewer/Supervisor Training Modules are available on the MRA website:  
<http://www.mra-net.org/publications/cmor.cfm>

Cheers,  
Howard Fienberg  
Director of Government Affairs  
The Marketing Research Association (MRA)

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Paul Braun  
Sent: Monday, March 09, 2009 9:17 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Looking for interviewer training resources

Keith,

CMOR produces a set of materials which are excellent

Cmor.org

Regards

Paul

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Keith Neuman  
Sent: Monday, March 09, 2009 8:28 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Looking for interviewer training resources

I am looking for proven, time-tested resources for training interviewers (for telephone surveys), including manuals, books, online resources or courses.

Any suggestions would be most appreciated. Feel free to post on AAPORNET (so others can benefit) or send directly to me at [keith.neuman@environics.ca](mailto:keith.neuman@environics.ca)

Thanks in advance,

Keith Neuman, Ph.D.  
Group Vice President - Public Affairs  
Environics Research Group

613-230-5089  
keith.neuman@environics.ca

-----  
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.

-----  
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 Mar 2009 12:17:36 -0400  
Reply-To: "Blumberg, Stephen J. (CDC/CCHIS/NCHS)" <[swb5@CDC.GOV](mailto:swb5@CDC.GOV)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Blumberg, Stephen J. (CDC/CCHIS/NCHS)" <[swb5@CDC.GOV](mailto:swb5@CDC.GOV)>  
Subject: State-level estimates from NCHS on wireless substitution  
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

Today, the National Center for Health Statistics released its first  
state-by-state estimates of the proportion of wireless-only households.

Oklahoma is leading the nation's wireless-only movement, with more than  
one in four households (26.2%) in that state using only wireless phones  
in 2007. On the other end of the spectrum, only 5.1% of households in  
Vermont were wireless-only in 2007.

These estimates were produced in collaboration with the State Health  
Access Data Assistance Center at the University of Minnesota, with  
support by a grant from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation.

The online report may be found at:

<http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhsr/nhsr014.htm>

Note: The tables may be easier to read if you download the PDF version  
of the report.

--Stephen--

Stephen J. Blumberg, Ph.D.  
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention  
National Center for Health Statistics  
Hyattsville, Maryland  
sblumberg@cdc.gov

-----  
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, 11 Mar 2009 12:17:30 -0700  
Reply-To: "James P. Murphy" <[jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM](mailto:jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "James P. Murphy" <[jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM](mailto:jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Stamp Affixing Machine  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU, John Marcum <[jmarcum@CTR.PCUSA.ORG](mailto:jmarcum@CTR.PCUSA.ORG)>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

John --

When stamps had glue that required moistening, we used inexpensive manual devices that were loaded with a "coil" of 100 plus a small supply of water. It worked okay but not great. Now coils are all "peel off" so you cannot do that. For small mailings (e.g. <2,000) we have the print shop do it manually. For larger mailings, you want a mail or lettershop that has a variety of equipment for automated insertion, sealing and affixing stamps. Those machines are very expensive and cost-justified only on the basis of being in almost constant use. There are a good number of these companies around, mostly serving the direct mail industry.

The stamped USPS envelopes Nick mentioned have been available for decades. They are very handy but, the last time I asked, are not available in the #9 size, which is what fits into the #10 outgoing envelope but is still large enough for a tri-folded 8.5 x 11 sheet or booklet. You would not want to fold a #10 to insert into another #10. However, it would fit if you went out in the next size bigger than #10. That would have to be checked because

se=20

Uncle charges more than 42 cents for formats only very slightly bigger th=

an=20

#10 (even if less than 1 ounce.). I've used stamped return envelopes for=20=

75% of our mail surveys over the past ten years. You get better response=20=

levels. Dillman's first book is an excellent reference for practical issu=

es=20

like this, esp. when applied to surveys with non-commercial sponsorship.=20=

Good luck. JIM MURPHY

-----  
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, 11 Mar 2009 15:00:27 -0500

Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>

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

From: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>

Subject: Re: Stamp Affixing Machine

Comments: To: "James P. Murphy" <[jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM](mailto:jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM)>

Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

In-Reply-To: <[LISTSERV%200903111217307384.BDF6@LISTS.ASU.EDU](mailto:LISTSERV%200903111217307384.BDF6@LISTS.ASU.EDU)>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

James. Link to stamped #9s from the USPS below. New to me.

<http://shop.usps.com/webapp/wcs/stores/servlet/ProductDisplay?catalogId=10152&storeId=10001&categoryId=15602&productId=41401&langId=-1&WT.ac=41401>

Nick

James P. Murphy wrote:

>John --

>

>When stamps had glue that required moistening, we used inexpensive manual

>devices that were loaded with a "coil" of 100 plus a small supply of water.

>It worked okay but not great. Now coils are all "peel off" so you cannot do

>that. For small mailings (e.g. <2,000) we have the print shop do it

>manually. For larger mailings, you want a mail or lettershop that has a

>variety of equipment for automated insertion, sealing and affixing stamps.

>Those machines are very expensive and cost-justified only on the basis of

>being in almost constant use. There are a good number of these companies

>around, mostly serving the direct mail industry.

>

>The stamped USPS envelopes Nick mentioned have been available for decades.  
>They are very handy but, the last time I asked, are not available in the #9  
>size, which is what fits into the #10 outgoing envelope but is still large  
>enough for a tri-folded 8.5 x 11 sheet or booklet. You would not want to  
>fold a #10 to insert into another #10. However, it would fit if you went  
>out in the next size bigger than #10. That would have to be checked because  
>Uncle charges more than 42 cents for formats only very slightly bigger than  
>#10 (even if less than 1 ounce.). I've used stamped return envelopes for  
>75% of our mail surveys over the past ten years. You get better response  
>levels. Dillman's first book is an excellent reference for practical issues  
>like this, esp. when applied to surveys with non-commercial sponsorship.  
>Good luck. JIM MURPHY

>  
>-----  
>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: Wed, 11 Mar 2009 16:40:57 -0400  
Reply-To: "James P. Murphy" <[jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM](mailto:jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "James P. Murphy" <[jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM](mailto:jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Stamp Affixing Machine  
Comments: To: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[49B8185B.7040402@marketsharescorp.com](mailto:49B8185B.7040402@marketsharescorp.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Outstanding! Thanks Nick. I asked in the Princeton P.O. only about a month ago. These will be very useful.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.  
J.P. MURPHY & COMPANY  
609 921 2432 Princeton, N.J.  
772 219 7671 Stuart, Fla.  
610 408 8800 Mobile  
[www.jpmurphy.com](http://www.jpmurphy.com)  
[jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com](mailto:jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com)



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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Nick Panagakis  
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2009 4:00 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Stamp Affixing Machine

James. Link to stamped #9s from the USPS below. New to me.

<http://shop.usps.com/webapp/wcs/stores/servlet/ProductDisplay?catalogId=10152&storeId=10001&categoryId=15602&productId=41401&langId=-1&WT.ac=41401>

Nick

James P. Murphy wrote:

>John --

>

>When stamps had glue that required moistening, we used inexpensive manual  
>devices that were loaded with a "coil" of 100 plus a small supply of water.

>It worked okay but not great. Now coils are all "peel off" so you cannot do  
>that. For small mailings (e.g. <2,000) we have the print shop do it

>manually. For larger mailings, you want a mail or lettershop that has a  
>variety of equipment for automated insertion, sealing and affixing stamps.

>Those machines are very expensive and cost-justified only on the basis of  
>being in almost constant use. There are a good number of these companies

>around, mostly serving the direct mail industry.

>

>The stamped USPS envelopes Nick mentioned have been available for decades.

>They are very handy but, the last time I asked, are not available in the #9

>size, which is what fits into the #10 outgoing envelope but is still large

>enough for a tri-folded 8.5 x 11 sheet or booklet. You would not want to

>fold a #10 to insert into another #10. However, it would fit if you went

>out in the next size bigger than #10. That would have to be checked because

>Uncle charges more than 42 cents for formats only very slightly bigger than

>#10 (even if less than 1 ounce.). I've used stamped return envelopes for

>75% of our mail surveys over the past ten years. You get better response

>levels. Dillman's first book is an excellent reference for practical issues

>like this, esp. when applied to surveys with non-commercial sponsorship.

>Good luck. JIM MURPHY

>

>-----

>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: Wed, 11 Mar 2009 17:47:28 -0400  
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: Re: Stamp Affixing Machine  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[006601c9a289\\$ae5e3a80\\$b29cdd62@TulipBreathing](mailto:006601c9a289$ae5e3a80$b29cdd62@TulipBreathing)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

James,  
Ditto on your recollections of the old school affixers. If you wanted stay old-school with the newer self-stick stamps for about \$22:  
<http://www.cleansweepsupply.com/pages/item-predl32.html>  
(This is not an endorsement, I have not used this device, but I was interested to see that it existed.)  
Jim

Jim Ellis  
Director of Research  
Center for Survey Research  
University of Virginia  
434-243-5224

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of James P. Murphy  
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2009 4:41 PM  
To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Subject: Re: Stamp Affixing Machine

Outstanding! Thanks Nick. I asked in the Princeton P.O. only about a month ago. These will be very useful.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.  
J.P. MURPHY & COMPANY  
609 921 2432 Princeton, N.J.  
772 219 7671 Stuart, Fla.

610 408 8800 Mobile  
www.jpMurphy.com  
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Nick Panagakis  
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2009 4:00 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Stamp Affixing Machine

James. Link to stamped #9s from the USPS below. New to me.

<http://shop.usps.com/webapp/wcs/stores/servlet/ProductDisplay?catalogId=10152&storeId=10001&categoryId=15602&productId=41401&langId=-1&WT.ac=41401>

Nick

James P. Murphy wrote:

>John --

>

>When stamps had glue that required moistening, we used inexpensive manual  
>devices that were loaded with a "coil" of 100 plus a small supply of water.  
>It worked okay but not great. Now coils are all "peel off" so you cannot do  
>that. For small mailings (e.g. <2,000) we have the print shop do it  
>manually. For larger mailings, you want a mail or lettershop that has a  
>variety of equipment for automated insertion, sealing and affixing stamps.  
>Those machines are very expensive and cost-justified only on the basis of  
>being in almost constant use. There are a good number of these companies  
>around, mostly serving the direct mail industry.

>

>The stamped USPS envelopes Nick mentioned have been available for decades.  
>They are very handy but, the last time I asked, are not available in the #9  
>size, which is what fits into the #10 outgoing envelope but is still large  
>enough for a tri-folded 8.5 x 11 sheet or booklet. You would not want to  
>fold a #10 to insert into another #10. However, it would fit if you went  
>out in the next size bigger than #10. That would have to be checked because  
>Uncle charges more than 42 cents for formats only very slightly bigger than  
>#10 (even if less than 1 ounce.). I've used stamped return envelopes for  
>75% of our mail surveys over the past ten years. You get better response  
>levels. Dillman's first book is an excellent reference for practical issues  
>like this, esp. when applied to surveys with non-commercial sponsorship.  
>Good luck. JIM MURPHY

>

>-----

>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)

---

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, 11 Mar 2009 22:28:42 +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](mailto:mkshares@COMCAST.NET)>  
Subject: Re: Stamp Affixing Machine  
Comments: To: "James P. Murphy" <[jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com](mailto:jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com)>  
Comments: cc: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[006601c9a289\\$ae5e3a80\\$b29cdd62@TulipBreathing](mailto:006601c9a289$ae5e3a80$b29cdd62@TulipBreathing)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=utf-8  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Note that postal rates increase May 11.=20  
<http://www.usps.com/prices/pricechanges.htm>=20

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

From: "James P. Murphy" <[jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com](mailto:jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com)>=20  
To: "Nick Panagakis" <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)=20  
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2009 3:40:57 PM GMT -06:00 US/Canada Central=20  
Subject: RE: Stamp Affixing Machine=20

Outstanding! Thanks Nick. I asked in the Princeton P.O. only about a month=  
=20  
ago. These will be very useful.=20

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.=20  
J.P. MURPHY & COMPANY=20  
609 921 2432 Princeton, N.J.=20

772 219 7671 Stuart, Fla.=20  
610 408 8800 Mobile=20  
www.jpMurphy.com=20  
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com=20  
=C2=A0=20

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Nick Panagakis=20  
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2009 4:00 PM=20  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU=20  
Subject: Re: Stamp Affixing Machine=20

James. Link to stamped #9s from the USPS below. New to me.=20

<http://shop.usps.com/webapp/wcs/stores/servlet/ProductDisplay?catalogId=3D1=015=20&storeId=3D10001&categoryId=3D15602&productId=3D41401&langId=3D-1&WT.ac=3D=41401=20>

Nick=20

James P. Murphy wrote:=20

>John --=20

>=20  
>When stamps had glue that required moistening, we used inexpensive manual=  
=20  
>devices that were loaded with a "coil" of 100 plus a small supply of water=  
.=20  
>It worked okay but not great. Now coils are all "peel off" so you cannot d=  
o=20  
>that. For small mailings (e.g. <2,000) we have the print shop do it=20  
>manually. For larger mailings, you want a mail or lettershop that has a=20  
>variety of equipment for automated insertion, sealing and affixing stamps.=  
=20  
>Those machines are very expensive and cost-justified only on the basis of=  
=20  
>being in almost constant use. There are a good number of these companies=  
=20  
>around, mostly serving the direct mail industry.=20  
>=20  
>The stamped USPS envelopes Nick mentioned have been available for decades.=  
=20  
>They are very handy but, the last time I asked, are not available in the #=  
9=20  
>size, which is what fits into the #10 outgoing envelope but is still large=  
=20  
>enough for a tri-folded 8.5 x 11 sheet or booklet. You would not want to=  
=20  
>fold a #10 to insert into another #10. However, it would fit if you went=  
=20  
>out in the next size bigger than #10. That would have to be checked becaus=  
e=20

>Uncle charges more than 42 cents for formats only very slightly bigger than  
>#10 (even if less than 1 ounce.). I've used stamped return envelopes for  
>75% of our mail surveys over the past ten years. You get better response  
>levels. Dillman's first book is an excellent reference for practical issues  
>like this, esp. when applied to surveys with non-commercial sponsorship.  
>Good luck. JIM MURPHY  
>-----  
>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)  
=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, 11 Mar 2009 18:37:49 -0400  
Reply-To: Cralley Marla <[Marla.Cralley@ARBITRON.COM](mailto:Marla.Cralley@ARBITRON.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Cralley Marla <[Marla.Cralley@ARBITRON.COM](mailto:Marla.Cralley@ARBITRON.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Stamp Affixing Machine  
Comments: To: "nickp@marketsharescorp.com" <[mkshares@COMCAST.NET](mailto:mkshares@COMCAST.NET)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: A<[1995101691.4565971236810522794.JavaMail.root@sz0107a.emeryville.ca.mail.comcast.net](mailto:1995101691.4565971236810522794.JavaMail.root@sz0107a.emeryville.ca.mail.comcast.net)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Everyone run to the post office and pick up a ton on "Forever" stamps!

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of  
nickp@marketsharescorp.com  
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2009 6:29 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Stamp Affixing Machine

Note that postal rates increase May 11.  
<http://www.usps.com/prices/pricechanges.htm>

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

From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com>  
To: "Nick Panagakis" <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2009 3:40:57 PM GMT -06:00 US/Canada Central  
Subject: RE: Stamp Affixing Machine

Outstanding! Thanks Nick. I asked in the Princeton P.O. only about a month ago. These will be very useful.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.  
J.P. MURPHY & COMPANY  
609 921 2432 Princeton, N.J.  
772 219 7671 Stuart, Fla.  
610 408 8800 Mobile  
[www.jpmurphy.com](http://www.jpmurphy.com)  
[jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com](mailto:jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com)

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Nick Panagakis  
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2009 4:00 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Stamp Affixing Machine

James. Link to stamped #9s from the USPS below. New to me.

<http://shop.usps.com/webapp/wcs/stores/servlet/ProductDisplay?catalogId=10152&storeId=10001&categoryId=15602&productId=41401&langId=-1&WT.ac=41401>

Nick

James P. Murphy wrote:

>John --

>

>When stamps had glue that required moistening, we used inexpensive manual  
>devices that were loaded with a "coil" of 100 plus a small supply of water.  
>It worked okay but not great. Now coils are all "peel off" so you cannot do  
>that. For small mailings (e.g. <2,000) we have the print shop do it

>manually. For larger mailings, you want a mail or lettershop that has a  
>variety of equipment for automated insertion, sealing and affixing stamps.  
>Those machines are very expensive and cost-justified only on the basis of  
>being in almost constant use. There are a good number of these companies  
>around, mostly serving the direct mail industry.  
>  
>The stamped USPS envelopes Nick mentioned have been available for decades.  
>They are very handy but, the last time I asked, are not available in the #9  
>size, which is what fits into the #10 outgoing envelope but is still large  
>enough for a tri-folded 8.5 x 11 sheet or booklet. You would not want to  
>fold a #10 to insert into another #10. However, it would fit if you went  
>out in the next size bigger than #10. That would have to be checked because  
>Uncle charges more than 42 cents for formats only very slightly bigger than  
>#10 (even if less than 1 ounce.). I've used stamped return envelopes for  
>75% of our mail surveys over the past ten years. You get better response  
>levels. Dillman's first book is an excellent reference for practical issues  
>like this, esp. when applied to surveys with non-commercial sponsorship.  
>Good luck. JIM MURPHY

>  
>-----  
>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)

---

This e-mail has been scanned by Arbitron's Email Content Service.

---

-----  
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 Mar 2009 10:39:59 -0400  
Reply-To: "Blumberg, Stephen J. (CDC/CCHIS/NCHS)" <[swb5@CDC.GOV](mailto:swb5@CDC.GOV)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Blumberg, Stephen J. (CDC/CCHIS/NCHS)" <[swb5@CDC.GOV](mailto:swb5@CDC.GOV)>  
Subject: More about Burnham violation  
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

Greetings,

In response to several queries regarding the specific requests AAPOR made to Dr. Gilbert Burnham related to the violation of minimal disclosure requirements, there is now additional detail available on the AAPOR website.=20

[http://www.aapor.org/uploads/AAPOR\\_Press\\_Releases/BurhnamDetailWebsite.pdf](http://www.aapor.org/uploads/AAPOR_Press_Releases/BurhnamDetailWebsite.pdf)  
df=20

Council has determined that release of this information was appropriate and allowable under AAPOR's Schedule of Procedures for Code Violations.=20

Best,

Mary Losch  
AAPOR Standards Chair=20

Stephen Blumberg  
AAPOR Associate Standards Chair

---

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, 12 Mar 2009 10:44:27 -0400  
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: Re: Stamp Affixing Machine  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To:  
<[EA2273607A10AC44B894E3B9FD37F5260160AE03@PIWMDPEXC.arbitron.com](mailto:EA2273607A10AC44B894E3B9FD37F5260160AE03@PIWMDPEXC.arbitron.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Sorry to add some fluff here, but my postal clerk at home wonders, "Why are they called Forever Stamps? You can only use them once." I thought that was a good one, especially considering the source.

Jim

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Cralley Marla  
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2009 6:38 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Stamp Affixing Machine

Everyone run to the post office and pick up a ton on "Forever" stamps!

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of  
nickp@marketsharescorp.com  
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2009 6:29 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Stamp Affixing Machine

Note that postal rates increase May 11.  
<http://www.usps.com/prices/pricechanges.htm>

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

From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com>  
To: "Nick Panagakis" <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2009 3:40:57 PM GMT -06:00 US/Canada Central  
Subject: RE: Stamp Affixing Machine

Outstanding! Thanks Nick. I asked in the Princeton P.O. only about a month ago. These will be very useful.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.  
J.P. MURPHY & COMPANY  
609 921 2432 Princeton, N.J.  
772 219 7671 Stuart, Fla.  
610 408 8800 Mobile  
[www.jpmurphy.com](http://www.jpmurphy.com)  
[jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com](mailto:jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com)

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Nick Panagakis  
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2009 4:00 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Stamp Affixing Machine

James. Link to stamped #9s from the USPS below. New to me.

<http://shop.usps.com/webapp/wcs/stores/servlet/ProductDisplay?catalogId=10152&storeId=10001&categoryId=15602&productId=41401&langId=-1&WT.ac=41401>

Nick

James P. Murphy wrote:

>John --

>

>When stamps had glue that required moistening, we used inexpensive manual

>devices that were loaded with a "coil" of 100 plus a small supply of water.

>It worked okay but not great. Now coils are all "peel off" so you cannot do

>that. For small mailings (e.g. <2,000) we have the print shop do it

>manually. For larger mailings, you want a mail or lettershop that has a

>variety of equipment for automated insertion, sealing and affixing stamps.

>Those machines are very expensive and cost-justified only on the basis of

>being in almost constant use. There are a good number of these companies

>around, mostly serving the direct mail industry.

>

>The stamped USPS envelopes Nick mentioned have been available for decades.

>They are very handy but, the last time I asked, are not available in the #9

>size, which is what fits into the #10 outgoing envelope but is still large

>enough for a tri-folded 8.5 x 11 sheet or booklet. You would not want to

>fold a #10 to insert into another #10. However, it would fit if you went

>out in the next size bigger than #10. That would have to be checked because

>Uncle charges more than 42 cents for formats only very slightly bigger than

>#10 (even if less than 1 ounce.). I've used stamped return envelopes for

>75% of our mail surveys over the past ten years. You get better response

>levels. Dillman's first book is an excellent reference for practical issues

>like this, esp. when applied to surveys with non-commercial sponsorship.

>Good luck. JIM MURPHY

>

>-----

>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

---

This e-mail has been scanned by Arbitron's Email Content Service.

---

-----  
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

-----  
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, 12 Mar 2009 10:58:16 -0400  
Reply-To: "Blumberg, Stephen J. (CDC/CCHIS/NCHS)" <[swb5@CDC.GOV](mailto:swb5@CDC.GOV)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Blumberg, Stephen J. (CDC/CCHIS/NCHS)" <[swb5@CDC.GOV](mailto:swb5@CDC.GOV)>  
Subject: Re: More about Burnham violation  
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

Sorry, everyone, for the link that was too long to fit on one line.

The document is available directly from the AAPOR homepage, or you can use:

<http://tinyurl.com/avl3nq>

Best,

Mary Losch  
AAPOR Standards Chair=20

Stephen Blumberg  
AAPOR Associate Standards Chair

-----  
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, 12 Mar 2009 21:10:33 -0700  
Reply-To: Paul Goodwin <paulg@GSVRESEARCH.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Paul Goodwin <paulg@GSVRESEARCH.COM>  
Subject: Help! a 6th grade magnet math class invited me to talk about polling  
Comments: To: "AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <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

I've been asked to speak to a 6th grade magnet school math class about polling. I desperately need suggestions for a fun 15-20 minute lesson for smart 6th graders. I have visions of Bertie Wooster speaking in front of the girls' school.

Paul Goodwin  
Goodwin Simon Victoria Research  
P.O. Box 366  
Culver City CA 90232  
310/558-4761 (phone)  
310/210-8984 (mobile)  
paulg@gsvresearch.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: Fri, 13 Mar 2009 04:11:42 -0700  
Reply-To: Spagat M <m.spagat@RHUL.AC.UK>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Spagat M <m.spagat@RHUL.AC.UK>  
Subject: Polling on Iraq War  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Hello everyone.

I am trying to put together a database of public opinion towards the invasion and subsequent occupation of Iraq between late 2002 until at least March of 2009. I'm interested in a few basics such as the strength of belief in correctness or otherwise of the US getting into and staying in Iraq, perceptions of the success or otherwise of military operations in Iraq

and expectations of whether the whole thing will/should be counted as a success in the end.

Ideally I'd like to obtain all such polling data although I fear that there may be hundreds upon hundred of such polls so ferreting out all of them may not be feasible. In this case I'd want to design a strategy to try to obtain a large, representative sample of such polls.

I imagine that a lot of people on this list have been involved in opinion polling on attitudes toward the Iraq war. Can people please help me out by pointing me toward their own work or the work of others?

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Mike Spagat  
Department of Economics  
Royal Holloway College  
University of London  
Egham  
Surrey  
TW20 0EX  
United Kingdom  
M.Spagat@rhul.ac.uk

---

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, 13 Mar 2009 12:10:07 +0000  
Reply-To: "nickp@marketsharescorp.com" <mkshares@COMCAST.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "nickp@marketsharescorp.com" <mkshares@COMCAST.NET>  
Subject: Re: Polling on Iraq War  
Comments: To: Spagat M <m.spagat@RHUL.AC.UK>  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
In-Reply-To: <20253692.5180961236945993304.JavaMail.root@sz0107a.emeryville.ca.mail.comcast.net>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=utf-8  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Have you tried Polling Report?  
<http://www.pollingreport.com/iraq.htm>

When you get to the bottom of the page, click "earlier polling on Iraq". Do

n't know how many pages in total.=20

Polling Report is a good place to start such searches.=20

Nick=20

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

From: "Spagat M" <m.spagat@RHUL.AC.UK>=20

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU=20

Sent: Friday, March 13, 2009 6:11:42 AM GMT -06:00 US/Canada Central=20

Subject: Polling on Iraq War=20

Hello everyone.=20

I am trying to put together a database of public opinion towards the=20  
invasion and subsequent occupation of Iraq between late 2002 until at least=

March of 2009. =C2=A0I=E2=80=99m interested in a few basics such as the str=  
ength of=20

belief in correctness or otherwise of the US getting into and staying in=20  
Iraq, perceptions of the success or otherwise of military operations in Ira=  
q=20

and expectations of whether the whole thing will/should be counted as a=20  
success in the end.=20

Ideally I=E2=80=99d like to obtain all such polling data although I fear th=  
at there=20

may be hundreds upon hundred of such polls so ferreting out all of them may=  
=20

not be feasible. =C2=A0In this case I=E2=80=99d want to design a strategy t=  
o try to=20

obtain a large, representative sample of such polls.=20

I imagine that a lot of people on this list have been involved in opinion=  
=20

polling on attitudes toward the Iraq war. =C2=A0Can people please help me o=  
ut by=20

pointing me toward their own work or the work of others?=20

Thank you very much for your consideration.=20

Mike Spagat=20

Department of Economics=20

Royal Holloway College=20

University of London=20

Egham=20

Surrey=20

TW20 0EX=20

United Kingdom=20

M.Spagat@rhul.ac.uk=20

=C2=A0=20

-----=20

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .=20  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.=20  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)=  
u=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: Fri, 13 Mar 2009 08:01:10 -0400  
Reply-To: "Siegel, Jon" <[jsiegel@HARRISINTERACTIVE.COM](mailto:jsiegel@HARRISINTERACTIVE.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Siegel, Jon" <[jsiegel@HARRISINTERACTIVE.COM](mailto:jsiegel@HARRISINTERACTIVE.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Help! a 6th grade magnet math class invited me to talk  
about

polling  
Comments: To: Paul Goodwin <[paulg@GSVRESEARCH.COM](mailto:paulg@GSVRESEARCH.COM)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: A<[80CE638E-9F83-4104-B8C7-F33DD6A7CDE7@gsvresearch.com](mailto:80CE638E-9F83-4104-B8C7-F33DD6A7CDE7@gsvresearch.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I do this all the time. Have them do a blind potato chip taste test.  
Keeps them engaged and you can use it to talk in pretty basic terms  
about nearly everything.  
Jon Siegel

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Paul Goodwin  
Sent: Friday, March 13, 2009 12:11 AM  
To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Subject: Help! a 6th grade magnet math class invited me to talk about  
polling

I've been asked to speak to a 6th grade magnet school math class about  
polling. I desperately need suggestions for a fun 15-20 minute lesson  
for smart 6th graders. I have visions of Bertie Wooster speaking in  
front of the girls' school.

Paul Goodwin  
Goodwin Simon Victoria Research  
P.O. Box 366  
Culver City CA 90232  
310/558-4761 (phone)  
310/210-8984 (mobile)  
[paulg@gsvresearch.com](mailto:paulg@gsvresearch.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.

---

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, 13 Mar 2009 08:22:24 -0400

Reply-To: Benjamin Phillips <[bphillips@BRANDEIS.EDU](mailto:bphillips@BRANDEIS.EDU)>

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

From: Benjamin Phillips <[bphillips@BRANDEIS.EDU](mailto:bphillips@BRANDEIS.EDU)>

Organization: Brandeis University

Subject: Re: Polling on Iraq War

Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

In-Reply-To:

<[1787861775.5181611236946207742.JavaMail.root@sz0107a.emeryville.ca.mail.comcast.net](mailto:1787861775.5181611236946207742.JavaMail.root@sz0107a.emeryville.ca.mail.comcast.net)>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

iPoll at the Roper Center at the University of Connecticut is a wonderful resource:

[http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/data\\_access/ipoll/ipoll.html](http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/data_access/ipoll/ipoll.html)

It allows one to search questions asked across most US opinion polls and examine the responses. It works best if you or your institution have a subscription (you can download the datasets) but free access (after registering) allows one to see a limited selection of the search results. If one can narrow down the query enough, this restriction may not come into play.

Ben

--

---

Benjamin Phillips, Ph.D.

Associate Research Scientist

Steinhardt Social Research Institute and

Cohen Center for Modern Jewish Studies

Brandeis University MS014

415 South Street

Waltham, MA 02454-9110

(ph) 781-736-3855 (fax) 781-736-3929

<http://www.brandeis.edu/cmjs/Person.cfm?idstaff=42>

Email: [bphillips@brandeis.edu](mailto:bphillips@brandeis.edu)

---

nickp@marketsharescorp.com wrote:

> Have you tried Polling Report?

> <http://www.pollingreport.com/iraq.htm>

>

>

> When you get to the bottom of the page, click "earlier polling on Iraq".

Don't know how many pages in total.

>

>

> Polling Report is a good place to start such searches.

>

>

> Nick

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

> From: "Spagat M" <m.spagat@RHUL.AC.UK>

> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

> Sent: Friday, March 13, 2009 6:11:42 AM GMT -06:00 US/Canada Central

> Subject: Polling on Iraq War

>

> Hello everyone.

>

> I am trying to put together a database of public opinion towards the  
> invasion and subsequent occupation of Iraq between late 2002 until at least

> March of 2009. Iâ€™m interested in a few basics such as the strength of

> belief in correctness or otherwise of the US getting into and staying in

> Iraq, perceptions of the success or otherwise of military operations in Iraq

> and expectations of whether the whole thing will/should be counted as a

> success in the end.

>

> Ideally Iâ€™d like to obtain all such polling data although I fear that  
there

> may be hundreds upon hundred of such polls so ferreting out all of them may

> not be feasible. In this case Iâ€™d want to design a strategy to try to

> obtain a large, representative sample of such polls.

>

> I imagine that a lot of people on this list have been involved in opinion

> polling on attitudes toward the Iraq war. Can people please help me out by

> pointing me toward their own work or the work of others?

>

> Thank you very much for your consideration.

>

> Mike Spagat

> Department of Economics

> Royal Holloway College

> University of London

> Egham

> Surrey

> TW20 0EX

> United Kingdom

> M.Spagat@rhul.ac.uk

>

-----  
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, 13 Mar 2009 09:10:54 -0400  
Reply-To: Sid Groeneman <sid@GROENEMAN.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Sid Groeneman <sid@GROENEMAN.COM>  
Subject: Re: American Religious Identification Survey  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Comments: cc: Joel Moskowitz <jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU>, Eric Plutzer <exp12@PSU.EDU>  
In-Reply-To: <7.0.1.0.2.20090309121416.052f98a8@uclink4.berkeley.edu>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII; format=flowed; delp=yes  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Mime-Version: 1.0 (Apple Message framework v930.3)

Substantively, the ARIS press release and many news stories have highlighted how much religious identification has declined. That is hardly new news. Their own 2001 survey first picked up on this trend, showing that the size of the "no religion" segment had approximately doubled in the past decade, to 14.2%. This was subsequently confirmed by estimates in a 2002 survey I did with Gary Tobin (16.1%), based on a national RDD sample of 10,204, and then again by the Pew Research Center (16.1%) in a 2007 national survey of more than 35,000. The authors of the ARIS study's interpretation of the "change" from 14.2% (2001) to 15.0% (2008) as continuation of a trend in non-identification strikes me as dubious. Others might see this 0.8% difference over 7 years as evidence of flattening of the "no religion" growth curve.

Sid Groeneman

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

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

---

---

Date: Fri, 13 Mar 2009 11:10:36 -0400  
Reply-To: Jaki McCarthy <Jaki\_McCarthy@NASS.USDA.GOV>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Jaki McCarthy <Jaki\_McCarthy@NASS.USDA.GOV>  
Subject: Job Opening  
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu, SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU, IREG-L@LIST.NIH.GOV  
Comments: cc: Dale Atkinson <Dale\_Atkinson@nass.usda.gov>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hello all (and apologies for cross posting),

The USDA's National Agricultural Statistics Service has a current opening in our Research Division, located in Fairfax, VA. If you know of anyone interested, please forward this information to them.

Thanks!

Announcement Number:

NASS-2009-0035

Vacancy Description:

Supervisory Mathematical Statistician

Open Period:

03/12/2009 - 03/26/2009

Series/Grade:

GS-1529-14

Salary:

\$102,721.00 TO \$133,543.00

Promotion Potential:

GS-14

Hiring Agency:

NASS

Duty Locations:

1 vacancy in Fairfax, VA

For more information, Contact:

Dakia Jones, 202-690-3694 [Dakia.Jones@ars.usda.gov](mailto:Dakia.Jones@ars.usda.gov)

AREA OF CONSIDERATION: Government-wide

Job Summary:

The National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) is the data collection and dissemination arm of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. NASS gathers and publishes a vast array of information on every facet of U.S.

agriculture, including production, economics, demographics, and the environment. The agency conducts hundreds of surveys each year and, through the Agricultural Statistics Board, issues nearly 500 national statistical reports annually. The agency has 46 field offices that serve all 50 states and Puerto Rico.

The position is located in the Research and Development Division, Census and Survey Research Branch, Sampling and Estimation Research Section. The incumbent serves as supervisor for a staff of approximately seven Mathematical Statisticians assigned to the section, planning and evaluating the work and overseeing day-to-day activities.

Major Duties:

The incumbent serves as the head of the Sampling and Estimation Research Section providing administrative and technical supervision for a staff of lower graded Mathematical Statisticians assigned to the section. He/she plans, conducts and directs research to develop statistical methodology for the Agency's operational census and survey programs. The incumbent serves as the Agency's technical expert on statistical methodology research, including research on sampling, estimation, and statistical data editing and imputation. He/she will coordinate the development of the Section's

statistical methodology research studies with other sections, branches and divisions of NASS and its Field Offices.

THIS VACANCY ANNOUNCEMENT IS BEING ANNOUNCED ON OPM's WEBSITE -  
<http://www.usajobs.opm.gov>

If anyone has any specific questions about the position, you may contact Dale Atkinson 703-877-8000, ext. 130.

Jaki S. McCarthy

USDA's National Agricultural Statistics Service  
Research and Development Division  
703-877-8000 ext 142  
[jaki\\_mccarthy@nass.usda.gov](mailto:jaki_mccarthy@nass.usda.gov)

-----  
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, 13 Mar 2009 10:08:33 -0700  
Reply-To: Paul Goodwin <[paulg@GSVRESEARCH.COM](mailto:paulg@GSVRESEARCH.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Paul Goodwin <[paulg@GSVRESEARCH.COM](mailto:paulg@GSVRESEARCH.COM)>  
Subject: thanks for suggestions -- 6th grade magnet classes  
Comments: To: "AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto: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

I really appreciate the suggestions. I will probably try to do some M&M tricks, and maybe a pizza topping poll. I'll let you know how it goes, assuming I am not chased out of the classroom by rotten tomatoes, a la Bertie Wooster. Something tells me that smart 6th graders are a tough crowd to please. I just hope that no one asks me to explain what happened with the New Hampshire primary polls last year!

Paul Goodwin  
Goodwin Simon Victoria Research  
P.O. Box 366  
Culver City CA 90232  
310/558-4761 (phone)  
310/210-8984 (mobile)  
[paulg@gsvresearch.com](mailto:paulg@gsvresearch.com)

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

---

Date: Fri, 13 Mar 2009 16:20:47 -0400

Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>

Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing

Subject: Re: thanks for suggestions -- 6th grade magnet classes

Comments: To: Paul Goodwin <paulg@GSVRESEARCH.COM>

Comments: cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

In-Reply-To: <BC7332EE-1416-45E5-9542-8E7EE567F53A@gsvresearch.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

If some students do ask about the NH primary polls, just tell them that by the time they are old enough to join AAPOR themselves, Council may actually have reported to the membership on the progress, or lack thereof, of the investigation into the causes of the errors.

In any case, warn them to be highly skeptical of what they hear or read about polls and polling in the news media.

A few days before the November 2008 election, NPR's Weekend Edition Saturday brought on their "Math Guy" Keith Devlin to explain all about random samples and margins of error. After giving some simplistic but reasonably clear explanations, he went on to state that the reason the polls predicted Dewey would beat Truman in 1948 was only wealthy people had telephones at the time, so when the pollsters called people to ask them who they would vote for, they didn't get a random sample of voters.

If interested, you can listen to the segment at:

<http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=96432107>

You can also see the "correction" NPR added after I wrote pointing out that telephone interviewing was rarely if ever used in polling in 1948 and that furthermore, the Mosteller report specifically discussed the issue of sampling in those polls and found no meaningful differences between results from random and non-random (quota) samples that year.

Jan Werner

---

Paul Goodwin wrote:

> I really appreciate the suggestions. I will probably try to do some  
> M&M tricks, and maybe a pizza topping poll. I'll let you know how it  
> goes, assuming I am not chased out of the classroom by rotten  
> tomatoes, a la Bertie Wooster. Something tells me that smart 6th  
> graders are a tough crowd to please. I just hope that no one asks me  
> to explain what happened with the New Hampshire primary polls last year!  
>  
>  
> Paul Goodwin

> Goodwin Simon Victoria Research  
> P.O. Box 366  
> Culver City CA 90232  
> 310/558-4761 (phone  
> 310/210-8984 (mobile)  
> paulg@gsvresearch.com

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

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

>  
>  
-----

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

=====

Date: Fri, 13 Mar 2009 21:33:46 +0000  
Reply-To: "Moon, Nick (GfK NOP, UK)" <nick.moon@GFK.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Moon, Nick (GfK NOP, UK)" <nick.moon@GFK.COM>  
Subject: Re: thanks for suggestions -- 6th grade magnet classes  
Comments: To: "jwerner@jwdp.com" <jwerner@jwdp.com>,  
"AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
In-Reply-To: <49BAC01F.9030602@jwdp.com>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

well you've taken me back a long time. Many many years ago Keith Devlin used to write a maths puzzle column in the Guardian newspaper in the UK - including one about conditional probability that prompted a months-long correspondence from maths experts, long before Marilyn vos Santos started the whole goat/car thing running.

I always wondered what had happened to him!

---

From: AAPORNET [AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jan Werner [jwerner@JWDP.COM]  
Sent: 13 March 2009 20:20  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: thanks for suggestions -- 6th grade magnet classes

If some students do ask about the NH primary polls, just tell them that by the time they are old enough to join AAPOR themselves, Council may actually have reported to the membership on the progress, or lack thereof, of the investigation into the causes of the errors.

In any case, warn them to be highly skeptical of what they hear or read about polls and polling in the news media.

A few days before the November 2008 election, NPR's Weekend Edition Saturday brought on their "Math Guy" Keith Devlin to explain all about random samples and margins of error. After giving some simplistic but reasonably clear explanations, he went on to state that the reason the polls predicted Dewey would beat Truman in 1948 was only wealthy people had telephones at the time, so when the pollsters called people to ask them who they would vote for, they didn't get a random sample of voters.

If interested, you can listen to the segment at:

<http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=96432107>

You can also see the "correction" NPR added after I wrote pointing out that telephone interviewing was rarely if ever used in polling in 1948 and that furthermore, the Mosteller report specifically discussed the issue of sampling in those polls and found no meaningful differences between results from random and non-random (quota) samples that year.

Jan Werner

---

Paul Goodwin wrote:

> I really appreciate the suggestions. I will probably try to do some  
> M&M tricks, and maybe a pizza topping poll. I'll let you know how it  
> goes, assuming I am not chased out of the classroom by rotten  
> tomatoes, a la Bertie Wooster. Something tells me that smart 6th  
> graders are a tough crowd to please. I just hope that no one asks me  
> to explain what happened with the New Hampshire primary polls last year!

>

>

> Paul Goodwin  
> Goodwin Simon Victoria Research  
> P.O. Box 366  
> Culver City CA 90232  
> 310/558-4761 (phone  
> 310/210-8984 (mobile)  
> paulg@gsvresearch.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)

>

>



-----  
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: Fri, 13 Mar 2009 17:43:45 -0400  
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: Wrong President too  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
In-Reply-To: <[49BAC01F.9030602@jwdp.com](mailto:49BAC01F.9030602@jwdp.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Disposition: inline  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Worse yet, they seem to be alluding to the Literary Digest survey done when  
Franklin Roosevelt was running (1936 I think) for the presidency.

Although this was not a telephone survey, the legend is that the Literary  
Digest used telephone listing to select their sample.

And it wasn't Truman in 1948 either!

Susan

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

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>

Date: Friday, March 13, 2009 4:21 pm

Subject: Re: thanks for suggestions -- 6th grade magnet classes

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

> If some students do ask about the NH primary polls, just tell them  
> that by the time they are old enough to join AAPOR themselves,  
> Council may  
> actually have reported to the membership on the progress, or lack  
> thereof, of the investigation into the causes of the errors.  
>  
> In any case, warn them to be highly skeptical of what they hear or  
> read about polls and polling in the news media.  
>  
> A few days before the November 2008 election, NPR's Weekend Edition  
> Saturday brought on their "Math Guy" Keith Devlin to explain all about  
> random samples and margins of error. After giving some simplistic but  
> reasonably clear explanations, he went on to state that the reason the  
> polls predicted Dewey would beat Truman in 1948 was only wealthy  
> people had telephones at the time, so when the pollsters called  
> people to ask  
> them who they would vote for, they didn't get a random sample of  
> voters.  
> If interested, you can listen to the segment at:  
> <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=96432107>  
>  
> You can also see the "correction" NPR added after I wrote pointing out  
> that telephone interviewing was rarely if ever used in polling in 1948  
> and that furthermore, the Mosteller report specifically discussed the  
> issue of sampling in those polls and found no meaningful differences  
> between results from random and non-random (quota) samples that year.  
>  
> Jan Werner  
> \_\_\_\_\_  
>  
> Paul Goodwin wrote:  
>> I really appreciate the suggestions. I will probably try to do some  
>> M&M tricks, and maybe a pizza topping poll. I'll let you know  
>> how it  
>> goes, assuming I am not chased out of the classroom by rotten  
>> tomatoes, a la Bertie Wooster. Something tells me that smart 6th  
>> graders are a tough crowd to please. I just hope that no one  
>> asks me  
>> to explain what happened with the New Hampshire primary polls  
>> last year!  
>>  
>>  
>> Paul Goodwin  
>> Goodwin Simon Victoria Research

>> P.O. Box 366  
>> Culver City CA 90232  
>> 310/558-4761 (phone  
>> 310/210-8984 (mobile)  
>> paulg@gsvresearch.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)

>>  
>>  
>

> -----  
> 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)

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> .  
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, 13 Mar 2009 17:47:01 -0400  
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: thanks for suggestions -- 6th grade magnet classes  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[BC7332EE-1416-45E5-9542-8E7EE567F53A@gsvresearch.com](mailto:BC7332EE-1416-45E5-9542-8E7EE567F53A@gsvresearch.com)>

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

When my son was in 6th grade, for his science fair project he surveyed three classes, two regular and one honors that replicated the "Oxford Items" on the NSF Science Surveys and we added some questions on pseudoscience (e.g., ghosts and aliens).

The honors class scored higher on knowing science facts but was, alas, as likely to endorse pseudoscience items as their regular class colleagues.

SCL

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

From: Paul Goodwin <paulg@GSVRESEARCH.COM>  
Date: Friday, March 13, 2009 1:10 pm  
Subject: thanks for suggestions -- 6th grade magnet classes  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

> I really appreciate the suggestions. I will probably try to do some  
> M&M tricks, and maybe a pizza topping poll. I'll let you know how it  
> goes, assuming I am not chased out of the classroom by rotten  
> tomatoes, a la Bertie Wooster. Something tells me that smart 6th  
> graders are a tough crowd to please. I just hope that no one asks me  
> to explain what happened with the New Hampshire primary polls last  
> year!

>  
> Paul Goodwin  
> Goodwin Simon Victoria Research  
> P.O. Box 366  
> Culver City CA 90232  
> 310/558-4761 (phone  
> 310/210-8984 (mobile)  
> paulg@gsvresearch.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

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> .  
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, 13 Mar 2009 18:42:33 -0400  
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: Wrong President too  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[1771798603-1236982953-cardhu\\_decombobulator\\_blackberry.rim.net-1739880405-@bx1092.bisx.produk.on.blackberry](mailto:1771798603-1236982953-cardhu_decombobulator_blackberry.rim.net-1739880405-@bx1092.bisx.produk.on.blackberry)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-Disposition: inline  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Truman did beat Dewey in 1948 but there weren't any telephone surveys then, quota sampling was royalty, interviewing stopped too soon, and I think by then the Literary Digest was out of business!

Susan

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

From: [RMWorcester@yahoo.com](mailto:RMWorcester@yahoo.com)  
Date: Friday, March 13, 2009 6:22 pm  
Subject: Re: Wrong President too  
To: Susan Carol Losh <[slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu](mailto:slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu)>

> Yes, 36; but Harry S (no period) Truman did beat Dewey in 1948.  
> Sent from my BlackBerry® wireless device

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

> From: Susan Losh <[slosh@FSU.EDU](mailto:slosh@FSU.EDU)>

> Date: Fri, 13 Mar 2009 17:43:45  
> To: <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
> Subject: Wrong President too

> Worse yet, they seem to be alluding to the Literary Digest survey  
> done when Franklin Roosevelt was running (1936 I think) for the

> presidency.  
> Although this was not a telephone survey, the legend is that the  
> Literary Digest used telephone listing to select their sample.  
>  
> And it wasn't Truman in 1948 either!  
>  
> Susan  
>  
> ----- Original Message -----  
> From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>  
> Date: Friday, March 13, 2009 4:21 pm  
> Subject: Re: thanks for suggestions -- 6th grade magnet classes  
> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
>  
>> If some students do ask about the NH primary polls, just tell them  
>> that by the time they are old enough to join AAPOR themselves,  
>> Council may  
>> actually have reported to the membership on the progress, or lack  
>> thereof, of the investigation into the causes of the errors.  
>>  
>> In any case, warn them to be highly skeptical of what they hear or  
>> read about polls and polling in the news media.  
>>  
>> A few days before the November 2008 election, NPR's Weekend Edition  
>> Saturday brought on their "Math Guy" Keith Devlin to explain all  
> about random samples and margins of error. After giving some  
> simplistic but  
>> reasonably clear explanations, he went on to state that the  
> reason the  
>> polls predicted Dewey would beat Truman in 1948 was only wealthy  
>> people had telephones at the time, so when the pollsters called  
>> people to ask  
>> them who they would vote for, they didn't get a random sample of  
>> voters.  
>> If interested, you can listen to the segment at:  
>> <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=96432107>  
>>  
>> You can also see the "correction" NPR added after I wrote  
> pointing out  
>> that telephone interviewing was rarely if ever used in polling  
> in 1948  
>> and that furthermore, the Mosteller report specifically  
> discussed the  
>> issue of sampling in those polls and found no meaningful differences  
>> between results from random and non-random (quota) samples that  
> year.>  
>> Jan Werner  
>> \_\_\_\_\_  
>>  
>> Paul Goodwin wrote:  
>>> I really appreciate the suggestions. I will probably try to  
> do some  
>>> M&M tricks, and maybe a pizza topping poll. I'll let you know  
>> how it

>>> goes, assuming I am not chased out of the classroom by rotten  
>>> tomatoes, a la Bertie Wooster. Something tells me that smart 6th  
>>> graders are a tough crowd to please. I just hope that no one  
>> asks me  
>>> to explain what happened with the New Hampshire primary polls  
>> last year!

>>>  
>>>

>>> Paul Goodwin  
>>> Goodwin Simon Victoria Research  
>>> P.O. Box 366  
>>> Culver City CA 90232  
>>> 310/558-4761 (phone  
>>> 310/210-8984 (mobile)  
>>> paulg@gsvresearch.com

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

>>> -----

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

>>>  
>>>  
>>

>> -----

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

>  
> 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> .

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

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

=====  
Date: Fri, 13 Mar 2009 18:55:44 -0400  
Reply-To: howard schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: howard schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>  
Subject: an important publication  
Comments: To: aapor <aapornet@asu.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

As a number of AAPOR members already know, Jean Converse's "Survey Research in the United States: Roots and Emergence 1890-1960" is by far the best history ever written about the development of polls and surveys. First published by the University of California Press in 1987, the book was allowed to go out of print more than a decade ago and even used copies were hard to locate. It has now been republished as a soft-cover edition by Transaction Publishers.

The book is full of interesting information concerning the pioneers who created the method and results around which AAPOR developed: individuals like Gallup, Cantril, Crossley, Stouffer, Lazarsfeld, Hyman, and many others; institutions such as Columbia's Bureau of Applied Social Research, NORC, ISR, POQ, and of course the founding of AAPOR itself; informative treatments of notable incidents from the past, including the Literary Digest debacle in 1936, the classic American Soldier research during World War II, the Dewey-Truman polls in 1948, and much else still referenced from time to time at AAPOR conferences and on aapornet; and discussion of continuing issues like academic-commercial cooperation and



conflict, and the promise and problems involved in sampling, measurement, interviewing, and analysis. Although the book is comprehensive, well referenced, and informative throughout, it is also beautifully written, easy to dip into when something stirs one's interest.

I have found the book invaluable on many occasions, and was one of a group of AAPOR members who sought for several years to have it reprinted.

-----  
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, 13 Mar 2009 20:27:12 -0400

Reply-To: Paul Braun <[pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM](mailto:pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM)>

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

From: Paul Braun <[pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM](mailto:pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM)>

Subject: Re: an important publication

Comments: To: howard schuman <[hschuman@UMICH.EDU](mailto:hschuman@UMICH.EDU)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

In-Reply-To: <[49BAE470.8040706@umich.edu](mailto:49BAE470.8040706@umich.edu)>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Howard,

And may I ask which book you consider the best in terms of directions in research in the future?

Regards

Paul

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

From: AAPORNET [[mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)] On Behalf Of howard schuman

Sent: Friday, March 13, 2009 6:56 PM

To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

Subject: an important publication

As a number of AAPOR members already know, Jean Converse's "Survey Research in the United States: Roots and Emergence 1890-1960" is by far the best history ever written about the development of polls and surveys. First published by the University of California Press in 1987, the book was allowed to go out of print more than a decade ago and even used copies were hard to locate. It has now been republished as a soft-cover edition by Transaction Publishers.

The book is full of interesting information concerning the pioneers who created the method and results around which AAPOR developed: individuals like Gallup, Cantril, Crossley, Stouffer, Lazarsfeld, Hyman, and many others; institutions such as Columbia's Bureau of Applied Social Research, NORC, ISR, POQ, and of course the founding of AAPOR itself; informative treatments of notable incidents from the past, including the Literary Digest

debacle in 1936, the classic American Soldier research during World War II, the Dewey-Truman polls in 1948, and much else still referenced from time to time at AAPOR conferences and on aapornet; and discussion of continuing issues like academic-commercial cooperation and conflict, and the promise and problems involved in sampling, measurement, interviewing, and analysis. Although the book is comprehensive, well referenced, and informative throughout, it is also beautifully written, easy to dip into when something stirs one's interest.

I have found the book invaluable on many occasions, and was one of a group of AAPOR members who sought for several years to have it reprinted.

-----  
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: Sat, 14 Mar 2009 11:19:17 -0500  
Reply-To: Keith <[fern8ler@SPAMARREST.COM](mailto:fern8ler@SPAMARREST.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Keith <[fern8ler@SPAMARREST.COM](mailto:fern8ler@SPAMARREST.COM)>  
Subject: May I contribute?  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="-----\_Part\_567\_3931038.1237047557358"

-----=\_Part\_567\_3931038.1237047557358  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Occasionally, I would like to add a comment on the listserv, but do not have access to the referee. Is this where I ask permission or send my suggested contributions?

ID # 14504

Keith Fernsler  
942 9th Ave W  
Dickinson, ND 58601-3713  
Home: 701-225-3436  
Cell: 701-260-9172

-----  
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)

-----=\_Part\_567\_3931038.1237047557358--

---

Date: Sat, 14 Mar 2009 14:51:40 -0400  
Reply-To: Paul J Lavrakas PhD <pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Paul J Lavrakas PhD <pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET>  
Subject: Re: May I contribute?  
Comments: To: Keith <fern8ler@SPAMARREST.COM>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
In-Reply-To: <32502693.1237047557367.JavaMail.root@web04>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Hi Keith,

I am a member of the AAPOR Executive Council, but am speaking for myself, and want you to know that there is no one's permission that you, as an AAPOR member, must gain to post a query or comment onto AAPORnet.

To my knowledge, the only "policing" that is done on AAPORnet is the informal feedback that some members might give another member, sometimes not in the most polite or tactful way, that they don't think a topic is appropriate for AAPORnet.

However, freedom of speech reigns, as it should.

Please let me know if you have any more uncertainty about this.

Best, PJL

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Keith  
Sent: Saturday, March 14, 2009 12:19 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: May I contribute?

Occasionally, I would like to add a comment on the listserv, but do not have access to the referee. Is this where I ask permission or send my suggested contributions?

ID # 14504

Keith Fernsler  
942 9th Ave W  
Dickinson, ND 58601-3713  
Home: 701-225-3436  
Cell: 701-260-9172

---

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

-----  
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: Mon, 16 Mar 2009 10:50:30 -0400  
Reply-To: Scott Keeter <[skeeter@PEWRESEARCH.ORG](mailto:skeeter@PEWRESEARCH.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Scott Keeter <[skeeter@PEWRESEARCH.ORG](mailto:skeeter@PEWRESEARCH.ORG)>  
Subject: Pew Research Center webpages on survey methods  
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

For the methodologically inclined among AAPORnetters, the Pew Research Center has recently developed an extensive set of web materials about survey methods, with a focus on telephone surveys.=20

=20

<http://people-press.org/methodology/>

=20

Comments and suggestions welcome.=20

=20

Scott Keeter

Pew Research Center / 1615 L St. N.W., Suite 700 / Washington, DC 20036

202-419-4362

[skeeter@pewresearch.org](mailto:skeeter@pewresearch.org) / <http://pewresearch.org> /  
<http://people-press.org>

Personal website <http://pollcats.net>

=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: Mon, 16 Mar 2009 11:14:56 -0400  
Reply-To: Alex Lundry <[alundry@TARGETPOINTCONSULTING.COM](mailto:alundry@TARGETPOINTCONSULTING.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Alex Lundry <[alundry@TARGETPOINTCONSULTING.COM](mailto:alundry@TARGETPOINTCONSULTING.COM)>  
Subject: Looking at Data: Learning to Explore Data with Graphics  
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

Just came across this workshop information via <http://flowingdata.com> and thought it was up AAPORnet's alley:

Looking at Data: Learning to Explore Data with Graphics  
<http://lookingatdata.com/jsm-2009.html>  
Washington DC July 30-31

Downtown Hilton Garden Inn, 815 14th Street N.W.

Breakfast, morning tea, lunch and afternoon included in registration. Please bring your own laptop.

Price: \$295 for one day, \$550 for both days. (Students: \$100 / day)

Graphics are a fundamental part of data analysis, used in initial data inspection and exploration, model building and checking and also communicating information. In this course we will teach the basics of static graphics and move on to the new developments in direct manipulation and dynamic graphics that facilitate exploratory data analysis. The methods taught are readily available in open source software, enabling all participants to reproduce, extend and use them with their own data after the workshop.

Who should take this course?

This course is targeted at anyone interested in learning a new way of looking at their data or learning about tools that make producing graphics easier. We will use R to demonstrate static graphics and to link analysis and exploratory graphics, so a basic knowledge of R will be helpful, but not necessary. Ideally, you should have read a book by Bill Cleveland, Naomi Robbins, Stephen Few or Edward Tufte, as these authors all touch on important themes in statistical graphics.

If you are already familiar with GGobi or ggplot2, this course may be too basic, although you will receive expert hands on instruction that you wouldn't otherwise.

Please bring your own laptop. Closer to the course we'll let you know what you need to install beforehand.

More info: <http://lookingatdata.com/jsm-2009.html>

Alexander Lundry<<mailto:alundry@targetpointconsulting.com>>, Vice President  
TargetPoint Consulting<<http://www.targetpointconsulting.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: Mon, 16 Mar 2009 17:45:56 -0400  
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: AAPOR and the Burnham condemnation  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

On February 4, 2009, AAPOR announced that Gilbert Burnham had violated the organization's code of ethics for refusing to provide information on a survey reported three years ago in *The Lancet*, and on March 10, the AAPOR Executive Council released a document providing some additional detail on just what had been requested of Dr. Burnham.

As an AAPOR member for over 3 decades, I find myself deeply troubled by Council's handling of this matter.

In particular, Council has not provided answers to two questions essential for any fair inquiry:

- 1) What exactly is Dr. Burnham accused of having done that would justify AAPOR's demand for supporting information?
- 2) What is the source of the allegations and/or who brought the accusation before the AAPOR Standards Committee?

The only previous such action by AAPOR came 12 years ago, when Frank Luntz was censured for not providing information about the surveys that were supposed to have provided the basis for the 1994 Republican "Contract With America." In that case, we knew the answers to the above questions because Warren Mitofsky made no secret that he had originated the complaint after a newspaper columnist wrote that Luntz had told him that there never had been any such survey and that he (Luntz) had simply made up the numbers. The current president of AAPOR was Standards chair at the time of the Luntz censure.

I know little about the Burnham case, but neither he nor Mr. Luntz were members of AAPOR and therefore never agreed to abide by the AAPOR Code. So whether or not their actions violated common standards of scientific research (and I would not call Mr. Luntz a scientific researcher) or even honesty, I fail to see that AAPOR has any standing to demand their data for review or how they can be accused of having violated the AAPOR Code.

I do think AAPOR should take a strong public stand on standards issues. But condemning non-members for violation of the Code is ineffectual and doing so without full disclosure just makes us look hypocritical.

I also believe that AAPOR would be on firmer ground if it were more consistent in calling its own members on the disclosure requirements spelled out in the Code. For example, look at section III-5 and then ask yourself when, if ever, you have seen a news organization disclose response rates for a survey they commissioned or conducted themselves.

Jan Werner

-----  
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 Mar 2009 08:41:53 -0000  
Reply-To: Spagat M <[M.Spagat@RHUL.AC.UK](mailto:M.Spagat@RHUL.AC.UK)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Spagat M <[M.Spagat@RHUL.AC.UK](mailto:M.Spagat@RHUL.AC.UK)>  
Subject: Re: AAPOR and the Burnham condemnation  
Comments: To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com), [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Jan,  
=20  
I brought the complaint. The main basis for it is here:  
=20  
[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)  
=20  
I mentioned this in the previous thread on the Burnham censure started =  
by Marc Sapir. =20  
=20  
This paper is forthcoming in the journal Defense and Peace Economics. =  
The journal offered the authors of the Burnham et al. paper space in the =  
journal to respond but they have decided not to do so.  
=20  
I am more than happy to answer any questions on this. Please fire away.  
=20  
Many researchers have expressed serious concerns about the Burnham et =  
al. paper. I have a number of pieces on this up on my personal web =  
site:  
=20  
<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Research.htm>  
=20  
Among them I would single out these:  
=20  
<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Denver.pdf>  
=20

[http://www.hicn.org/research\\_design/rdn2.pdf](http://www.hicn.org/research_design/rdn2.pdf) (which recently won =  
article of the year in the Journal of Peace Research:=20  
[http://www.prio.no/Research-and-Publications/Journal-of-Peace-Research/Ar=  
ticle-of-the-year/ \)](http://www.prio.no/Research-and-Publications/Journal-of-Peace-Research/Article-of-the-year/)  
=20  
<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Summary.pdf>  
=20  
<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Mainstreaming.pdf>  
=20  
There are various notable papers written by other people that also cast =  
serious doubt on the Burnham et al. study including:  
=20  
Violence-Related Mortality in Iraq from 2002 to 2006, Iraq Family Health =  
Survey (IFHS) Study Group. The New England Journal of Medicine, Volume =  
358:484-493. <http://tinyurl.com/yoysuf> <<http://tinyurl.com/yoysuf>>=20  
=20  
Wartime estimates of Iraqi civilian casualties, by Beth Osborne Daponte. =  
International Review of the Red Cross, No. 868. =  
<http://tinyurl.com/48mq63> <<http://tinyurl.com/48mq63>>=20  
=20  
Confidence Intervals for the Population Mean Tailored to Small Sample =  
Sizes, with Applications to Survey Sampling, by Michael Rosenblum, Mark =  
J. van der Laan. University of California, Berkeley Division of =  
Biostatistics Working Paper Series. =  
<http://www.bepress.com/ucbbiostat/paper237/> =  
<<http://www.bepress.com/ucbbiostat/paper237/>>=20  
=20  
Retrospective two-stage cluster sampling for mortality in Iraq, by Seppo =  
Laaksonen, International Journal of Market Research, Vol. 50, No. 3, =  
2008. <http://tinyurl.com/4yawmx> <<http://tinyurl.com/4yawmx>>=20  
=20  
I can provide a full bibliography of scientific literature on this issue =  
if people are interested. =20  
=20  
There have also been a number of journalistic articles that have raised =  
serious and unanswered questions about the Burnham et al. research. =  
These include (some of these may be blocked but I can fish out copies):  
=20  
<http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/ScienceLancet.pdf>  
=20  
[http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Sciencearticle2\\_datarelease.pdf](http://personal.rhul.ac.uk/uhte/014/Sciencearticle2_datarelease.pdf)  
=20  
<http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v446/n7131/full/446006a.html>  
=20  
<http://news.nationaljournal.com/articles/databomb/index.htm>  
=20  
Mike Spagat  
=20  
=20

---

From: AAPORNET on behalf of Jan Werner  
Sent: Mon 16/03/2009 21:45



To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: AAPOR and the Burnham condemnation

On February 4, 2009, AAPOR announced that Gilbert Burnham had violated the organization's code of ethics for refusing to provide information on a survey reported three years ago in The Lancet, and on March 10, the AAPOR Executive Council released a document providing some additional detail on just what had been requested of Dr. Burnham.

As an AAPOR member for over 3 decades, I find myself deeply troubled by Council's handling of this matter.

In particular, Council has not provided answers to two questions essential for any fair inquiry:

- 1) What exactly is Dr. Burnham accused of having done that would justify AAPOR's demand for supporting information?
- 2) What is the source of the allegations and/or who brought the accusation before the AAPOR Standards Committee?

The only previous such action by AAPOR came 12 years ago, when Frank Luntz was censured for not providing information about the surveys that were supposed to have provided the basis for the 1994 Republican "Contract With America." In that case, we knew the answers to the above questions because Warren Mitofsky made no secret that he had originated the complaint after a newspaper columnist wrote that Luntz had told him that there never had been any such survey and that he (Luntz) had simply made up the numbers. The current president of AAPOR was Standards chair at the time of the Luntz censure.

I know little about the Burnham case, but neither he nor Mr. Luntz were members of AAPOR and therefore never agreed to abide by the AAPOR Code. So whether or not their actions violated common standards of scientific research (and I would not call Mr. Luntz a scientific researcher) or even honesty, I fail to see that AAPOR has any standing to demand their data for review or how they can be accused of having violated the AAPOR Code.

I do think AAPOR should take a strong public stand on standards issues. But condemning non-members for violation of the Code is ineffectual and doing so without full disclosure just makes us look hypocritical.

I also believe that AAPOR would be on firmer ground if it were more consistent in calling its own members on the disclosure requirements spelled out in the Code. For example, look at section III-5 and then ask yourself when, if ever, you have seen a news organization disclose response rates for a survey they commissioned or conducted themselves.

Jan Werner

-----

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

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](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, 17 Mar 2009 08:34:15 -0500  
Reply-To: [Mary.Losch@uni.edu](mailto:Mary.Losch@uni.edu)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mary Losch <[Mary.Losch@UNI.EDU](mailto:Mary.Losch@UNI.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: AAPOR and the Burnham investigation  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: Quoted-printable

In light of the specific questions posted on Monday about the AAPOR Code of Professional Ethics and Practice and the Schedule of Procedures for Investigating Code Violations, I offer the following:

The AAPOR Code in Section III outlines eight elements of minimal disclosure. They are: 1. Who sponsored the survey, and who conducted it, 2. The exact wording of questions asked, including the text of any preceding instruction or explanation to the interviewer or respondents that might reasonably be expected to affect the response, 3. A definition of the population under study, and a description of the sampling frame used to identify this population, 4. A description of the sample design, giving a clear indication of the method by which the respondents were selected by the researcher, or whether the respondents were entirely self-selected, 5. Sample sizes and, where appropriate, eligibility criteria, screening procedures, and response rates computed according to AAPOR Standard Definitions. At a minimum, a summary of disposition of sample cases should be provided so that response rates could be computed, 6. A discussion of

the precision of the findings, including estimates of sampling error, and =  
a  
description of any weighting or estimating procedures used, 7. Which resul=  
ts are  
based on parts of the sample, rather than on the total sample, and the siz=  
e of  
such parts, and 8. Method, location, and dates of data collection.

The Schedule of Procedures explicitly indicates that any AAPOR member (or =  
non-  
member) may submit a written complaint alleging a violation of the AAPOR C=  
ode.

Per the Procedures, these investigations are confidential to provide prote=  
ction to  
both the complainant and the target of the complaint. The allegation may =  
be  
made against a member of AAPOR or a non-member. In this case, as outlined=

on AAPORnet last month by the complainant, Dr. Spagat, who has identified  
himself, an allegation was made that Dr. Burnham violated the AAPOR Code i=  
n  
the survey he conducted in Iraq and about which he published results in th=  
e  
October 2006 issue of the Lancet. As is true for every allegation of Code=

violation, the Standards Chair, Associate Chair and Council followed the A=  
APOR  
Schedule of Procedures and in this case, launched a formal investigation. =

In the  
course of the investigation, the evaluation committee sought specific info=  
rmation  
related to the study. Dr. Burnham refused to provide the elements of mini=  
mal  
disclosure or any other information. Based on this unambiguous violation =  
of the  
Code, the evaluation committee recommended a public censure and Council  
agreed.

If there is a specific portion of the Procedures that anyone believes was =  
not  
followed by me, by the evaluation committee or by Council, I would be happ=  
y to  
discuss that with them - either on AAPORnet or privately. However, at thi=  
s point,  
it appears that the remaining questions are a function of lack of familiar=  
ity with the  
AAPOR Code and Procedures. Please note that the Code and Procedures have  
been in place for many years. Moreover, if there is an AAPOR member who  
ANYONE believes is in violation of the AAPOR Code, then by all means, I  
encourage you to submit a complaint and be assured that it will be given t=  
he same  
attention and due diligence that every other allegation receives.

Respectfully,

Mary Losch  
AAPOR Standards Chair

-----  
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, 17 Mar 2009 09:35:33 -0500  
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: AAPOR and Norms of Public Opinion Research  
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

Mr. Werner has raised a question that comes up whenever AAPOR censures someone who is not a member: Since the offending party did not agree to abide by the AAPOR Code, what business does the Association have in censuring him or her?

The idea underlying the question is that AAPOR's Code specifies behavior that is special -- a level of responsibility above and beyond what is normally expected of those who do public opinion research. On this view, AAPOR members take on an extra burden when they join the Association. It follows that those who choose not to assume the burden ought to be exempted from Code-based scrutiny.

But the idea that the Code calls for extraordinary behavior is fundamentally wrong. Instead, the Code lays out a set of norms to which anyone engaged in public opinion research should adhere. The purpose of the Code is not just to say what AAPOR members believe, but to publicly proclaim what responsible

public opinion research is. In other words, the Code seeks to make explicit what constitutes professional behavior. Like the American Medical Association or the American Bar Association in their respective spheres of influence, AAPOR seeks to define and encourage what researchers should do in order to be professionals. Many physicians and lawyers do not belong to the AMA or ABA, but those professional organizations do not declare that their expressed norms only apply to members.

Those who are unpersuaded may want to consider this question: What provisions of the Code should NOT apply to every public opinion researcher? What aspect is so extraordinary that asking researchers generally to comply with it is an unwarranted imposition?

In essence, the Code says that researchers should behave ethically and that they should document aspects of their work that have a direct bearing on data quality and may facilitate interpretation of results. The disclosure requirements -- officially termed the *\*minimal\** disclosure requirements -- apply only to research that enters the public domain. The Code does not prescribe particular research methods. Disclosure is the sole mechanism by which the meaning and quality of work is judged. Perhaps more important, disclosure is the sole mechanism in the field for separating genuine research from fraud. Anyone can claim to have done a poll or survey; disclosure is our only means for validating such assertions.

Should we aspire to encourage professionalism only among the 1700 or so individuals who belong to AAPOR? Does it further the profession to say to

the world that eschewing AAPOR membership gives one license to behave unprofessionally? Should we ignore behavior by nonmembers that calls into question the integrity of the field? Our predecessors answered no to these questions. We owe them and ourselves fidelity to the principles set forth in the AAPOR Code.

--

Peter V. Miller  
Department of Communication Studies  
Northwestern University  
Vice-President, American Association for Public Opinion Research  
p-miller@northwestern.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, 17 Mar 2009 11:32:22 -0400  
Reply-To: "Shiman, Lawrence H" <[LawrenceH\\_Shiman@DFCI.HARVARD.EDU](mailto:LawrenceH_Shiman@DFCI.HARVARD.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Shiman, Lawrence H" <[LawrenceH\\_Shiman@DFCI.HARVARD.EDU](mailto:LawrenceH_Shiman@DFCI.HARVARD.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: AAPOR and Norms of Public Opinion Research  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: A<[815570ad0903170735i15207323v53574a6be45d16ae@mail.gmail.com](mailto:A815570ad0903170735i15207323v53574a6be45d16ae@mail.gmail.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

There is a fundamental difference between lawyers and doctors on one hand, and survey research professionals on the other. One is either a practicing physician, or one is not. The average person on the street periodically makes health related suggestions to others - it doesn't make them a doctor, and the AMA would not censor them for their opinions or behavior. It is the clear distinction between doctors and non-doctors, and lawyers and non-lawyers, that allow such organizations as the AMA or ABA to oversee their industries.

Survey research is different. Countless professionals engage in survey research, but would not consider themselves part of the industry. Public health research, for example, consistently includes survey research, but is usually carried out by people who do not consider themselves survey researchers. I believe it is a valid question whether a professional organization should censure or demand information from people who do not consider themselves part of

the industry at all.

Larry Shiman  
Survey Methodologist  
Dana-Farber Cancer Institute

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Peter Miller  
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2009 10:36 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: AAPOR and Norms of Public Opinion Research

Mr. Werner has raised a question that comes up whenever AAPOR censures someone who is not a member: Since the offending party did not agree to abide by the AAPOR Code, what business does the Association have in censuring him or her?

The idea underlying the question is that AAPOR's Code specifies behavior that is special -- a level of responsibility above and beyond what is normally expected of those who do public opinion research. On this view, AAPOR members take on an extra burden when they join the Association. It follows that those who choose not to assume the burden ought to be exempted from Code-based scrutiny.

But the idea that the Code calls for extraordinary behavior is fundamentally wrong. Instead, the Code lays out a set of norms to which anyone engaged in public opinion research should adhere. The purpose of the Code is not just to say what AAPOR members believe, but to publicly proclaim what responsible public opinion research is. In other words, the Code seeks to make explicit what constitutes professional behavior. Like the American Medical Association or the American Bar Association in their respective spheres of influence, AAPOR seeks to define and encourage what researchers should do in order to be professionals. Many physicians and lawyers do not belong to the AMA or ABA,

but those professional organizations do not declare that their expressed norms only apply to members.

Those who are unpersuaded may want to consider this question: What provisions of the Code should NOT apply to every public opinion researcher? What aspect is so extraordinary that asking researchers generally to comply with it is an unwarranted imposition?

In essence, the Code says that researchers should behave ethically and that they

should document aspects of their work that have a direct bearing on data quality and may facilitate interpretation of results. The

disclosure requirements -- officially termed the \*minimal\* disclosure

requirements -- apply only to research that enters the public domain. The

Code does not prescribe particular research methods. Disclosure is the sole

mechanism by which the meaning and quality of work is judged. Perhaps more

important, disclosure is the sole mechanism in the field for separating genuine

research from fraud. Anyone can claim to have done a poll or survey;

disclosure is our only means for validating such assertions.

Should we aspire to encourage professionalism only among the 1700 or so

individuals who belong to AAPOR? Does it further the profession to say to

the world that eschewing AAPOR membership gives one license to behave

unprofessionally? Should we ignore behavior by nonmembers that calls into

question the integrity of the field? Our predecessors answered no to these

questions. We owe them and ourselves fidelity to the principles set forth

in the AAPOR Code.



--

Peter V. Miller  
Department of Communication Studies  
Northwestern University  
Vice-President, American Association for Public Opinion Research  
p-miller@northwestern.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)

The information in this e-mail is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed. If you believe this e-mail was sent to you in error and the e-mail contains patient information, please contact the Partners Compliance HelpLine at <http://www.partners.org/complianceline> . If the e-mail was sent to you in error but does not contain patient information, please contact the sender and properly dispose of the e-mail.

-----  
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, 17 Mar 2009 11:40:09 -0400  
Reply-To: "Butterworth, Michael" <[MXB@CBSNEWS.COM](mailto:MXB@CBSNEWS.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Butterworth, Michael" <[MXB@CBSNEWS.COM](mailto:MXB@CBSNEWS.COM)>  
Subject: Re: AAPOR and Norms of Public Opinion Research  
Comments: To: "Shiman, Lawrence H" <[LawrenceH\\_Shiman@DFCI.HARVARD.EDU](mailto:LawrenceH_Shiman@DFCI.HARVARD.EDU)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[E7F2032087CB5B4192A356E73AC8DF2A0208874E@PHSXMB6.partners.org](mailto:E7F2032087CB5B4192A356E73AC8DF2A0208874E@PHSXMB6.partners.org)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Recently I have seen several billboards warning against chiropractors. Whatever organization is paying for them, I do not think that many chiropractors are members.

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

From: AAPORNET [[mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)] On Behalf Of Shiman, Lawrence H

Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2009 11:32 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: AAPOR and Norms of Public Opinion Research

There is a fundamental difference between lawyers and doctors on one hand, and survey research professionals on the other. One is either a practicing physician, or one is not. The average person on the street periodically makes health related suggestions to others - it doesn't make them a doctor, and the AMA would not censor them for their opinions or behavior. It is the clear distinction between doctors and non-doctors, and lawyers and non-lawyers, that allow such organizations as the AMA or ABA to oversee their industries.

Survey research is different. Countless professionals engage in survey research, but would not consider themselves part of the industry. Public health research, for example, consistently includes survey research, but is usually carried out by people who do not consider themselves survey researchers.

I believe it is a valid question whether a professional organization should censure or demand information from people who do not consider themselves part of the industry at all.

Larry Shiman  
Survey Methodologist  
Dana-Farber Cancer Institute

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Peter Miller  
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2009 10:36 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: AAPOR and Norms of Public Opinion Research

Mr. Werner has raised a question that comes up whenever AAPOR censures someone who is not a member: Since the offending party did not agree to abide by the AAPOR Code, what business does the Association have in censoring him or her?

The idea underlying the question is that AAPOR's Code specifies behavior that is special -- a level of responsibility above and beyond what is

normally expected of those who do public opinion research. On this view,

AAPOR members take on an extra burden when they join the Association. It

follows that those who choose not to assume the burden ought to be exempted

from Code-based scrutiny.

But the idea that the Code calls for extraordinary behavior is fundamentally

wrong. Instead, the Code lays out a set of norms to which anyone engaged in

public opinion research should adhere. The purpose of the Code is not just

to say what AAPOR members believe, but to publicly proclaim what responsible

public opinion research is. In other words, the Code seeks to make explicit

what constitutes professional behavior. Like the American Medical Association

or the American Bar Association in their respective spheres of influence, AAPOR

seeks to define and encourage what researchers should do in order to be

professionals. Many physicians and lawyers do not belong to the AMA or ABA,

but those professional organizations do not declare that their expressed norms

only apply to members.

Those who are unpersuaded may want to consider this question: What provisions

of the Code should NOT apply to every public opinion researcher? What aspect

is so extraordinary that asking researchers generally to comply with it is

an unwarranted imposition?

In essence, the Code says that researchers should behave ethically and that they

should document aspects of their work that have a direct bearing on data

quality and may facilitate interpretation of results. The

disclosure requirements -- officially termed the \*minimal\* disclosure

requirements -- apply only to research that enters the public domain.

The

Code does not prescribe particular research methods. Disclosure is the sole

mechanism by which the meaning and quality of work is judged. Perhaps more

important, disclosure is the sole mechanism in the field for separating genuine

research from fraud. Anyone can claim to have done a poll or survey;

disclosure is our only means for validating such assertions.

Should we aspire to encourage professionalism only among the 1700 or so

individuals who belong to AAPOR? Does it further the profession to say to

the world that eschewing AAPOR membership gives one license to behave

unprofessionally? Should we ignore behavior by nonmembers that calls into

question the integrity of the field? Our predecessors answered no to these

questions. We owe them and ourselves fidelity to the principles set forth

in the AAPOR Code.

--

Peter V. Miller

Department of Communication Studies

Northwestern University  
Vice-President, American Association for Public Opinion Research  
p-miller@northwestern.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)

The information in this e-mail is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed. If you believe this e-mail was sent to you in error and the e-mail contains patient information, please contact the Partners Compliance HelpLine at <http://www.partners.org/complianceline> . If the e-mail was sent to you in error but does not contain patient information, please contact the sender and properly dispose of the e-mail.

---

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, 17 Mar 2009 11:03:10 -0500  
Reply-To: "Rucinski, Dianne" <[drucin@UIC.EDU](mailto:drucin@UIC.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Rucinski, Dianne" <[drucin@UIC.EDU](mailto:drucin@UIC.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: AAPOR and Norms of Public Opinion Research  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[E7F2032087CB5B4192A356E73AC8DF2A0208874E@PHSXMB6.partners.org](mailto:E7F2032087CB5B4192A356E73AC8DF2A0208874E@PHSXMB6.partners.org)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

But the AMA does go after non-physician health care providers for providing health care, and with more force than censure. The AMA routinely lobbies hard for laws preventing "non-physicians" from practicing medicine--such as its long campaign against certified professional mid-wives, certified nurse mid-wives and its current resolution calling for bans on home births.

Dianne Rucinski

On Tue, March 17, 2009 10:32 am, Shiman, Lawrence H wrote:

> There is a fundamental difference between lawyers and doctors on one hand,  
> and

> survey research professionals on the other. One is either a practicing  
> physician, or one is not. The average person on the street periodically  
> makes

> health related suggestions to others - it doesn't make them a doctor, and  
> the

> AMA would not censor them for their opinions or behavior. It is the clear  
> distinction between doctors and non-doctors, and lawyers and non-lawyers,  
> that

> allow such organizations as the AMA or ABA to oversee their industries.  
>

> Survey research is different. Countless professionals engage in survey  
> research, but would not consider themselves part of the industry. Public  
> health

> research, for example, consistently includes survey research, but is  
> usually

> carried out by people who do not consider themselves survey researchers.  
> I

> believe it is a valid question whether a professional organization should  
> censor or demand information from people who do not consider themselves  
> part of

> the industry at all.

>

> Larry Shiman

> Survey Methodologist

> Dana-Farber Cancer Institute

>

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

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

> Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2009 10:36 AM

> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

> Subject: AAPOR and Norms of Public Opinion Research

>

> Mr. Werner has raised a question that comes up whenever AAPOR censors

>

> someone who is not a member: Since the offending party did not agree to

>

> abide by the AAPOR Code, what business does the Association have in

>

> censoring him or her?

>

>

>

>

> The idea underlying the question is that AAPOR's Code specifies behavior

>  
> that is special -- a level of responsibility above and beyond what is  
>  
> normally expected of those who do public opinion research. On this view,  
>  
> AAPOR members take on an extra burden when they join the Association. It  
>  
> follows that those who choose not to assume the burden ought to be  
> exempted  
>  
> from Code-based scrutiny.  
>  
>  
>  
> But the idea that the Code calls for extraordinary behavior is  
> fundamentally  
>  
> wrong. Instead, the Code lays out a set of norms to which anyone engaged  
> in  
>  
> public opinion research should adhere. The purpose of the Code is not  
> just  
>  
> to say what AAPOR members believe, but to publicly proclaim what  
> responsible  
>  
> public opinion research is. In other words, the Code seeks to make  
> explicit  
>  
> what constitutes professional behavior. Like the American Medical  
> Association  
>  
> or the American Bar Association in their respective spheres of influence,  
> AAPOR  
>  
> seeks to define and encourage what researchers should do in order to be  
>  
> professionals. Many physicians and lawyers do not belong to the AMA or  
> ABA,  
>  
> but those professional organizations do not declare that their expressed  
> norms  
>  
> only apply to members.  
>  
>  
>  
> Those who are unpersuaded may want to consider this question: What  
> provisions  
>  
> of the Code should NOT apply to every public opinion researcher? What  
> aspect  
>  
> is so extraordinary that asking researchers generally to comply with it is

>  
> an unwarranted imposition?  
>  
>  
> In essence, the Code says that researchers should behave ethically and  
> that they  
>  
> should document aspects of their work that have a direct bearing on data  
>  
> quality and may facilitate interpretation of results. The  
>  
> disclosure requirements -- officially termed the \*minimal\* disclosure  
>  
> requirements -- apply only to research that enters the public domain. The  
>  
> Code does not prescribe particular research methods. Disclosure is the  
> sole  
>  
> mechanism by which the meaning and quality of work is judged. Perhaps  
> more  
>  
> important, disclosure is the sole mechanism in the field for separating  
> genuine  
>  
> research from fraud. Anyone can claim to have done a poll or survey;  
>  
> disclosure is our only means for validating such assertions.  
>  
>  
>  
> Should we aspire to encourage professionalism only among the 1700 or so  
>  
> individuals who belong to AAPOR? Does it further the profession to say to  
>  
> the world that eschewing AAPOR membership gives one license to behave  
>  
> unprofessionally? Should we ignore behavior by nonmembers that calls into  
>  
> question the integrity of the field? Our predecessors answered no to  
> these  
>  
> questions. We owe them and ourselves fidelity to the principles set forth  
>  
> in the AAPOR Code.  
>  
>  
>  
> --  
> Peter V. Miller  
> Department of Communication Studies  
> Northwestern University  
> Vice-President, American Association for Public Opinion Research  
> p-miller@northwestern.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)  
>  
>  
> The information in this e-mail is intended only for the person to whom it  
> is  
> addressed. If you believe this e-mail was sent to you in error and the  
> e-mail  
> contains patient information, please contact the Partners Compliance  
> HelpLine at  
> <http://www.partners.org/complianceline> . If the e-mail was sent to you in  
> error  
> but does not contain patient information, please contact the sender and  
> properly  
> dispose of the e-mail.

> -----  
> 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, 17 Mar 2009 11:00:12 -0500  
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: Re: AAPOR and Norms of Public Opinion Research  
Comments: To: "Shiman, Lawrence H" <[LawrenceH\\_Shiman@dfci.harvard.edu](mailto:LawrenceH_Shiman@dfci.harvard.edu)>,  
aapornet@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <[E7F2032087CB5B4192A356E73AC8DF2A0208874E@PHSXMB6.partners.org](mailto:E7F2032087CB5B4192A356E73AC8DF2A0208874E@PHSXMB6.partners.org)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

1. AAPOR censures only those who flout professional norms.
2. AAPOR asks for methodological details only for studies whose results have been put into the public domain, and about which a standards complaint has been made.
3. The study director's self-concept is irrelevant to these matters.
4. The research product is what is at issue in standards cases. If you are doing survey research, it doesn't matter what you think your identity is.

On Tue, Mar 17, 2009 at 10:32 AM, Shiman, Lawrence H <LawrenceH\_Shiman@dfci.harvard.edu> wrote:

> There is a fundamental difference between lawyers and doctors on one hand,  
> and  
> survey research professionals on the other. One is either a practicing  
> physician, or one is not. The average person on the street periodically  
> makes  
> health related suggestions to others - it doesn't make them a doctor, and  
> the  
> AMA would not censor them for their opinions or behavior. It is the clear  
> distinction between doctors and non-doctors, and lawyers and non-lawyers,  
> that  
> allow such organizations as the AMA or ABA to oversee their industries.  
>  
> Survey research is different. Countless professionals engage in survey  
> research, but would not consider themselves part of the industry. Public  
> health  
> research, for example, consistently includes survey research, but is  
> usually  
> carried out by people who do not consider themselves survey researchers. I  
> believe it is a valid question whether a professional organization should  
> censor or demand information from people who do not consider themselves  
> part of  
> the industry at all.

>  
> Larry Shiman  
> Survey Methodologist  
> Dana-Farber Cancer Institute

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Peter Miller  
> Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2009 10:36 AM  
> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
> Subject: AAPOR and Norms of Public Opinion Research

>  
> Mr. Werner has raised a question that comes up whenever AAPOR censures  
>  
> someone who is not a member: Since the offending party did not agree to  
>  
> abide by the AAPOR Code, what business does the Association have in  
>

> censuring him or her?  
>  
>  
>  
> The idea underlying the question is that AAPOR's Code specifies behavior  
>  
> that is special -- a level of responsibility above and beyond what is  
>  
> normally expected of those who do public opinion research. On this view,  
>  
> AAPOR members take on an extra burden when they join the Association. It  
>  
> follows that those who choose not to assume the burden ought to be exempted  
>  
> from Code-based scrutiny.  
>  
>  
>  
> But the idea that the Code calls for extraordinary behavior is  
> fundamentally  
>  
> wrong. Instead, the Code lays out a set of norms to which anyone engaged  
> in  
>  
> public opinion research should adhere. The purpose of the Code is not just  
>  
> to say what AAPOR members believe, but to publicly proclaim what  
> responsible  
>  
> public opinion research is. In other words, the Code seeks to make  
> explicit  
>  
> what constitutes professional behavior. Like the American Medical  
> Association  
>  
> or the American Bar Association in their respective spheres of influence,  
> AAPOR  
>  
> seeks to define and encourage what researchers should do in order to be  
>  
> professionals. Many physicians and lawyers do not belong to the AMA or  
> ABA,  
>  
> but those professional organizations do not declare that their expressed  
> norms  
>  
> only apply to members.  
>  
>  
>  
> Those who are unpersuaded may want to consider this question: What  
> provisions  
>  
> of the Code should NOT apply to every public opinion researcher? What

> aspect  
>  
> is so extraordinary that asking researchers generally to comply with it is  
>  
> an unwarranted imposition?  
>  
>  
> In essence, the Code says that researchers should behave ethically and  
> that they  
>  
> should document aspects of their work that have a direct bearing on data  
>  
> quality and may facilitate interpretation of results. The  
>  
> disclosure requirements -- officially termed the \*minimal\* disclosure  
>  
> requirements -- apply only to research that enters the public domain. The  
>  
> Code does not prescribe particular research methods. Disclosure is the  
> sole  
>  
> mechanism by which the meaning and quality of work is judged. Perhaps more  
>  
> important, disclosure is the sole mechanism in the field for separating  
> genuine  
>  
> research from fraud. Anyone can claim to have done a poll or survey;  
>  
> disclosure is our only means for validating such assertions.  
>  
>  
>  
> Should we aspire to encourage professionalism only among the 1700 or so  
>  
> individuals who belong to AAPOR? Does it further the profession to say to  
>  
> the world that eschewing AAPOR membership gives one license to behave  
>  
> unprofessionally? Should we ignore behavior by nonmembers that calls into  
>  
> question the integrity of the field? Our predecessors answered no to these  
>  
> questions. We owe them and ourselves fidelity to the principles set forth  
>  
> in the AAPOR Code.  
>  
>  
>  
> --  
> Peter V. Miller  
> Department of Communication Studies  
> Northwestern University  
> Vice-President, American Association for Public Opinion Research  
> p-miller@northwestern.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)

>  
>  
> The information in this e-mail is intended only for the person to whom it  
> is  
> addressed. If you believe this e-mail was sent to you in error and the  
> e-mail  
> contains patient information, please contact the Partners Compliance  
> HelpLine at  
> <http://www.partners.org/complianceline> . If the e-mail was sent to you in  
> error  
> but does not contain patient information, please contact the sender and  
> properly  
> dispose of the e-mail.

>  
> -----  
> 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)

>

--  
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>  
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, 17 Mar 2009 12:20:15 -0400  
Reply-To: David Moore <[dmoore62@COMCAST.NET](mailto:dmoore62@COMCAST.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: David Moore <[dmoore62@COMCAST.NET](mailto:dmoore62@COMCAST.NET)>  
Subject: Re: AAPOR and Norms of Public Opinion Research  
Comments: To: "Shiman, Lawrence H" <[LawrenceH\\_Shiman@DFCI.HARVARD.EDU](mailto:LawrenceH_Shiman@DFCI.HARVARD.EDU)>,>

AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

In-Reply-To: <E7F2032087CB5B4192A356E73AC8DF2A0208874E@PHSXMB6.partners.org>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Larry,

I think you're right, it is a valid question "whether a professional organization should censure or demand information from people who do not consider themselves part of the industry at all."

And the question has been raised and debated over the years. My sense is that Peter gave a pretty persuasive argument in favor of AAPOR's actions, which relied only partially on the analogy with doctors and lawyers. He also stressed that the professional ethical standards AAPOR uses are only the minimal ones that should be applied when claims are made for scientific survey research. If AAPOR will not address ethical lapses in this field of research, then who will? Shifting the responsibility to someone else hardly seems the way to go. AAPOR has strived to be a leader in the field of survey research, and its willingness to confront ethical problems is one mark of that leadership.

The fact that some people engage in scientific survey research but do not think of themselves as doing so hardly excuses them from these minimal ethical standards, I would think. In this specific case, it hardly matters whether Dr. Burnham considers himself a member of the survey research industry. He certainly claimed he was presenting information based on scientific methods. When he refused to release details of his study, it was a clear violation of what we all know to be the basic standards of scientific research, which require minimal transparency so that other researchers can try to replicate findings. And thus he undermined the trust that is essential to scientific research.

Individuals can point to this failure in transparency, but as one of the most visible survey research organizations in the country, AAPOR's censorship obviously carries much more weight than single researchers.

If there is anything in AAPOR's procedures that is unfair, then I think we ought to change them. But by being willing to point to ethical lapses among survey researchers, I think AAPOR provides a needed voice to our political leaders and to the public.

Best,

David

David W. Moore, Ph.D.

Senior Fellow, The Carsey Institute

University of New Hampshire

73 Main Street, Huddleston Hall

Durham, NH 03824

603.868.7002

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Shiman, Lawrence H

Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2009 11:32 AM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: Re: AAPOR and Norms of Public Opinion Research

There is a fundamental difference between lawyers and doctors on one hand,  
and

survey research professionals on the other. One is either a practicing

physician, or one is not. The average person on the street periodically  
makes

health related suggestions to others - it doesn't make them a doctor, and  
the

AMA would not censor them for their opinions or behavior. It is the clear

distinction between doctors and non-doctors, and lawyers and non-lawyers,  
that

allow such organizations as the AMA or ABA to oversee their industries.

Survey research is different. Countless professionals engage in survey

research, but would not consider themselves part of the industry. Public  
health

research, for example, consistently includes survey research, but is usually

carried out by people who do not consider themselves survey researchers. I

believe it is a valid question

[\*whether a professional organization should

censure or demand information from people who do not consider themselves  
part of

the industry at all.]

Larry Shiman

Survey Methodologist

Dana-Farber Cancer Institute

---

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, 17 Mar 2009 13:24:47 -0400

Reply-To: Eleanor Singer <[esinger@ISR.UMICH.EDU](mailto:esinger@ISR.UMICH.EDU)>

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

From: Eleanor Singer <[esinger@ISR.UMICH.EDU](mailto:esinger@ISR.UMICH.EDU)>

Subject: Re: AAPOR and the Burnham investigation

Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

In-Reply-To: A<[49BF6087.25708.2080D702@Mary.Losch.uni.edu](mailto:49BF6087.25708.2080D702@Mary.Losch.uni.edu)>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

There are two issues being debated on AAPORNET at the same time. One is whether the action taken by the Council in this particular case was appropriate, and the other is whether the Code or the procedures to implement the Code should be changed. The Standards Committee and the Council appear to have followed precisely the procedures prescribed when a complaint is brought. Those procedures protect the complainant from having his or her identity disclosed. They also specify that anyone, member or not, may bring a complaint, against anyone conducting a survey and failing to adhere to the standards laid out in the Code, which, as



Peter and David note, are minimal standards.

I happen to agree with Peter's and David's argument, but it potentially imposes a huge burden on the organization, one that as a result it may fulfill only selectively. That in turn may cause a problem or the appearance of a problem. Apparently the organization is going to re-examine the AAPOR Code; but for the moment, it is what it is, and was followed faithfully.

I can't help wondering why there is so much anger about this particular case.

Eleanor Singer

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Mary Losch  
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2009 9:34 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: AAPOR and the Burnham investigation

In light of the specific questions posted on Monday about the AAPOR Code of Professional Ethics and Practice and the Schedule of Procedures for Investigating Code Violations, I offer the following:

The AAPOR Code in Section III outlines eight elements of minimal disclosure.

They are: 1. Who sponsored the survey, and who conducted it, 2. The exact wording of questions asked, including the text of any preceding instruction or explanation to the interviewer or respondents that might reasonably be expected to affect the response, 3. A definition of the population under study, and a description of the sampling frame used to identify this population, 4. A description of the sample design, giving a clear indication of the method by which the respondents were selected by the researcher, or whether the respondents were entirely self-selected, 5. Sample sizes and, where appropriate, eligibility criteria, screening procedures, and response rates computed according to AAPOR Standard Definitions. At a minimum, a summary of disposition of sample cases should be provided so that response rates could be computed, 6. A discussion of the precision of the findings, including estimates of sampling error, and a description of any weighting or estimating procedures used, 7. Which results are based on parts of the sample, rather than on the total sample, and the size of such parts, and 8. Method, location, and dates of data collection.

The Schedule of Procedures explicitly indicates that any AAPOR member (or non-member) may submit a written complaint alleging a violation of the AAPOR Code.

Per the Procedures, these investigations are confidential to provide protection to both the complainant and the target of the complaint. The allegation may be made against a member of AAPOR or a non-member. In this case, as outlined on AAPORnet last month by the complainant, Dr. Spagat, who has identified himself, an allegation was made that Dr. Burnham violated the AAPOR Code in the survey he conducted in Iraq and

about which he published results in the October 2006 issue of the Lancet. As is true for every allegation of Code violation, the Standards Chair, Associate Chair and Council followed the AAPOR Schedule of Procedures and in this case, launched a formal investigation. In the course of the investigation, the evaluation committee sought specific information related to the study. Dr. Burnham refused to provide the elements of minimal disclosure or any other information. Based on this unambiguous violation of the Code, the evaluation committee recommended a public censure and Council agreed.

If there is a specific portion of the Procedures that anyone believes was not followed by me, by the evaluation committee or by Council, I would be happy to discuss that with them - either on AAPORnet or privately. However, at this point, it appears that the remaining questions are a function of lack of familiarity with the AAPOR Code and Procedures. Please note that the Code and Procedures have been in place for many years. Moreover, if there is an AAPOR member who ANYONE believes is in violation of the AAPOR Code, then by all means, I encourage you to submit a complaint and be assured that it will be given the same attention and due diligence that every other allegation receives.

Respectfully,  
Mary Losch  
AAPOR Standards Chair

---

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, 17 Mar 2009 13:27:12 -0500  
Reply-To: Ken Doyle <[KenDoyle@UMN.EDU](mailto:KenDoyle@UMN.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Ken Doyle <[KenDoyle@UMN.EDU](mailto:KenDoyle@UMN.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: AAPOR and the Burnham investigation  
Comments: To: Eleanor Singer <[esinger@ISR.UMICH.EDU](mailto:esinger@ISR.UMICH.EDU)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[942E05ED295BE1489D46F6301DACE3A3090605E6@isr-mail1.ad.isr.umich.edu](mailto:942E05ED295BE1489D46F6301DACE3A3090605E6@isr-mail1.ad.isr.umich.edu)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I agree with Eleanor. Taking on a policing function places a huge burden on the organization and creates the risk, perhaps the likelihood, that "prosecution" may be selective, possibly even politically or even personally motivated. Does the AAPOR Code actually use the amazingly strong word "condemnation"?

Ken Doyle

--

\*Kenneth O. Doyle\*

\*Kenneth O. Doyle, Director\*\*\*

\*Communication Research Division\*

\*School of Journalism & Mass Communication\*

\*University of Minnesota -- Twin Cities\*

\*323 Murphy Hall -- 206 Church Street\*

\*Minneapolis MN 55455-0418\*

\* \*

\*Phone 612.624.5341\*

\*www.KenDoyle.umn.edu\*

Just a reminder: This e-mail and any attachments are covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 USC 2510-2521. Accordingly, it's the property of the sender, confidential, intended only for the designated recipient(s), and additionally privileged under law. Any retention, distribution, action or inaction in reliance on the content is prohibited. If you receive this e-mail by mistake, please delete it and notify me: KenDoyle@umn.edu <mailto:KenDoyle@umn.edu>, 612.624.5341. Thanks a lot.

-----  
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, 17 Mar 2009 15:23:32 -0400  
Reply-To: "Safir, Adam - BLS" <[Safir.Adam@BLS.GOV](mailto:Safir.Adam@BLS.GOV)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Safir, Adam - BLS" <[Safir.Adam@BLS.GOV](mailto:Safir.Adam@BLS.GOV)>  
Subject: Re: AAPOR and the Burnham investigation  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: A<[49BFEB80.5060304@umn.edu](mailto:A49BFEB80.5060304@umn.edu)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

The amazingly strong word "condemnation" was introduced by Jan Werner in the subject line of his March 16 e-mail.

The word condemnation does not actually appear anywhere in the AAPOR code, which is available for any and all to read at <<http://www.aapor.org/aaporcodeofethics>>, nor does it appear in AAPOR's February 4 press release concerning the case.

Best,

Adam

Adam Safir  
U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics  
[safir.adam@bls.gov](mailto:safir.adam@bls.gov)  
(202) 691-5175

\*\* Personal opinions only \*\*

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Ken Doyle  
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2009 2:27 PM  
To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Subject: Re: AAPOR and the Burnham investigation

I agree with Eleanor. Taking on a policing function places a huge burden on the organization and creates the risk, perhaps the likelihood, that "prosecution" may be selective, possibly even politically or even personally motivated.

Does the AAPOR Code actually use the amazingly strong word "condemnation"?

Ken Doyle

--

\*Kenneth O. Doyle\*

\*Kenneth O. Doyle, Director\*\*\*

\*Communication Research Division\*

\*School of Journalism & Mass Communication\*

\*University of Minnesota -- Twin Cities\*

\*323 Murphy Hall -- 206 Church Street\*

\*Minneapolis MN 55455-0418\*

\* \*

\*Phone 612.624.5341\*

\*www.KenDoyle.umn.edu\*

Just a reminder: This e-mail and any attachments are covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 USC 2510-2521. Accordingly, it's the property of the sender, confidential, intended only for the designated recipient(s), and additionally privileged under law. Any retention, distribution, action or inaction in reliance on the content is prohibited. If you receive this e-mail by mistake, please delete it and notify me: KenDoyle@umn.edu <mailto:KenDoyle@umn.edu>, 612.624.5341. Thanks a lot.

-----  
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

---

Date: Tue, 17 Mar 2009 14:50:25 -0500  
Reply-To: Peter Miller <p-miller@NORTHWESTERN.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Peter Miller <p-miller@NORTHWESTERN.EDU>  
Subject: Re: AAPOR and the Burnham investigation  
Comments: To: Ken Doyle <KenDoyle@umn.edu>  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <49BFEB80.5060304@umn.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Enforcing the Code is an arduous, time-consuming job. It is not a responsibility that AAPOR or any organization assumes without careful thought. A look at the history of the Association, Paul Sheatsley and Warren Mitofsky, *\*A Meeting Place\** gives a sense of how we arrived at our current position.

Code enforcement involves responding to complaints. Complaints can have many different motivations. Regardless of motivation, the merit of the complaint is judged on whether a violation of the Code has occurred.

In disclosure cases, the Standards Chair is empowered to try to get requested information before an official case is begun. Once a case is begun, the complaint is vetted by an independent committee, charged with judging whether the Code has been violated. The committee makes a recommendation to Council about what action should be taken. Committees can and have decided that complaints have been resolved or were unfounded.

Given the time and effort involved in standards cases, one does not take them on lightly.

On Tue, Mar 17, 2009 at 1:27 PM, Ken Doyle <KenDoyle@umn.edu> wrote:

> I agree with Eleanor. Taking on a policing function places a huge  
> burden on the  
> organization and creates the risk, perhaps the likelihood, that  
> "prosecution" may  
> be selective, possibly even politically or even personally motivated.  
> Does the  
> AAPOR Code actually use the amazingly strong word "condemnation"?  
>  
> Ken Doyle  
>  
>  
> --  
>  
> \*Kenneth O. Doyle\*

>  
> \*Kenneth O. Doyle, Director\*\*\*  
>  
> \*Communication Research Division\*  
>  
> \*School of Journalism & Mass Communication\*  
>  
> \*University of Minnesota -- Twin Cities\*  
>  
> \*323 Murphy Hall -- 206 Church Street\*  
>  
> \*Minneapolis MN 55455-0418\*  
>  
> \* \*  
>  
> \*Phone 612.624.5341\*  
>  
> \*www.KenDoyle.umn.edu\*>  
>  
>  
>

> Just a reminder: This e-mail and any attachments are covered by the  
> Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 USC 2510-2521. Accordingly,  
> it's the property of the sender, confidential, intended only for the  
> designated recipient(s), and additionally privileged under law. Any  
> retention, distribution, action or inaction in reliance on the content  
> is prohibited. If you receive this e-mail by mistake, please delete it  
> and notify me: KenDoyle@umn.edu <mailto:KenDoyle@umn.edu>,  
> 612.624.5341. Thanks a lot.

>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> -----  
> 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)  
>

--  
Peter V. Miller  
Department of Communication Studies  
Northwestern University  
Vice-President, American Association for Public Opinion Research

p-miller@northwestern.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, 17 Mar 2009 17:02:03 -0400

Reply-To: "Diane K. Bowers" <[dbowers@casro.org](mailto:dbowers@casro.org)>

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

From: "Diane K. Bowers" <[dbowers@CASRO.ORG](mailto:dbowers@CASRO.ORG)>

Organization: CASRO

Subject: AAPOR and CASRO "amicus brief" on respondent confidentiality is supported by Federal Court

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

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

FROM: Dick Kulka, President, AAPOR; and Diane Bowers, President, CASRO

RE: A Joint Press Release

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Oklahoma ruled last week in *State of Oklahoma v. Tyson Foods* that the personal identification of respondents in survey research is confidential information. *Oklahoma v. Tyson Foods* is an environmental impact assessment case, in which Defendant Tyson Foods, moved to compel disclosure of respondent-identifiable information related to surveys conducted by the Plaintiff State of Oklahoma, and the State, in a counter motion, sought the court's protection of survey participants' personal information as confidential information.=20

AAPOR (American Association for Public Opinion Research) and CASRO (Council of American Survey Research Organizations) jointly submitted an Amicus ("friend of the court") Brief on behalf of their members and the research industry, and, specifically, in support of Westat and the other research organizations whose survey reports were submitted as evidence in the case. The surveys were part of a contingent valuation study to determine the amount of damages caused by excess phosphorous from poultry waste and other sources in Oklahoma's Illinois River System. Tyson Foods, argued that discovery of respondent identities was relevant and necessary to fully critique the States' assessment of damages. =20

Citing the mandatory codes of standards and professional ethics of AAPOR and CASRO, the Court affirmed that respondent identities are confidential information, which, if disclosed, could be harmful to the parties involved. Further, the Court stated that the Defendants had failed to meet the burden of proof needed to compel discovery of this confidential information. The Court stated: =20



Defendants have failed to persuade the Court that such [confidential = information] is sufficiently relevant and necessary to their case to = outweigh the harm of undermining the public interest in insuring the = ability of surveys to elicit accurate information from respondents.=20

The Amicus Brief filed by CASRO and AAPOR asserted that the guarantee of = respondent confidentiality is fundamental to the professional practice = of survey research, and is assured through adherence to mandatory and = enforceable codes of standards and ethics. The Amicus stated that = respondent confidentiality "is warranted (1) to protect survey research = results against inaccuracies or bias as the candor of the respondents' = answers may be inhibited by public disclosure and (2) to ensure the free = flow of information and to provide the foundation for unbiased survey = data."

CASRO and/or AAPOR have successfully filed Amicus briefs in support of = Research Respondent Confidentiality in about a dozen legal and court = challenges over the years. This advocacy is a valuable part of the = service that CASRO and AAPOR provide to their members. The impact of = these efforts, however extends beyond association members. AAPOR = President, Richard Kulka, and CASRO President, Diane Bowers, noted that = court opinions like the one in Tyson Foods which explicitly affirmed the = necessity of protecting respondent confidentiality and the value of = survey research, also affirms the research industry's integrity and = commitment to ethical and professional practice.

CASRO's General Counsel and principal author of the Amicus Brief, Duane = L. Berlin noted, "this Federal Court decision is an important victory = for AAPOR, CASRO, and the entire research industry."

-----  
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, 17 Mar 2009 20:23:35 -0400

Reply-To: "Rockwell, Richard" <[richard.rockwell@UCONN.EDU](mailto:richard.rockwell@UCONN.EDU)>

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

From: "Rockwell, Richard" <[richard.rockwell@UCONN.EDU](mailto:richard.rockwell@UCONN.EDU)>

Subject: Re: AAPOR and Norms of Public Opinion Research

Comments: To: Peter Miller <[p-miller@NORTHWESTERN.EDU](mailto:p-miller@NORTHWESTERN.EDU)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

In support of Peter's observation that the AAPOR Code of Professional Ethics & Practices does not call for extraordinary behavior or create a level of responsibility above and beyond what is normally expected of those who do public opinion research:

I'm quite certain that any college, university, or research institute that

receives Federal funding has a policy defining "misconduct in scientific research." Here at home, the University of Connecticut's code defines "unethical research practices" as follows (see <http://osp.uconn.edu/policy.php>):

Though the concept "integrity in research" embraces a wide range of issues and practices, this policy defines research misconduct as fraudulent or markedly irregular practices in research conduct and in the collection, analysis and reporting of data; including fabrication, falsification, plagiarism or other practices that seriously deviate from those that are commonly accepted within the scientific community for proposing, conducting or reporting research.

Primary responsibility for inhibiting misconduct and safeguarding the integrity of research should be exercised by the research community. This responsibility includes: examination of allegations of misconduct, investigation of substantiated allegations, and the imposition of sanctions when appropriate.

The UConn code refers to "practices that seriously deviate from those that are commonly accepted within the scientific community." It does not say "practices that deviate from the standards of the professional organization(s) of which one is a member." The implication is that these standards are an integral part of science, well understood and accepted within the scientific community, not the product of some organization's peculiar decisions. The UConn code vests primary responsibility for safeguarding the integrity of research in the research community, not in some bureaucracy charged with oversight, although UConn does have a Compliance Office.

I view AAPOR's Code as simply spelling out in detail what these standards mean for survey research. I also note that AAPOR is not alone in stating these standards. See the National Council on Public Polls' "Principles of Disclosure" (<http://www.ncpp.org/?q=node/19>) and <http://www.ncpp.org/?q=node/19> and the Code of Standards and Ethics for Survey Research of the Council of American Survey Research Organizations (<http://www.casro.org/codeofstandards.cfm>). This scientific community is speaking with one voice on the main body of issues of ethics and standards. (Where the codes differ is on matters such as when it is permissible to use email to contact respondents who have no expectation of being asked to participate in research. These matters would be useful subjects for discussions among the relevant organizations, adding CMOR and some others to the discussions.)

Further reference is made in the UConn Web site on scientific misconduct to the standards set by granting agencies, such as the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health. NSF writes under "Sharing of Findings, Data, and Other Research Products"

The National Science Foundation advocates and encourages open scientific communication. The NSF expects significant findings from research and educational activities it supports to be promptly submitted for publication, with authorship that accurately reflects the contributions of those involved. It expect investigators to share with other researchers, at no more than incremental cost and within a reasonable time, the data, samples, physical collections, and other supporting materials created or gathered in the course

of the work. It also encourages awardees to share software and inventions or otherwise act to make the innovations they embody widely useful and usable.

NSF Program management will implement these policies, in ways appropriate to the field and circumstances, through the proposal review process; through award negotiations and conditions; and through appropriate support and incentives for data cleanup, documentation, dissemination, storage, and the like. Adjustments and, where essential, exceptions may be allowed to safeguard the rights of individuals and subjects, the validity of results, or the integrity of collections or to accommodate legitimate interests of investigators.

As I read this, what NSF "expects" was precisely what AAPOR was asking for. AAPOR appears to me to have been operating entirely within the standards that we social scientists have imposed upon ourselves, not as members of AAPOR but instead as persons claiming to do scientific survey research. Part of our credibility with each other and with the larger public depends upon our mutual support of and adherence to those standards.

---

Richard C. ROCKWELL  
Professor and Associate Head  
Department of Sociology  
University of Connecticut Unit 2068  
344 Mansfield Road  
Storrs-Mansfield, CT 06269-2068  
+1.860.486.0086 Office +1.860.486.4422 Department +1.860.486-6356 Fax  
richard.rockwell@uconn.edu

---

From: AAPORNET on behalf of Peter Miller  
Sent: Tue 3/17/2009 10:35 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: AAPOR and Norms of Public Opinion Research

Mr. Werner has raised a question that comes up whenever AAPOR censures someone who is not a member: Since the offending party did not agree to abide by the AAPOR Code, what business does the Association have in censuring him or her?

The idea underlying the question is that AAPOR's Code specifies behavior that is special -- a level of responsibility above and beyond what is

normally expected of those who do public opinion research. On this view, AAPOR members take on an extra burden when they join the Association. It follows that those who choose not to assume the burden ought to be exempted from Code-based scrutiny.

But the idea that the Code calls for extraordinary behavior is fundamentally wrong. Instead, the Code lays out a set of norms to which anyone engaged in public opinion research should adhere. The purpose of the Code is not just to say what AAPOR members believe, but to publicly proclaim what responsible public opinion research is. In other words, the Code seeks to make explicit what constitutes professional behavior. Like the American Medical Association or the American Bar Association in their respective spheres of influence, AAPOR seeks to define and encourage what researchers should do in order to be professionals. Many physicians and lawyers do not belong to the AMA or ABA, but those professional organizations do not declare that their expressed norms only apply to members.

Those who are unpersuaded may want to consider this question: What provisions of the Code should NOT apply to every public opinion researcher? What aspect is so extraordinary that asking researchers generally to comply with it is an unwarranted imposition?

In essence, the Code says that researchers should behave ethically and that they should document aspects of their work that have a direct bearing on data quality and may facilitate interpretation of results. The disclosure requirements -- officially termed the *\*minimal\** disclosure requirements -- apply only to research that enters the public domain. The

Code does not prescribe particular research methods. Disclosure is the sole mechanism by which the meaning and quality of work is judged. Perhaps more important, disclosure is the sole mechanism in the field for separating genuine research from fraud. Anyone can claim to have done a poll or survey; disclosure is our only means for validating such assertions.

Should we aspire to encourage professionalism only among the 1700 or so individuals who belong to AAPOR? Does it further the profession to say to the world that eschewing AAPOR membership gives one license to behave unprofessionally? Should we ignore behavior by nonmembers that calls into question the integrity of the field? Our predecessors answered no to these questions. We owe them and ourselves fidelity to the principles set forth in the AAPOR Code.

--  
Peter V. Miller  
Department of Communication Studies  
Northwestern University  
Vice-President, American Association for Public Opinion Research  
p-miller@northwestern.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, 17 Mar 2009 21:28:23 -0400

Reply-To: Phillip Downs <pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Phillip Downs <pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM>  
Subject: Standards  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I agree with all of the posts about the need for meeting scientific standards, need to protect our profession from charlatans, etc.

However, it seems to me an important part of this issue is what authority does AAPOR have to demand

anything from a non-member.

One might be totally without fault in all elements of research design and consider AAPOR to be irrelevant or a pest.

What then?

Phillip Downs, Ph.D.

Senior Partner, Kerr & Downs Research

Professor of Marketing, FSU

-----  
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, 17 Mar 2009 21:38:15 -0400  
Reply-To: Eleanor Singer <esinger@ISR.UMICH.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Eleanor Singer <esinger@ISR.UMICH.EDU>  
Subject: Re: AAPOR and CASRO "amicus brief" on respondent confidentiality  
is supported by Federal Court  
Comments: To: "Diane K. Bowers" <[dbowers@casro.org](mailto:dbowers@casro.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

Indeed it is! Congratulations to Diane, Dick, and all the rest of us, =  
including respondents to surveys.

=20

Eleanor Singer

From: AAPORNET on behalf of Diane K. Bowers  
Sent: Tue 03/17/2009 5:02 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: AAPOR and CASRO "amicus brief" on respondent confidentiality is = supported by Federal Court

FROM: Dick Kulka, President, AAPOR; and Diane Bowers, President, CASRO

RE: A Joint Press Release

The United States District Court for the Northern District = of Oklahoma ruled last week in State of Oklahoma v. Tyson Foods that the = personal identification of respondents in survey research is = confidential information. Oklahoma v. Tyson Foods is an environmental = impact assessment case, in which Defendant Tyson Foods, moved to compel = disclosure of respondent-identifiable information related to surveys = conducted by the Plaintiff State of Oklahoma, and the State, in a = counter motion, sought the court's protection of survey participants' = personal information as confidential information.

AAPOR (American Association for Public Opinion Research) and CASRO = (Council of American Survey Research Organizations) jointly submitted an = Amicus ("friend of the court") Brief on behalf of their members and the = research industry, and, specifically, in support of Westat and the other = research organizations whose survey reports were submitted as evidence = in the case. The surveys were part of a contingent valuation study to = determine the amount of damages caused by excess phosphorous from = poultry waste and other sources in Oklahoma's Illinois River System. = Tyson Foods, argued that discovery of respondent identities was relevant = and necessary to fully critique the States' assessment of damages.=20

Citing the mandatory codes of standards and professional ethics of AAPOR = and CASRO, the Court affirmed that respondent identities are = confidential information, which, if disclosed, could be harmful to the = parties involved. Further, the Court stated that the Defendants had = failed to meet the burden of proof needed to compel discovery of this = confidential information. The Court stated:=20

Defendants have failed to persuade the Court that such [confidential = information] is sufficiently relevant and necessary to their case to = outweigh the harm of undermining the public interest in insuring the = ability of surveys to elicit accurate information from respondents.

The Amicus Brief filed by CASRO and AAPOR asserted that the guarantee of = respondent confidentiality is fundamental to the professional practice = of survey research, and is assured through adherence to mandatory and = enforceable codes of standards and ethics. The Amicus stated that = respondent confidentiality "is warranted (1) to protect survey research = results against inaccuracies or bias as the candor of the respondents' = answers may be inhibited by public disclosure and (2) to ensure the free = flow of information and to provide the foundation for unbiased survey =

data."

CASRO and/or AAPOR have successfully filed Amicus briefs in support of Research Respondent Confidentiality in about a dozen legal and court challenges over the years. This advocacy is a valuable part of the service that CASRO and AAPOR provide to their members. The impact of these efforts, however extends beyond association members. AAPOR President, Richard Kulka, and CASRO President, Diane Bowers, noted that court opinions like the one in Tyson Foods which explicitly affirmed the necessity of protecting respondent confidentiality and the value of survey research, also affirms the research industry's integrity and commitment to ethical and professional practice.

CASRO's General Counsel and principal author of the Amicus Brief, Duane L. Berlin noted, "this Federal Court decision is an important victory for AAPOR, CASRO, and the entire research industry."

-----  
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, 17 Mar 2009 21:04:45 -0500  
Reply-To: Chris Wilson <[CWilson@W-R-S.COM](mailto:CWilson@W-R-S.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Chris Wilson <[CWilson@W-R-S.COM](mailto:CWilson@W-R-S.COM)>  
Subject: Re: AAPOR and CASRO "amicus brief" on respondent confidentiality  
is supported by Federal Court  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: A<[942E05ED295BE1489D46F6301DACE3A3037E06AF@isr-mail1.ad.isr.umich.edu](mailto:942E05ED295BE1489D46F6301DACE3A3037E06AF@isr-mail1.ad.isr.umich.edu)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

As one of the companies served by the attorneys in this case (as we were a provider of research), let me state my personal thanks to all who had a role in this. We fought back and refused to reveal any names despite legal threats of contempt. It feels very good to have this behind us and to have the Federal Court confirm our right to protect the privacy



commitment we give, and owe, to every respondent.

---

Chris Wilson, PRC  
Wilson Research Strategies  
www.w-r-s.com

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Eleanor Singer  
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2009 8:38 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: AAPOR and CASRO "amicus brief" on respondent confidentiality is supported by Federal Court

Indeed it is! Congratulations to Diane, Dick, and all the rest of us, including respondents to surveys.

Eleanor Singer

---

From: AAPORNET on behalf of Diane K. Bowers  
Sent: Tue 03/17/2009 5:02 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: AAPOR and CASRO "amicus brief" on respondent confidentiality is supported by Federal Court

FROM: Dick Kulka, President, AAPOR; and Diane Bowers, President, CASRO

RE: A Joint Press Release

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Oklahoma ruled last week in *State of Oklahoma v. Tyson Foods* that the personal identification of respondents in survey research is confidential information. *Oklahoma v. Tyson Foods* is an environmental impact assessment case, in which Defendant Tyson Foods, moved to compel disclosure of respondent-identifiable information related to surveys conducted by the Plaintiff State of Oklahoma, and the State, in a counter motion, sought the court's protection of survey participants' personal information as confidential information.

AAPOR (American Association for Public Opinion Research) and CASRO (Council of American Survey Research Organizations) jointly submitted an Amicus ("friend of the court") Brief on behalf of their members and the research industry, and, specifically, in support of Westat and the other research organizations whose survey reports were submitted as evidence in the case. The surveys were part of a contingent valuation study to determine the amount of damages caused by excess phosphorous from poultry waste and other sources in Oklahoma's Illinois River System. Tyson Foods, argued that discovery of respondent identities was relevant and necessary to fully critique the States' assessment of damages.

Citing the mandatory codes of standards and professional ethics of AAPOR and CASRO, the Court affirmed that respondent identities are confidential information, which, if disclosed, could be harmful to the parties involved. Further, the Court stated that the Defendants had failed to meet the burden of proof needed to compel discovery of this confidential information. The Court stated:

Defendants have failed to persuade the Court that such [confidential information] is sufficiently relevant and necessary to their case to outweigh the harm of undermining the public interest in insuring the ability of surveys to elicit accurate information from respondents.

The Amicus Brief filed by CASRO and AAPOR asserted that the guarantee of respondent confidentiality is fundamental to the professional practice of survey research, and is assured through adherence to mandatory and enforceable codes of standards and ethics. The Amicus stated that respondent confidentiality "is warranted (1) to protect survey research results against inaccuracies or bias as the candor of the respondents' answers may be inhibited by public disclosure and (2) to ensure the free flow of information and to provide the foundation for unbiased survey data."

CASRO and/or AAPOR have successfully filed Amicus briefs in support of Research Respondent Confidentiality in about a dozen legal and court challenges over the years. This advocacy is a valuable part of the service that CASRO and AAPOR provide to their members. The impact of these efforts, however extends beyond association members. AAPOR President, Richard Kulka, and CASRO President, Diane Bowers, noted that court opinions like the one in Tyson Foods which explicitly affirmed the necessity of protecting respondent confidentiality and the value of survey research, also affirms the research industry's integrity and commitment to ethical and professional practice.

CASRO's General Counsel and principal author of the Amicus Brief, Duane L. Berlin noted, "this Federal Court decision is an important victory for AAPOR, CASRO, and the entire research industry."

-----  
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

-----  
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 Mar 2009 02:35:06 +0000  
Reply-To: [amyrsimon@aol.com](mailto:amyrsimon@aol.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Amy R. Simon" <[amyrsimon@AOL.COM](mailto:amyrsimon@AOL.COM)>  
Subject: Re: AAPOR and CASRO "amicus brief" on respondent confidentiality  
is supported by Federal Court  
Comments: To: Chris Wilson <[CWilson@W-R-S.COM](mailto:CWilson@W-R-S.COM)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[7CC246CE5B93F149BF2572ADE038A734CB863C@wsrv.wrs.local](mailto:7CC246CE5B93F149BF2572ADE038A734CB863C@wsrv.wrs.local)>  
Content-Type: text/plain  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Thanks for standing up in an important fight when it might have been just as easy to buckle under.

Amy Simon

Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry

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

From: Chris Wilson <[CWilson@W-R-S.COM](mailto:CWilson@W-R-S.COM)>

Date: Tue, 17 Mar 2009 21:04:45  
To: <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: AAPOR and CASRO "amicus brief" on respondent confidentiality is supported by Federal Court

As one of the companies served by the attorneys in this case (as we were a provider of research), let me state my personal thanks to all who had a role in this. We fought back and refused to reveal any names despite legal threats of contempt. It feels very good to have this behind us and to have the Federal Court confirm our right to protect the privacy commitment we give, and owe, to every respondent.

---

Chris Wilson, PRC  
Wilson Research Strategies  
[www.w-r-s.com](http://www.w-r-s.com)

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Eleanor Singer  
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2009 8:38 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: AAPOR and CASRO "amicus brief" on respondent confidentiality is supported by Federal Court

Indeed it is! Congratulations to Diane, Dick, and all the rest of us, including respondents to surveys.

Eleanor Singer

---

From: AAPORNET on behalf of Diane K. Bowers  
Sent: Tue 03/17/2009 5:02 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: AAPOR and CASRO "amicus brief" on respondent confidentiality is supported by Federal Court

FROM: Dick Kulka, President, AAPOR; and Diane Bowers, President, CASRO

RE: A Joint Press Release

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Oklahoma ruled last week in *State of Oklahoma v. Tyson Foods* that the personal identification of respondents in survey research is confidential information. *Oklahoma v. Tyson Foods* is an environmental impact assessment case, in which Defendant Tyson Foods, moved to compel disclosure of respondent-identifiable information related to surveys conducted by the Plaintiff State of Oklahoma, and the State, in a counter motion, sought the court's protection of survey participants' personal information as confidential information.

AAPOR (American Association for Public Opinion Research) and CASRO (Council of American Survey Research Organizations) jointly submitted an Amicus ("friend of the court") Brief on behalf of their members and the research industry, and, specifically, in support of Westat and the other research organizations whose survey reports were submitted as evidence in the case. The surveys were part of a contingent valuation study to determine the amount of damages caused by excess phosphorous from poultry waste and other sources in Oklahoma's Illinois River System. Tyson Foods, argued that discovery of respondent identities was relevant and necessary to fully critique the States' assessment of damages.

Citing the mandatory codes of standards and professional ethics of AAPOR and CASRO, the Court affirmed that respondent identities are confidential information, which, if disclosed, could be harmful to the parties involved. Further, the Court stated that the Defendants had failed to meet the burden of proof needed to compel discovery of this confidential information. The Court stated:

Defendants have failed to persuade the Court that such [confidential

information] is sufficiently relevant and necessary to their case to outweigh the harm of undermining the public interest in insuring the ability of surveys to elicit accurate information from respondents.

The Amicus Brief filed by CASRO and AAPOR asserted that the guarantee of respondent confidentiality is fundamental to the professional practice of survey research, and is assured through adherence to mandatory and enforceable codes of standards and ethics. The Amicus stated that respondent confidentiality "is warranted (1) to protect survey research results against inaccuracies or bias as the candor of the respondents' answers may be inhibited by public disclosure and (2) to ensure the free flow of information and to provide the foundation for unbiased survey data."

CASRO and/or AAPOR have successfully filed Amicus briefs in support of Research Respondent Confidentiality in about a dozen legal and court challenges over the years. This advocacy is a valuable part of the service that CASRO and AAPOR provide to their members. The impact of these efforts, however extends beyond association members. AAPOR President, Richard Kulka, and CASRO President, Diane Bowers, noted that court opinions like the one in Tyson Foods which explicitly affirmed the necessity of protecting respondent confidentiality and the value of survey research, also affirms the research industry's integrity and commitment to ethical and professional practice.

CASRO's General Counsel and principal author of the Amicus Brief, Duane L. Berlin noted, "this Federal Court decision is an important victory for AAPOR, CASRO, and the entire research industry."

-----  
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

---

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: Wed, 18 Mar 2009 08:29:26 -0400

Reply-To: "Mariolis, Peter (CDC/CCHP/NCCDPHP)" <[pxm1@CDC.GOV](mailto:pxm1@CDC.GOV)>

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

From: "Mariolis, Peter (CDC/CCHP/NCCDPHP)" <[pxm1@CDC.GOV](mailto:pxm1@CDC.GOV)>

Subject: Re: Standards

Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

In-Reply-To: <005801c9a768\$dbb09530\$9311bf90\$@com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

From my perspective, the answer to Phil's first question (What authority does AAPOR have to demand anything from a non-member?) is, it depends. If "authority" implies a legal right, then AAPOR does not have the authority to demand from anyone, member or non-member, that they provide evidence that they have followed "its" scientific standards. AAPOR's authority rests on its standing in the survey research and broader scientific communities. To the extent that its judgments in the Burnham case are known and accepted, Burnham's study will be under a cloud and his reputation will be tarnished. My response to Phil's second question (One might be totally without fault in all elements of research design and consider AAPOR to be irrelevant or a pest. What then?) is that AAPOR and anyone, member or non-member, whose research has been the object of a complaint have to make judgments about what the other party might do in response to their actions, what the consequences to them might be, and how acceptable the possible consequences are. (I do expect that AAPOR members would take requests from AAPOR more seriously than non-members.)

Peter Mariolis, Ph.D.

Health Scientist

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Office on Smoking and Health

MS K50

3005 Chamblee-Tucker Road

Atlanta, GA 30341

(Voice) 770-488-5845

(Fax) 770-488-5848

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

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

Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2009 9:28 PM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: Standards

I agree with all of the posts about the need for meeting scientific standards, need to protect our profession from charlatans, etc.

However, it seems to me an important part of this issue is what authority does AAPOR have to demand

anything from a non-member.

One might be totally without fault in all elements of research design and consider AAPOR to be irrelevant or a pest.

What then?

Phillip Downs, Ph.D.

Senior Partner, Kerr & Downs Research

Professor of Marketing, FSU

-----  
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.

=====  
Date: Wed, 18 Mar 2009 07:50:57 -0500

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: Re: Standards

Comments: To: Phillip Downs <[pd@kerr-downs.com](mailto:pd@kerr-downs.com)>

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

In-Reply-To: <[005801c9a768\\$dbb09530\\$9311bf90\\$@com](mailto:005801c9a768$dbb09530$9311bf90$@com)>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

My response is that we (AAPOR) must do what we can. Our tools are

education, moral suasion and publicity. They may not be efficacious in every case. This does not mean that we stop trying.

On Tue, Mar 17, 2009 at 8:28 PM, Phillip Downs <pd@kerr-downs.com> wrote:

> I agree with all of the posts about the need for meeting scientific  
> standards, need to protect our profession from charlatans, etc.  
>  
> However, it seems to me an important part of this issue is what authority  
> does AAPOR have to demand  
>  
> anything from a non-member.  
>  
> One might be totally without fault in all elements of research design and  
> consider AAPOR to be irrelevant or a pest.  
>  
> What then?  
>  
> Phillip Downs, Ph.D.  
>  
> Senior Partner, Kerr & Downs Research  
>  
> Professor of Marketing, FSU  
>  
>  
> -----  
> 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)  
>

--

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, 18 Mar 2009 09:59:23 -0400  
Reply-To: Tom Guterbock <[tmg1p@VIRGINIA.EDU](mailto:tmg1p@VIRGINIA.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Tom Guterbock <[tmg1p@VIRGINIA.EDU](mailto:tmg1p@VIRGINIA.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: AAPOR and the Burnham investigation (fwd)



Comments: To: AAPORnet List server <aapornet@asu.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Content-Disposition: inline

----- Forwarded Message -----

Date: Tuesday, March 17, 2009 10:21 PM -0400  
From: Tom Guterbock <tmglp@virginia.edu>  
To: Mary.Losch@uni.edu  
Subject: Re: AAPOR and the Burnham investigation

I'm a former AAPOR Standards Chair and before that I chaired a task force that was appointed by the Executive Council to revise the standards procedures. The current procedures are the result of that 2005(?) revision process, which ironed out some inconsistencies and strove to simplify things in a few places.

Our task force began with a debate about whether AAPOR should even be bothering with standards enforcement, because public censure has been so rare in our history. The debate going on now is similar to the debate we heard at that time. I respect the issues that Jan W. has raised. Obviously, we reached a consensus that we should continue AAPOR's tradition of standards enforcement despite its cost and difficulty. We also debated whether we should continue to apply the standards to those outside our membership. To me, the convincing issue here was that, if we restricted out attention to members only, then anyone wishing to carry out unethical research could simply renounce their membership or let it lapse, and they then would be beyond the reach of our sanctions.

But most important was the obvious need for protection of the complainant's identity in the process ( as well as protection of any person accused of a violation, up until such time as public censure occurs). I have frankly been surprised that members have demanded to know who the accuser is, as if that would naturally be made public or the public has a right to know. The public may be curious, but it is the accuser who has a right to protection, especially in a case where the accuser might be blowing the whistle on their own employer or their own client. Mr. Spagat has chosen to make his identity known, which is his right and I think is to his credit, but I hope it will not discourage others from bringing standards matters to the attention of AAPOR, thinking that their identity will be disclosed as a matter of course. In fact, it will be scrupulously protected.

A final note: I, too, was initially worried that our rules would allow people with political or other motives to bring accusations (e.g., gaining competitive advantage over a rival). In fact, I saw a number of complaints where this seemed to be a factor, and I ultimately came to realize that accusers are often 'motivated' in court cases, high school gossip networks, and every other arena of conflict. There's nothing to be done about it and, in the end, the accuser's motivation or political affiliation is not relevant to deciding the merit of the accusation itself.

I hope these comments will help AAPOR members to put the recent events into perspective. Mary and her colleagues have clearly handled this with utmost professionalism and deserve our gratitude for it.

Tom

--On Tuesday, March 17, 2009 8:34 AM -0500 Mary Losch <Mary.Losch@UNI.EDU> wrote:

> In light of the specific questions posted on Monday about the AAPOR Code  
> of Professional Ethics and Practice and the Schedule of Procedures for  
> Investigating Code Violations, I offer the following:

>  
> The AAPOR Code in Section III outlines eight elements of minimal  
> disclosure. They are: 1. Who sponsored the survey, and who conducted it,  
> 2. The exact wording of questions asked, including the text of any  
> preceding instruction or explanation to the interviewer or respondents  
> that might reasonably be expected to affect the response, 3. A definition  
> of the population under study, and a description of the sampling frame  
> used to identify this population, 4. A description of the sample design,  
> giving a clear indication of the method by which the respondents were  
> selected by the researcher, or whether the respondents were entirely  
> self-selected, 5. Sample sizes and, where appropriate, eligibility  
> criteria, screening procedures, and response rates computed according to  
> AAPOR Standard Definitions. At a minimum, a summary of disposition of  
> sample cases should be provided so that response rates could be computed,  
> 6. A discussion of the precision of the findings, including estimates of  
> sampling error, and a description of any weighting or estimating  
> procedures used, 7. Which results are based on parts of the sample,  
> rather than on the total sample, and the size of such parts, and 8.  
> Method, location, and dates of data collection.

>  
> The Schedule of Procedures explicitly indicates that any AAPOR member (or  
> non- member) may submit a written complaint alleging a violation of the  
> AAPOR Code. Per the Procedures, these investigations are confidential to  
> provide protection to both the complainant and the target of the  
> complaint. The allegation may be made against a member of AAPOR or a  
> non-member. In this case, as outlined on AAPORnet last month by the  
> complainant, Dr. Spagat, who has identified himself, an allegation was  
> made that Dr. Burnham violated the AAPOR Code in the survey he conducted  
> in Iraq and about which he published results in the October 2006 issue of  
> the Lancet. As is true for every allegation of Code violation, the  
> Standards Chair, Associate Chair and Council followed the AAPOR Schedule  
> of Procedures and in this case, launched a formal investigation. In the  
> course of the investigation, the evaluation committee sought specific  
> information related to the study. Dr. Burnham refused to provide the  
> elements of minimal disclosure or any other information. Based on this  
> unambiguous violation of the Code, the evaluation committee recommended a  
> public censure and Council agreed.

>  
> If there is a specific portion of the Procedures that anyone believes was  
> not followed by me, by the evaluation committee or by Council, I would be  
> happy to discuss that with them - either on AAPORnet or privately.  
> However, at this point, it appears that the remaining questions are a  
> function of lack of familiarity with the AAPOR Code and Procedures.  
> Please note that the Code and Procedures have been in place for many  
> years. Moreover, if there is an AAPOR member who ANYONE believes is in  
> violation of the AAPOR Code, then by all means, I encourage you to submit  
> a complaint and be assured that it will be given the same attention and  
> due diligence that every other allegation receives.

>  
> Respectfully,  
> Mary Losch  
> AAPOR Standards Chair  
>  
>  
> -----  
> 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)

Thomas M. Guterbock                      Voice: (434)243-5223  
Director                      CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222  
Center for Survey Research              FAX: (434)982-5524  
University of Virginia      EXPRESS DELIVERY: 2400 Old Ivy Road  
P. O. Box 400767                      Suite 212  
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767      Charlottesville, VA 22903  
e-mail: [TomG@virginia.edu](mailto:TomG@virginia.edu)

----- End Forwarded Message -----

Thomas M. Guterbock                      Voice: (434)243-5223  
Director                      CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222  
Center for Survey Research              FAX: (434)982-5524  
University of Virginia      EXPRESS DELIVERY: 2400 Old Ivy Road  
P. O. Box 400767                      Suite 212  
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767      Charlottesville, VA 22903  
e-mail: [TomG@virginia.edu](mailto:TomG@virginia.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, 18 Mar 2009 10:23:53 -0400  
Reply-To:    "Petrino, Marissa" <[Marissa.Petrino@LIBERTYMUTUAL.COM](mailto:Marissa.Petrino@LIBERTYMUTUAL.COM)>  
Sender:      AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From:        "Petrino, Marissa" <[Marissa.Petrino@LIBERTYMUTUAL.COM](mailto:Marissa.Petrino@LIBERTYMUTUAL.COM)>  
Subject:     Surveying Best Practices  
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

Good Morning,

When surveying for VOC, are there any best practices around how many questions you should ask? What tools to use (SharePoint, etc)? How can you avoid leading questions? Should you always include a neutral option as an answer?

Thanks!

Thanks,=20  
Marissa=20

Marissa Petruno=20  
Hosting Services-Quality & Performance Excellence=20  
Liberty Mutual Group=20  
(603) 245-4752=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: Wed, 18 Mar 2009 10:53:49 -0400  
Reply-To: "Murray, Patrick" <[pdmurray@MONMOUTH.EDU](mailto:pdmurray@MONMOUTH.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Murray, Patrick" <[pdmurray@MONMOUTH.EDU](mailto:pdmurray@MONMOUTH.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Standards  
Comments: To: "AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
In-Reply-To: <[005801c9a768\\$dbb09530\\$9311bf90\\$@com](mailto:005801c9a768$dbb09530$9311bf90$@com)>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Phillip asks "...what authority does AAPOR have to demand anything from a non-member." By the same token, one can ask by what authority does WATCH (World Against Toys Causing Harm, Inc.) put out its annual list of most dangerous toys. Or by what authority does Consumer Reports rate different consumer products. Or by what authority are journalists allowed to rake the muck?

With the plethora of polls out there, our industry needs a watchdog. Especially when those polls are influencing important policy debates. Who better to take on this role than AAPOR?

I do agree that the Burnham press release could have been better written or perhaps provided for a different type of action -- "censuring" a non-member does sound strange. Maybe we should have a "caveat emptor" type of response for these cases.

However, Dick Kulka's quote underlines why it is important for AAPOR to take on this responsibility: "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."

I view AAPOR's activity as "protecting the brand." I wish they did so more often, although I appreciate the caution needed when choosing to act.

Patrick Murray  
Director  
Polling Institute  
Monmouth University

-----  
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, 18 Mar 2009 11:49:40 -0400  
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: Standards  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[200903181454.n2IEDVfn024432@lists.asu.edu](mailto:200903181454.n2IEDVfn024432@lists.asu.edu)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=utf-8  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I appreciate the many thoughtful comments and would just like to add a few points for consideration:

First, are there any consequences to censure by AAPOR? Does it mean that one can no longer be a referee for POQ (which Burnham has done), present at an AAPOR conference, or publish in POQ or Survey Practice? This gets pretty tricky because as mentioned earlier it should be the work that is on trial, not the researcher in a personal way. Yet in many states, someone convicted of a felony cannot practice law. And as a practical matter, it would make an easier explanation of the censure--that there are specific consequences from the organization. Even though the real reason, from our point of view, is sticking up for standards.

Second, is there a way to be more positive about the need for disclosure? Like once a year coming up with a list of something like the five best survey reports, that exemplified our standards, exceed the minimum disclosure, and share methodological details in a very clear way? I am wondering, if for every year since Luntz, we'd had annual press releases sent not just to lay media but also to professional organization newsletters across various fields, etc. honoring the Pew Religious Landscape Survey and the ABC News Where Things Stand in Iraq survey and so on, that folks would have a better sense of what the standards are, that many surveys meet or exceed them. And even if a journalist never ran a story about the award list per se, they would understand the concept of expected disclosure, and know who to call if they have questions. It just seems that if we were being positive more, then our voice would be even stronger when raised in warning and concern.

Colleen Porter  
Gainesville, FL

-----  
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, 18 Mar 2009 10:28:23 -0600  
Reply-To: Hugh Gladwin <[gladwin@FIU.EDU](mailto:gladwin@FIU.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Hugh Gladwin <[gladwin@FIU.EDU](mailto:gladwin@FIU.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Standards  
Comments: To: "AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>, "colleen\_porter@COX.NET" <[colleen\\_porter@cox.net](mailto:colleen_porter@cox.net)>  
In-Reply-To: <20090318114940.A4UJS.402603.imal@eastrmwml42>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

In addition to the important issues that have been well commented on here, I think there are also a couple of reasons why it is unfortunate that the Burnham case was pursued as an ethical complaint AAPOR had to deal with.

First, the extreme difficulty of doing research in a war zone means it is very hard to separate ethical and methodological concerns. Most of what I have read seems to focus more on the latter, and should have been dealt with in an article submitted for publication in a journal like POQ.

Second, the Burnham study is one of a number offering conflicting estimates of the civilian death toll in Iraq. The differences between these estimates have major political implications as well as implications for US military tactics. It may be unfair, but AAPOR's censure will be seen by many outside our field as having political implications and even motivations. Again, I think an academic review through published articles and comments would have been a better place to start. It would not have relieved AAPOR of having to respond to an ethical concern, but AAPOR could have acted in response to a much clearer situation.

-- Hugh

Dr. Hugh Gladwin, Director  
Institute for Public Opinion Research,  
School of Journalism and Mass Communication  
Assoc. Professor, Global & Sociocultural Studies  
Florida International University  
[gladwin@fiu.edu](mailto:gladwin@fiu.edu), 305-608-9961  
fax: 866-384-6069, 305-919-5242  
<http://www.fiu.edu/~ipor/>

On Wed, Mar 18, 2009 at 9:49 AM, Colleen Porter <colleen\_porter@cox.net> wrote:

> I appreciate the many thoughtful comments and would just like to add a few  
> points for consideration:  
>  
> First, are there any consequences to censureship by AAPOR? Does it mean  
> that one can no longer be a referee for POQ (which Burnham has done),  
> present at an AAPOR conference, or publish in POQ or Survey Practice? This  
> gets pretty tricky because as mentioned earlier it should be the work that  
> is on trial, not the researcher in a personal way. Yet in many states,  
> someone convicted of a felony cannot practice law. And as a practical  
> matter, it would make an easier explanation of the censure--that there are  
> specific consequences from the organization. Even though the real reason,  
> from our point of view, is sticking up for standards.  
>  
> Second, is there a way to be more positive about the need for disclosure?  
> Like once a year coming up with a list of something like the five best  
> survey reports, that exemplified our standards, exceed the minimum  
> disclosure, and share methodological details in a very clear way? I am  
> wondering, if for every year since Luntz, we'd had annual press releases  
> sent not just to lay media but also to professional organization newsletters  
> across various fields, etc. honoring the Pew Religious Landscape Survey and  
> the ABC News Where Things Stand in Iraq survey and so on, that folks would  
> have a better sense of what the standards are, that many surveys meet or  
> exceed them. And even if a journalist never ran a story about the award  
> list per se, they would understand the concept of expected disclosure, and  
> know who to call if they have questions. It just seems that if we were  
> being positive more, then our voice would be even stronger when raised in  
> warning and concern.

> Colleen Porter  
> Gainesville, FL

> -----  
> 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: Wed, 18 Mar 2009 12:49:22 -0400  
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: Summary: data collection by text messaging  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=utf-8

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Here is a summary of what I learned about text messaging as a form of data collection.

First, there is a very recent article:

"Smartphones: An Emerging Tool for Social Scientists"

by Mika Raento, Antti Oulasvirta and Nathan Eagle

Sociological Methods Research 37; 426-454

February 2009

Then, Eszter Hargittai of the Communication Studies Department at Northwestern, currently a fellow at the Berkman Center for Internet & Society, Harvard University has an upcoming book called RESEARCH CONFIDENTIAL that includes a chapter, "WAT R U DOIN? Studying the Thumb Generation Using Text Messaging" by Eszter Hargittai and Chris Karr. I was able to read an advance copy, and the methods section is excellent and helpful, but the references list is one of the shortest I have ever seen, because this is all so new.

Adolescents were also the target audience of some work some colleagues did here in Florida; they followed young people for a bit, giving them a prepaid cell phone and rewarding their participation with additional minutes.

Some commercial recommendations:

"Techneos® Systems today launched the full beta version of its Survey On-Demand Application (SODA,™) software platform for mobile phone surveys..."

<http://www.techneos.com/newsandreviews/soda-platform-beta-launched-mra-fall-conference>

Someone said that 20/20 Research does this

<http://www.2020research.com/>

and they had seen a presentation from Jim Bryson.

Here in a health-care context, people are excited about the idea of using text messaging as a form of realtime diary keeping. When they started coming out with cell phones that are also blood sugar monitors, the research opportunities seemed obvious, and here is one of the first articles to explore that application:

"Interactive diary for diabetes: A useful and easy-to-use new telemedicine system to support the decision-making process in type 1 diabetes."

Rossi MC, Nicolucci A, Pellegrini F, Bruttomesso D, Bartolo PD, Marelli G, Dal Pos M, Galetta M, Horwitz D, Vespasiani G.

DIABETES TECHNOLOGY & THERAPEUTICS, 11 (1): 19-24 JAN 2009

One application of text-messaging was as a pre-alert for cell phone surveys, rather than data collection per se. That was explored in the now-classic 2007 article "Cell Phone Survey Feasibility in The U.S.: Sampling and Calling Cell Numbers Versus Landline Numbers" by J. Michael Brick, Pat D. Brick, Sarah Dipko, Stanley Presser, Clyde Tucker and Yangyang Yuan, Public Opinion Quarterly 71(1):23-39. Their experiment found no difference in response rates in a survey of cell phones between numbers that were texted before the first call and those that were not texted.



However, text pre-alerts were found to be helpful in a study in Finland (which may be a preview of what the U.S. might look like in a few years). Here's that reference.

Author(s): Virtanen, V; Sirkia, T; Jokiranta, V

Title: Reducing nonresponse by SMS reminders in mail surveys

Source: SOCIAL SCIENCE COMPUTER REVIEW, 25 (3): 384-395 FAL 2007

However, in the US, there are also legal concerns, as these commenters pointed out--

>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.

Also

>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.

So that's kind of what we learned.

Colleen Porter

Gainesville, FL

-----  
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, 18 Mar 2009 10:38:41 -0700

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: Standards

Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

In-Reply-To: <[18afe4c50903180928n33b70b1aod92425171883857a@mail.gmail.com](mailto:18afe4c50903180928n33b70b1aod92425171883857a@mail.gmail.com)>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

When a "different number" is produced, there are three possibilities:

- 1) the "different number" is not valid,
- 2) the other numbers are not valid, or
- 3) things have changed a lot since the other numbers were obtained.

Well, there is also a possibility that none of the numbers are valid, but I think we can accept that some civilians had indeed died in Iraq and good faith attempts have been made to guess at the number.

In the absence of knowing what the "real" number is, the validity of any estimate will turn on methodological issues (sample frame, sampling procedures and execution, recruitment procedures and execution, interviewing procedures and execution, representativeness of the sample, instrumentation, etc.). These are the very pieces of information that Burnham has declined to disclose. Thus, the validity of his "different number" cannot be determined, which means real scholarly discussion is short circuited by incomplete information. The very academic review you feel is desirable is precluded by Burnham's failure to disclose the information requested.

AAPOR did not censure the results of the study, what they censured was Burnham's failure to disclose. It is the failure to disclose that information that has further eroded confidence in Burnham's numbers.

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 Hugh Gladwin  
Sent: Wednesday, March 18, 2009 9:28 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Standards

In addition to the important issues that have been well commented on here, I think there are also a couple of reasons why it is unfortunate that the Burnham case was pursued as an ethical complaint AAPOR had to deal with.

First, the extreme difficulty of doing research in a war zone means it is very hard to separate ethical and methodological concerns. Most of what I have read seems to focus more on the latter, and should have been dealt with in an article submitted for publication in a journal like POQ.

Second, the Burnham study is one of a number offering conflicting estimates of the civilian death toll in Iraq. The differences between these estimates have major political implications as well as implications for US military tactics. It may be unfair, but AAPOR's censure will be seen by many outside our field as having political implications and even motivations. Again, I think an academic review through published articles and comments would have been a better place to start. It would not have relieved AAPOR of having to respond to an ethical concern, but AAPOR could have acted in response to a much clearer situation.

-- Hugh

Dr. Hugh Gladwin, Director  
Institute for Public Opinion Research,  
School of Journalism and Mass Communication  
Assoc. Professor, Global & Sociocultural Studies  
Florida International University  
gladwin@fiu.edu, 305-608-9961  
fax: 866-384-6069, 305-919-5242  
<http://www.fiu.edu/~ipor/>

On Wed, Mar 18, 2009 at 9:49 AM, Colleen Porter  
<colleen\_porter@cox.net> wrote:

> I appreciate the many thoughtful comments and would just like to add a few  
> points for consideration:  
>  
> First, are there any consequences to censureship by AAPOR? Does it mean  
> that one can no longer be a referee for POQ (which Burnham has done),  
> present at an AAPOR conference, or publish in POQ or Survey Practice?  
This  
> gets pretty tricky because as mentioned earlier it should be the work  
that  
> is on trial, not the researcher in a personal way. Yet in many  
states,  
> someone convicted of a felony cannot practice law. And as a practical  
> matter, it would make an easier explanation of the censure--that there  
are  
> specific consequences from the organization. Even though the real  
reason,  
> from our point of view, is sticking up for standards.

>  
> Second, is there a way to be more positive about the need for disclosure?  
> Like once a year coming up with a list of something like the five best  
> survey reports, that exemplified our standards, exceed the minimum disclosure, and share methodological details in a very clear way? I am  
> wondering, if for every year since Luntz, we'd had annual press releases  
> sent not just to lay media but also to professional organization newsletters  
> across various fields, etc. honoring the Pew Religious Landscape Survey and  
> the ABC News Where Things Stand in Iraq survey and so on, that folks would  
> have a better sense of what the standards are, that many surveys meet or  
> exceed them. And even if a journalist never ran a story about the award  
> list per se, they would understand the concept of expected disclosure, and  
> know who to call if they have questions. It just seems that if we were  
> being positive more, then our voice would be even stronger when raised in  
> warning and concern.  
>  
> Colleen Porter  
> Gainesville, FL  
>  
> -----  
> 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.

-----  
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, 18 Mar 2009 11:55:23 -0700  
Reply-To: Michael Sullivan <[michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM](mailto:michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Michael Sullivan <[michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM](mailto:michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM)>

Subject: Re: Standards  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
In-Reply-To: <EA0466BAF6823540B51BD39821E9CB820617F58A@EXVS05.net.ucsf.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

This has been one of the most interesting weeks on AAPORNET in a very long time -- in terms of both the quality and depth of thought that has been presented -- stamp licking machines aside. First, let me say that I think the biggest news and most important achievement that has been discussed this week is the success of the amicus brief filed by AAPOR and CASRO. By supporting this effort, they have done a great service -- particularly for those of us who design, conduct and testify regarding the results of surveys in court. It is impossible for me to understate the importance of this achievement.

Then there is the continuing dialog about the censure of Professor Burnham. I confess I wasn't very interested in this debate in the beginning because I think AAPOR has little to gain by questioning the ethics of a researcher based on the fact that they refuse to disclose the details of their methods; and more importantly I have nagging doubt AAPOR's moral authority to render judgments about ethical concerns. Those of us who trade on our reputations find this a very fearful threat. It can be a career killer; and killing someone's career because they refused to answer a request for information seems to me to be pretty harsh punishment. On the other hand, AAPOR is charged with protecting the legitimacy of discipline of survey research and as such needs to take a stand against the publication of survey evidence (especially in important public policy contexts) that does not follow the basic canons of scientific investigation. The question is: is there a way to do that without getting into ethical questions. I think there is. Why not write a letter to the editor of Lancet and other publications that have published this work (derivatively) explaining that in the opinion of AAPOR the survey results presented in their publication did not comport with the basic canons of scientific investigation and should be retracted by the editor immediately with an explanation of why this is necessary. Rather than having a mechanism that many of us would agree is capable of political manipulation and extremely dangerous (i.e., censure), wouldn't it be better to destroy the credibility of the research and punish the editor for failing to properly vet the proposed research report?

All that said, thanks to everyone for taking the time to comment on this important issue.

Regards,

Michael J. Sullivan, Ph.D.  
Chairman  
Freeman, Sullivan & Co.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Pollack, Lance  
Sent: Wednesday, March 18, 2009 10:39 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Standards

When a "different number" is produced, there are three possibilities:

- 1) the "different number" is not valid,
- 2) the other numbers are not valid, or
- 3) things have changed a lot since the other numbers were obtained.

Well, there is also a possibility that none of the numbers are valid, but I think we can accept that some civilians had indeed died in Iraq and good faith attempts have been made to guess at the number.

In the absence of knowing what the "real" number is, the validity of any estimate will turn on methodological issues (sample frame, sampling procedures and execution, recruitment procedures and execution, interviewing procedures and execution, representativeness of the sample, instrumentation, etc.). These are the very pieces of information that Burnham has declined to disclose. Thus, the validity of his "different number" cannot be determined, which means real scholarly discussion is short circuited by incomplete information. The very academic review you feel is desirable is precluded by Burnham's failure to disclose the information requested.

AAPOR did not censure the results of the study, what they censured was Burnham's failure to disclose. It is the failure to disclose that information that has further eroded confidence in Burnham's numbers.

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 Hugh Gladwin  
Sent: Wednesday, March 18, 2009 9:28 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Standards

In addition to the important issues that have been well commented on here, I think there are also a couple of reasons why it is unfortunate that the Burnham case was pursued as an ethical complaint AAPOR had to deal with.

First, the extreme difficulty of doing research in a war zone means it is very hard to separate ethical and methodological concerns. Most of what I have read seems to focus more on the latter, and should have been dealt with in an article submitted for publication in a journal like

POQ.

Second, the Burnham study is one of a number offering conflicting estimates of the civilian death toll in Iraq. The differences between these estimates have major political implications as well as implications for US military tactics. It may be unfair, but AAPOR's censure will be seen by many outside our field as having political implications and even motivations. Again, I think an academic review through published articles and comments would have been a better place to start. It would not have relieved AAPOR of having to respond to an ethical concern, but AAPOR could have acted in response to a much clearer situation.

-- Hugh

Dr. Hugh Gladwin, Director  
Institute for Public Opinion Research,  
School of Journalism and Mass Communication Assoc. Professor, Global &  
Sociocultural Studies Florida International University gladwin@fiu.edu,  
305-608-9961  
fax: 866-384-6069, 305-919-5242  
<http://www.fiu.edu/~ipor/>

On Wed, Mar 18, 2009 at 9:49 AM, Colleen Porter  
<colleen\_porter@cox.net> wrote:

- > I appreciate the many thoughtful comments and would just like to add a few
- > points for consideration:
- >
- > First, are there any consequences to censureship by AAPOR? Does it mean
- > that one can no longer be a referee for POQ (which Burnham has done),
- > present at an AAPOR conference, or publish in POQ or Survey Practice?
- This
- > gets pretty tricky because as mentioned earlier it should be the work that
- > is on trial, not the researcher in a personal way. Yet in many states,
- > someone convicted of a felony cannot practice law. And as a practical
- > matter, it would make an easier explanation of the censure--that there are
- > specific consequences from the organization. Even though the real reason,
- > from our point of view, is sticking up for standards.
- >
- > Second, is there a way to be more positive about the need for disclosure?
- > Like once a year coming up with a list of something like the five best
- > survey reports, that exemplified our standards, exceed the minimum

> disclosure, and share methodological details in a very clear way? I  
am  
> wondering, if for every year since Luntz, we'd had annual press  
releases  
> sent not just to lay media but also to professional organization  
newsletters  
> across various fields, etc. honoring the Pew Religious Landscape  
Survey and  
> the ABC News Where Things Stand in Iraq survey and so on, that folks  
would  
> have a better sense of what the standards are, that many surveys meet  
or  
> exceed them. And even if a journalist never ran a story about the  
award  
> list per se, they would understand the concept of expected  
disclosure, and  
> know who to call if they have questions. It just seems that if we  
were  
> being positive more, then our voice would be even stronger when raised  
in  
> warning and concern.  
>  
> Colleen Porter  
> Gainesville, FL  
>  
> -----  
> 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.

-----  
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: Wed, 18 Mar 2009 15:40:10 -0400  
Reply-To: "Zanutto, Elaine" <[zanutto@WHARTON.UPENN.EDU](mailto:zanutto@WHARTON.UPENN.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Zanutto, Elaine" <[zanutto@WHARTON.UPENN.EDU](mailto:zanutto@WHARTON.UPENN.EDU)>



Subject: ASA Bryant Scholarship for a Graduate Student in Survey  
Statistics  
Comments: To: "AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

(Apologies for cross-posting).

This is a reminder that the deadline for applications for the ASA's Bryant Scholarship for an outstanding graduate student in survey statistics is April 1.

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. Applicants must be full-time students at an American university as of July 1, 2009.

Application (including transcripts) 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

-----  
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, 18 Mar 2009 15:47:51 -0500  
Reply-To: [Robert.Lowery@KANTAROPERATIONS.COM](mailto:Robert.Lowery@KANTAROPERATIONS.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Robert Lowery <[Robert.Lowery@KANTAROPERATIONS.COM](mailto:Robert.Lowery@KANTAROPERATIONS.COM)>  
Subject: Average dials per hour on manually dialed telephone projects  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
MIME-Version: 1.0

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

For those that have telephone projects that are manually dialed can you share with us what your average dials per hour are?

=20

=20

~~~~~ =20

Robert Lowery

Process & Quality Management

Kantar Operations North America

535 East Diehl Road

Naperville IL, 60563

[T] (630) 955-8609

[F] (630) 245-5721

[M] (217) 201-8881

[E] robert.lowery@kantaroperations.com

www.kantaroperations.com

=20

=20

=20

=3D=  
=3D=  
=3D=

This email is confidential and intended solely for the use of the =  
individual or organization to whom it is addressed. Any opinions or =  
advice presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily =  
represent those of any member Company of the Kantar Group, the Insight, =  
Information and Consultancy Arm of WPP plc. If you are not the intended =  
recipient of this email, you should not copy, modify, distribute or take =  
any action in reliance on it. If you have received this email in error =  
please notify the sender and delete this email from your system. =  
Although this email has been checked for viruses and other defects, no =  
responsibility can be accepted for any loss or damage arising from its =  
receipt or use.

=3D=



I imagine that a lot of people on this list have been involved in opinion polling on attitudes toward the Iraq war. Can people please help me out by pointing me toward their own work or the work of others?

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Mike Spagat  
Department of Economics  
Royal Holloway College  
University of London  
Egham  
Surrey  
TW20 0EX  
United Kingdom  
M.Spagat@rhul.ac.uk

Chase H. Harrison, Ph.D.  
Preceptor in Survey Research  
Department of Government  
Harvard University  
1737 Cambridge St.  
Cambridge, MA 02138

(617) 384-7251  
(617) 495-0438 [FAX]

charrison@gov.harvard.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, 18 Mar 2009 16:55:10 -0500  
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: Re: Standards  
Comments: To: [colleen\\_porter@cox.net](mailto:colleen_porter@cox.net)  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <20090318114940.A4UJS.402603.imal@eastrmwml42>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Here is an attempt to answer Colleen's questions.

The Code does not specify any further consequences tied to censure.

We have some ways of recognizing positive examples of research in awards distributed at the annual meeting (e.g. Innovators, Policy Impact).

In addition, the Poll Review section of \*POQ\* periodically publishes papers highlighting exemplary research.

But I personally think we need to take a more proactive stance on standards issues. I have begun exploring ideas with Council and I will try to start some initiatives this year.

On Wed, Mar 18, 2009 at 10:49 AM, Colleen Porter  
<colleen\_porter@cox.net> wrote:

- > I appreciate the many thoughtful comments and would just like to add a few
- > points for consideration:
- >
- > First, are there any consequences to censureship by AAPOR? Does it mean
- > that one can no longer be a referee for POQ (which Burnham has done),
- > present at an AAPOR conference, or publish in POQ or Survey Practice? This
- > gets pretty tricky because as mentioned earlier it should be the work that
- > is on trial, not the researcher in a personal way. Yet in many states,
- > someone convicted of a felony cannot practice law. And as a practical
- > matter, it would make an easier explanation of the censure--that there are
- > specific consequences from the organization. Even though the real reason,
- > from our point of view, is sticking up for standards.
- >
- > Second, is there a way to be more positive about the need for disclosure?
- > Like once a year coming up with a list of something like the five best
- > survey reports, that exemplified our standards, exceed the minimum
- > disclosure, and share methodological details in a very clear way? I am
- > wondering, if for every year since Luntz, we'd had annual press releases
- > sent not just to lay media but also to professional organization newsletters
- > across various fields, etc. honoring the Pew Religious Landscape Survey and
- > the ABC News Where Things Stand in Iraq survey and so on, that folks would
- > have a better sense of what the standards are, that many surveys meet or
- > exceed them. And even if a journalist never ran a story about the award
- > list per se, they would understand the concept of expected disclosure, and
- > know who to call if they have questions. It just seems that if we were
- > being positive more, then our voice would be even stronger when raised in
- > warning and concern.
- >
- > Colleen Porter
- > Gainesville, FL
- >
- > -----
- > 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.
- >

--

Peter V. Miller  
Department of Communication Studies  
Northwestern University  
Vice-President, American Association for Public Opinion Research  
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, 18 Mar 2009 20:38:55 -0500  
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: Re: Standards  
Comments: To: Hugh Gladwin <[gladwin@fiu.edu](mailto:gladwin@fiu.edu)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[18afe4c50903180928n33b70b1aod92425171883857a@mail.gmail.com](mailto:18afe4c50903180928n33b70b1aod92425171883857a@mail.gmail.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The Burnham et al. Iraq survey was the subject of a Poll Review by David Marker in POQ. (72:2, Summer 2008).

The complaint about non-disclosure of information came later, from a researcher in England, Mark Spagat, who identified himself on AAPORNET.

The Poll Review and the complaint are unconnected. Just for the record, there was a scholarly look at the Iraq survey in POQ before the standards matter was brought.

On Wed, Mar 18, 2009 at 11:28 AM, Hugh Gladwin <[gladwin@fiu.edu](mailto:gladwin@fiu.edu)> wrote:

> In addition to the important issues that have been well commented on here,  
> I  
> think there are also a couple of reasons why it is unfortunate that the  
> Burnham case was pursued as an ethical complaint AAPOR had to deal with.  
>  
> First, the extreme difficulty of doing research in a war zone means it is  
> very hard to separate ethical and methodological concerns. Most of what I  
> have read seems to focus more on the latter, and should have been dealt  
> with  
> in an article submitted for publication in a journal like POQ.  
>  
> Second, the Burnham study is one of a number offering conflicting estimates  
> of the civilian death toll in Iraq. The differences between these  
> estimates  
> have major political implications as well as implications for US military  
> tactics. It may be unfair, but AAPOR's censure will be seen by many

> outside  
> our field as having political implications and even motivations. Again, I  
> think an academic review through published articles and comments would have  
> been a better place to start. It would not have relieved AAPOR of having  
> to  
> respond to an ethical concern, but AAPOR could have acted in response to a  
> much clearer situation.

> -- Hugh

> Dr. Hugh Gladwin, Director  
> Institute for Public Opinion Research,  
> School of Journalism and Mass Communication  
> Assoc. Professor, Global & Sociocultural Studies  
> Florida International University  
> gladwin@fiu.edu, 305-608-9961  
> fax: 866-384-6069, 305-919-5242  
> <http://www.fiu.edu/~ipor/> <<http://www.fiu.edu/%7Eipor/>>

> On Wed, Mar 18, 2009 at 9:49 AM, Colleen Porter <colleen\_porter@cox.net  
> >wrote:

>> I appreciate the many thoughtful comments and would just like to add a  
> few  
>> points for consideration:  
>>  
>> First, are there any consequences to censureship by AAPOR? Does it mean  
>> that one can no longer be a referee for POQ (which Burnham has done),  
>> present at an AAPOR conference, or publish in POQ or Survey Practice?  
> This  
>> gets pretty tricky because as mentioned earlier it should be the work  
> that  
>> is on trial, not the researcher in a personal way. Yet in many states,  
>> someone convicted of a felony cannot practice law. And as a practical  
>> matter, it would make an easier explanation of the censure--that there  
> are  
>> specific consequences from the organization. Even though the real  
> reason,  
>> from our point of view, is sticking up for standards.  
>>  
>> Second, is there a way to be more positive about the need for disclosure?  
>> Like once a year coming up with a list of something like the five best  
>> survey reports, that exemplified our standards, exceed the minimum  
>> disclosure, and share methodological details in a very clear way? I am  
>> wondering, if for every year since Luntz, we'd had annual press releases  
>> sent not just to lay media but also to professional organization  
> newsletters  
>> across various fields, etc. honoring the Pew Religious Landscape Survey  
> and  
>> the ABC News Where Things Stand in Iraq survey and so on, that folks  
> would  
>> have a better sense of what the standards are, that many surveys meet or

>> exceed them. And even if a journalist never ran a story about the award  
>> list per se, they would understand the concept of expected disclosure,  
> and  
>> know who to call if they have questions. It just seems that if we were  
>> being positive more, then our voice would be even stronger when raised in  
>> warning and concern.

>>  
>> Colleen Porter  
>> Gainesville, FL

>> -----  
>> 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.

>

--  
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, 18 Mar 2009 21:42:19 -0600  
Reply-To: Hugh Gladwin <[gladwin@FIU.EDU](mailto:gladwin@FIU.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Hugh Gladwin <[gladwin@FIU.EDU](mailto:gladwin@FIU.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Standards  
Comments: To: Peter Miller <[p-miller@northwestern.edu](mailto:p-miller@northwestern.edu)>  
Comments: cc: "AAPORNET@asu.edu" <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
In-Reply-To: <[815570ad0903181838x47b8011fq886450f0c3de4b53@mail.gmail.com](mailto:815570ad0903181838x47b8011fq886450f0c3de4b53@mail.gmail.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Peter,

Thank you for the clarification. I apologize for jumping into this without



having looked back over what had been done in POQ.

You are all correct who are arguing for a more proactive stance by AAPOR on standards -- with that the Burnham decision wouldn't have been seen so much as having come unexpectedly out of the blue (particularly since AAPOR does not do much censuring like this, so without AAPOR proactive presence, it the censure gets full space on the public attention radar and people have no perspective on it).

-- Hugh

On Wed, Mar 18, 2009 at 7:38 PM, Peter Miller <p-miller@northwestern.edu> wrote:

> The Burnham et al. Iraq survey was the subject of a Poll Review by David  
> Marker in POQ. (72:2, Summer 2008).

>  
> The complaint about non-disclosure of information came later, from a  
> researcher in England, Mark Spagat, who identified himself on AAPORNET.

>  
> The Poll Review and the complaint are unconnected. Just for the record,  
> there was a scholarly look at the Iraq survey in POQ before the standards  
> matter was brought.

>  
> On Wed, Mar 18, 2009 at 11:28 AM, Hugh Gladwin <gladwin@fiu.edu> wrote:

>  
>> In addition to the important issues that have been well commented on here,  
>> I  
>> think there are also a couple of reasons why it is unfortunate that the  
>> Burnham case was pursued as an ethical complaint AAPOR had to deal with.

>>  
>> First, the extreme difficulty of doing research in a war zone means it is  
>> very hard to separate ethical and methodological concerns. Most of what I  
>> have read seems to focus more on the latter, and should have been dealt  
>> with  
>> in an article submitted for publication in a journal like POQ.

>>  
>> Second, the Burnham study is one of a number offering conflicting  
>> estimates  
>> of the civilian death toll in Iraq. The differences between these  
>> estimates  
>> have major political implications as well as implications for US military  
>> tactics. It may be unfair, but AAPOR's censure will be seen by many  
>> outside  
>> our field as having political implications and even motivations. Again, I  
>> think an academic review through published articles and comments would  
>> have  
>> been a better place to start. It would not have relieved AAPOR of having  
>> to  
>> respond to an ethical concern, but AAPOR could have acted in response to a  
>> much clearer situation.

>>  
>> -- Hugh

>>  
>>  
>> Dr. Hugh Gladwin, Director  
>> Institute for Public Opinion Research,  
>> School of Journalism and Mass Communication  
>> Assoc. Professor, Global & Sociocultural Studies  
>> Florida International University  
>> gladwin@fiu.edu, 305-608-9961  
>> fax: 866-384-6069, 305-919-5242  
>> http://www.fiu.edu/~ipor/ <http://www.fiu.edu/%7Eipor/>

>>  
>> On Wed, Mar 18, 2009 at 9:49 AM, Colleen Porter <colleen\_porter@cox.net  
>> >wrote:

>>  
>>> I appreciate the many thoughtful comments and would just like to add a  
>> few  
>>> points for consideration:  
>>>  
>>> First, are there any consequences to censureship by AAPOR? Does it mean  
>>> that one can no longer be a referee for POQ (which Burnham has done),  
>>> present at an AAPOR conference, or publish in POQ or Survey Practice?  
>> This  
>>> gets pretty tricky because as mentioned earlier it should be the work  
>> that  
>>> is on trial, not the researcher in a personal way. Yet in many states,  
>>> someone convicted of a felony cannot practice law. And as a practical  
>>> matter, it would make an easier explanation of the censure--that there  
>> are  
>>> specific consequences from the organization. Even though the real  
>> reason,  
>>> from our point of view, is sticking up for standards.  
>>>  
>>> Second, is there a way to be more positive about the need for  
>> disclosure?  
>>> Like once a year coming up with a list of something like the five best  
>>> survey reports, that exemplified our standards, exceed the minimum  
>>> disclosure, and share methodological details in a very clear way? I am  
>>> wondering, if for every year since Luntz, we'd had annual press releases  
>>> sent not just to lay media but also to professional organization  
>> newsletters  
>>> across various fields, etc. honoring the Pew Religious Landscape Survey  
>> and  
>>> the ABC News Where Things Stand in Iraq survey and so on, that folks  
>> would  
>>> have a better sense of what the standards are, that many surveys meet or  
>>> exceed them. And even if a journalist never ran a story about the award  
>>> list per se, they would understand the concept of expected disclosure,  
>> and  
>>> know who to call if they have questions. It just seems that if we were  
>>> being positive more, then our voice would be even stronger when raised  
>> in  
>>> warning and concern.  
>>>

>>> Colleen Porter  
>>> Gainesville, FL  
>>>  
>>> -----  
>>> 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.  
>>>

>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> --  
> 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: Thu, 19 Mar 2009 06:08:59 -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: AAPOR and CASRO "amicus brief" on respondent confidentiality  
is supported by Federal Court  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

In a much smaller way I went through this years ago with my client The Stanley Works. They were being sued by a company (interested in a possible acquisition) who claimed that they couldn't fully evaluate all aspects of

Stanley unless we disclosed the identification information for each respondent participating in a recent quantitative study. I went to court

with Stanley where we made arguments very similar to the Tyson case, citing industry codes, the issue of confidentiality, and the potential harm if

ethical standards were compromised. And, as in the Tyson case, the judge ruled that the defendants had not met the burden of proof and could not adequately justify why having this information was "relevant and necessary to their case." A hair-raising but rewarding experience for this researcher.

--  
Margaret R. Roller  
Roller Marketing Research  
rnr@rollerresearch.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: Thu, 19 Mar 2009 09:16:45 -0400  
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: more Re: Summary: data collection by text messaging  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[200903181654.n2IGqm43018860@lists.asu.edu](mailto:200903181654.n2IGqm43018860@lists.asu.edu)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=utf-8  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Someone was kind enough to send me the following citation, which describes the experiment with text messages that led to the paragraph I had quoted from the report of the AAPOR Cell Phone Survey Task Force.

Steeh, Charlotte, Trent D. Buskirk, and Mario Callegaro.. 2007. "Using Text Messages in U.S. Mobile Phone Surveys," *Field Methods* 19: 59-75.

This article makes the point that the researcher must know whether or not the text message was actually delivered before a judgment of its effectiveness in increasing participation can be made.

---- Colleen Porter <[colleen\\_porter@COX.NET](mailto:colleen_porter@COX.NET)> wrote:

> Here is a summary of what I learned about text messaging as a form of data collection.

>  
> First, there is a very recent article:  
> "Smartphones: An Emerging Tool for Social Scientists"  
> by Mika Raento, Antti Oulasvirta and Nathan Eagle  
> *Sociological Methods Research* 37; 426-454  
> February 2009

>  
> Then, Eszter Hargittai of the Communication Studies Department at Northwestern, currently a fellow at the Berkman Center for Internet & Society, Harvard University has an upcoming book called RESEARCH CONFIDENTIAL that

includes a chapter, "WAT R U DOIN? Studying the Thumb Generation Using Text Messaging" by Eszter Hargittai and Chris Karr. I was able to read an advance copy, and the methods section is excellent and helpful, but the references list is one of the shortest I have ever seen, because this is all so new.

>

> Adolescents were also the target audience of some work some colleagues did here in Florida; they followed young people for a bit, giving them a prepaid cell phone and rewarding their participation with additional minutes.

>

> Some commercial recommendations:

> "Techneos,® Systems today launched the full beta version of its Survey On-Demand Application (SODA,®) software platform for mobile phone surveys..."

> <http://www.techneos.com/newsandreviews/soda-platform-beta-launched-mra-fall-conference>

>

> Someone said that 20/20 Research does this

> <http://www.2020research.com/>

> and they had seen a presentation from Jim Bryson.

>

> Here in a health-care context, people are excited about the idea of using text messaging as a form of realtime diary keeping. When they started coming out with cell phones that are also blood sugar monitors, the research opportunities seemed obvious, and here is one of the first articles to explore that application:

>

> "Interactive diary for diabetes: A useful and easy-to-use new telemedicine system to support the decision-making process in type 1 diabetes."

> Rossi MC, Nicolucci A, Pellegrini F, Bruttomesso D, Bartolo PD, Marelli G, Dal Pos M, Galetta M, Horwitz D, Vespasiani G.

> DIABETES TECHNOLOGY & THERAPEUTICS, 11 (1): 19-24 JAN 2009

>

> One application of text-messaging was as a pre-alert for cell phone surveys, rather than data collection per se. That was explored in the now-classic 2007 article "Cell Phone Survey Feasibility in The U.S.: Sampling and Calling Cell Numbers Versus Landline Numbers" by J. Michael Brick, Pat D. Brick, Sarah Dipko, Stanley Presser, Clyde Tucker and Yangyang Yuan, Public Opinion Quarterly 71(1):23-39. Their experiment found no difference in response rates in a survey of cell phones between numbers that were texted before the first call and those that were not texted.

>

> However, text pre-alerts were found to be helpful in a study in Finland (which may be a preview of what the U.S. might look like in a few years). Here's that reference.

> Author(s): Virtanen, V; Sirkia, T; Jokiranta, V

> Title: Reducing nonresponse by SMS reminders in mail surveys

> Source: SOCIAL SCIENCE COMPUTER REVIEW, 25 (3): 384-395 FAL 2007

>

> However, in the US, there are also legal concerns, as these commenters pointed out--

> >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.

>  
> Also  
> >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.

>  
> So that's kind of what we learned.

>  
> Colleen Porter  
> Gainesville, FL

>  
> -----  
> 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: Thu, 19 Mar 2009 10:44:14 -0500  
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Subject: Re: AAPOR and CASRO "amicus brief" on respondent confidentiality  
is supported by Federal Court  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[LISTSERV%200903190608594552.12D8@LISTS.ASU.EDU](mailto:LISTSERV%200903190608594552.12D8@LISTS.ASU.EDU)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Here is an experience I had that may be of interest to Florida pollsters.

Serial candidate and litigant Andy Martin tried to sue the Chicago Tribune and my company in 2006 claiming we omitted his name in a 2006 GOP Illinois primary poll. The poll had him at 1% - but he persisted

even after official results showed him winning only 0.8% of votes. In addition to respondent names, he wanted correspondence in advance of the poll, questionnaire drafts, data sets, marginals, etc. etc. Release of such information to someone untrained in survey research was problematic.

Martin who has residences in Chicago and Palm Beach is a frequent candidate in Illinois and Florida plus a few other states. In 2004 he was tossed from the IL Senate ballot over nominating petition issues which left plenty of time to become a Senate candidate in Florida the same year. He has been a candidate somewhere in every election year since 1978.

Our attorneys apparently shared original and CATI questionnaires and a marginal report with the judge. Below comes from a story about 2010 Illinois Senate candidates. Go to Wikipedia for more background on Andy Martin.

Nick

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

> LITTLE-KNOWN FIELD VIES TO FACE DURBIN

> Chicago Tribune - Chicago, Ill.

> David Mendell; Rick Pearson

> Feb 1, 2008

>

> -----

> One challenger, Andy Martin, has been a frequent candidate in Illinois

> and Florida in the last three decades. His last appearance on the

> state's Republican primary ballot was two years ago, when he received

> 6,095 votes in finishing last in a five-way race in which more than

> 729,000 ballots were cast.

>

> In 1973, the Illinois Supreme Court refused to allow Martin admission

> to the bar, saying he lacked the fitness to be an attorney.

>

> Federal courts have repeatedly sanctioned him for what judges said is

> his filing of hundreds of largely meritless legal actions.

>

> In early January, a Cook County judge tossed a lawsuit Martin filed

> against the Tribune alleging the newspaper portrayed him in a false

> light, contending that his name was not surveyed in a poll of the GOP

> primary candidates for governor that showed he had less than 1 percent

> support. [Election outcome: Martin got 0.8%.]

>

> Judge Stuart Palmer ruled Martin's allegations about the poll appeared

> to be "simply wrong" in that Martin's name was included in the survey.

>

> Palmer also rejected the lawsuit, in part, because he said Martin had

> failed to adhere to a federal court injunction preventing him from

> initiating lawsuits in state courts without filing a document reciting

> his litigation history.

>

> In his past, Martin also has expressed anti-Semitic views. When he ran

> for Congress in Connecticut in 1986, the name of his congressional

> campaign committee included the phrase "to exterminate Jew power in  
> America," Federal Election Commission records show.  
> ----

Margaret R. Roller wrote:

>In a much smaller way I went through this years ago with my client The  
>Stanley Works. They were being sued by a company (interested in a possible  
>acquisition) who claimed that they couldn't fully evaluate all aspects of  
>Stanley unless we disclosed the identification information for each  
>respondent participating in a recent quantitative study. I went to court  
>with Stanley where we made arguments very similar to the Tyson case, citing  
>industry codes, the issue of confidentiality, and the potential harm if  
>ethical standards were compromised. And, as in the Tyson case, the judge  
>ruled that the defendants had not met the burden of proof and could not  
>adequately justify why having this information was "relevant and necessary  
>to their case." A hair-raising but rewarding experience for this researcher.

>  
>--  
>Margaret R. Roller  
>Roller Marketing Research  
>rnr@rollerresearch.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)

-----  
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, 19 Mar 2009 10:36:28 -0700  
Reply-To: Teresa Edwards <[teresa\\_edwards@UNC.EDU](mailto:teresa_edwards@UNC.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Teresa Edwards <[teresa\\_edwards@UNC.EDU](mailto:teresa_edwards@UNC.EDU)>  
Subject: Job Posting - Notre Dame Center for Social Research  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

I am posting this for a colleague. If interested, please respond as=20  
indicated below.

Teresa Edwards  
Odum Institute for Research in Social Science  
University of North Carolina--Chapel Hill



ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR =E2=80=93  
NOTRE DAME CENTER FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH

The University of Notre Dame (www.nd.edu), a Catholic University, and one=  
=20  
of the nation's top 20 institutions of higher learning, invites=20  
applications for the position of Associate Director within the Notre Dame=  
=20  
Center for Social Research. The Associate Director is responsible for=20=

long-term vision and development and for overseeing the day-to day=20  
operations of the Notre Dame Center for Social Research. The Associate=20=

Director will take a leadership role in the communications of the Center,=  
=20  
will manage the Center's programs, coordinate internal computer needs wit=  
h=20  
internal IT units, assist project managers on infrastructural needs, and=20=

assist the Director in developing the Center's intellectual and=20  
programmatic vision.=20

Specific duties include the following:=20  
-09Responsible for the various projects, educational programs, and=20  
outreach efforts with which the Center is involved. Manage the Center's=20=

lectures, workshops, and meetings.=20  
-09Manage the Center's proposal activities and know the proposal=20  
development process. Work with other centers and small groups preparing=20=

proposals for scholarly activity in the Center.=20  
-09Establish vehicles for communicating with the Center's various=20  
constituencies.=20  
-09Play a central role in the Center's evaluation of its programs and=20=

priorities. The Associate Director will assist in the determination of=20=  
priorities based on opportunity and current and future resources.=20  
-09Serve as the liaison between the Center and Human Resources, the=20  
Center and the Office of the Vice President for Research, and the Center=20=  
and other ND units, such as OIT, Center for Research Computing, Arts &=20=

Letters, etc. The Associate Director will assume the leadership role for=20=  
the Center's staff members and student employees.=20=20=20=20

MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS:  
Master's degree required in a social science field or extensive career=20=  
experience in work related to the social sciences. Must have at least 3 o=  
r=20

more years of experience in the managing, strategic development and administration of a social science or similar academic center, program, or institute.

The following special knowledge, abilities or skills are required:

- Excellent organizational, management, and problem-solving skills.
- Excellent written and verbal communication skills, especially the ability to communicate with various audiences.
- Must be able to exercise strong leadership in fostering an organizational culture among Center for Social Research staff emphasizing outreach, service, and customer support to and for University constituencies which the Center serves. Must have a proactive, pragmatic, problem-solving orientation to work.
- Must be able to work both independently of direct supervision by the Center's Director and collaboratively with Center staff and its constituencies.
- Significant experience in assisting with similar or comparable program.

#### APPLICATION PROCESS:

Please apply online at <http://ND.jobs> to Job # 09098. For additional information about working at the University of Notre Dame and various benefits available to employees, please visit [http://hr.nd.edu/employment/working\\_at\\_nd.shtml](http://hr.nd.edu/employment/working_at_nd.shtml).

The University of Notre Dame is committed to diversity in its staff, faculty, and student body. As such, we strongly encourage applications from members of minority groups, women, veterans, individuals with disabilities, and others who will enhance our community.

The University of Notre Dame is an EEO/AA employer.

-----  
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, 19 Mar 2009 17:30:23 -0400  
Reply-To: Tom Guterbock <[tmg1p@VIRGINIA.EDU](mailto:tmg1p@VIRGINIA.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Tom Guterbock <[tmg1p@VIRGINIA.EDU](mailto:tmg1p@VIRGINIA.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Standards  
Comments: To: AAPORnet List server <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Content-Disposition: inline

And the POQ Poll Review process affords the target of the critique an

opportunity to respond in the pages of the journal. That offer was declined.

Tom G. (former co-editor, with Mark Schulman, of Poll Reviews)

--On Wednesday, March 18, 2009 8:38 PM -0500 Peter Miller  
<p-miller@NORTHWESTERN.EDU> wrote:

> The Burnham et al. Iraq survey was the subject of a Poll Review by David  
> Marker in POQ. (72:2, Summer 2008).

>  
> The complaint about non-disclosure of information came later, from a  
> researcher in England, Mark Spagat, who identified himself on AAPORNET.

>  
> The Poll Review and the complaint are unconnected. Just for the record,  
> there was a scholarly look at the Iraq survey in POQ before the standards  
> matter was brought.

>  
> On Wed, Mar 18, 2009 at 11:28 AM, Hugh Gladwin <gladwin@fiu.edu> wrote:

>  
>> In addition to the important issues that have been well commented on  
>> here, I  
>> think there are also a couple of reasons why it is unfortunate that the  
>> Burnham case was pursued as an ethical complaint AAPOR had to deal with.

>>  
>> First, the extreme difficulty of doing research in a war zone means it is  
>> very hard to separate ethical and methodological concerns. Most of what  
>> I have read seems to focus more on the latter, and should have been dealt  
>> with  
>> in an article submitted for publication in a journal like POQ.

>>  
>> Second, the Burnham study is one of a number offering conflicting  
>> estimates of the civilian death toll in Iraq. The differences between  
>> these estimates  
>> have major political implications as well as implications for US military  
>> tactics. It may be unfair, but AAPOR's censure will be seen by many  
>> outside  
>> our field as having political implications and even motivations. Again,  
>> I think an academic review through published articles and comments would  
>> have been a better place to start. It would not have relieved AAPOR of  
>> having to  
>> respond to an ethical concern, but AAPOR could have acted in response to  
>> a much clearer situation.

>>  
>> -- Hugh

>>  
>> Dr. Hugh Gladwin, Director  
>> Institute for Public Opinion Research,  
>> School of Journalism and Mass Communication  
>> Assoc. Professor, Global & Sociocultural Studies  
>> Florida International University  
>> gladwin@fiu.edu, 305-608-9961  
>> fax: 866-384-6069, 305-919-5242  
>> <http://www.fiu.edu/~ipor/> <<http://www.fiu.edu/%7Eipor/>>

>>  
>>  
>> On Wed, Mar 18, 2009 at 9:49 AM, Colleen Porter <colleen\_porter@cox.net  
>> > wrote:  
>>  
>> > I appreciate the many thoughtful comments and would just like to add a  
>> few  
>> > points for consideration:  
>> >  
>> > First, are there any consequences to censureship by AAPOR? Does it  
>> > mean that one can no longer be a referee for POQ (which Burnham has  
>> > done), present at an AAPOR conference, or publish in POQ or Survey  
>> > Practice?  
>> This  
>> > gets pretty tricky because as mentioned earlier it should be the work  
>> that  
>> > is on trial, not the researcher in a personal way. Yet in many states,  
>> > someone convicted of a felony cannot practice law. And as a practical  
>> > matter, it would make an easier explanation of the censure--that there  
>> are  
>> > specific consequences from the organization. Even though the real  
>> reason,  
>> > from our point of view, is sticking up for standards.  
>> >  
>> > Second, is there a way to be more positive about the need for  
>> > disclosure? Like once a year coming up with a list of something like  
>> > the five best survey reports, that exemplified our standards, exceed  
>> > the minimum disclosure, and share methodological details in a very  
>> > clear way? I am wondering, if for every year since Luntz, we'd had  
>> > annual press releases sent not just to lay media but also to  
>> > professional organization  
>> newsletters  
>> > across various fields, etc. honoring the Pew Religious Landscape Survey  
>> and  
>> > the ABC News Where Things Stand in Iraq survey and so on, that folks  
>> would  
>> > have a better sense of what the standards are, that many surveys meet  
>> > or exceed them. And even if a journalist never ran a story about the  
>> > award list per se, they would understand the concept of expected  
>> > disclosure,  
>> and  
>> > know who to call if they have questions. It just seems that if we were  
>> > being positive more, then our voice would be even stronger when raised  
>> > in warning and concern.  
>> >  
>> > Colleen Porter  
>> > Gainesville, FL  
>> >  
>> > -----  
>> > 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.

>>  
>  
>  
>  
> --  
> 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.

Thomas M. Guterbock                      Voice: (434)243-5223  
Director                      CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222  
Center for Survey Research              FAX: (434)982-5524  
University of Virginia      EXPRESS DELIVERY: 2400 Old Ivy Road  
P. O. Box 400767                      Suite 212  
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767      Charlottesville, VA 22903  
e-mail: [TomG@virginia.edu](mailto:TomG@virginia.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, 19 Mar 2009 14:37:06 -0700  
Reply-To: Paul Goodwin <[paulg@GSVRESEARCH.COM](mailto:paulg@GSVRESEARCH.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Paul Goodwin <[paulg@GSVRESEARCH.COM](mailto:paulg@GSVRESEARCH.COM)>  
Subject: 6th grade math class -- I survived!  
Comments: To: "AAPORNET@ASU. EDU" <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
Mime-Version: 1.0 (Apple Message framework v930.3)  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII; format=flowed; delp=yes  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

These were some smart kids, and were quite up to speed on all kinds of research-related issues. We did a pizza toppings poll and some random sampling exercises, and I even broke out the dreaded histogram. We spent most of the time talking about good questions and bad questions, and their ideas about good questions would certainly be in line with AAPOR standards, if not exceeding them. I kept a bag of M and Ms in

reserve in case things went south, but fortunately they were interested enough in my presentation that no extra bribes were necessary. Thanks again to everyone for your suggestions.

Paul Goodwin  
Goodwin Simon Victoria Research  
P.O. Box 366  
Culver City CA 90232  
310/558-4761 (phone)  
310/210-8984 (mobile)  
paulg@gsvresearch.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: Fri, 20 Mar 2009 10:58:01 -0400  
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: 6th grade math class -- I survived!  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=utf-8  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

It was great to hear about how that went, and that there is a budding new crop of researchers coming along:)

I was wondering about it Wednesday night as I drove home, because I had a similar opportunity, to speak at a career night event for high school-aged kids. I had been invited through a church connection, but it was in a small town right in the middle of the intervention area for my new project at work, which influenced my willingness to spend the time driving up there.

I had brought along copies of my research reports, etc. But when I looked out at those faces, I ended up saying things that I had not planned at all.

I talked about being a nerd in high school, but that nowadays I have a better-paying job and richer life than a lot of the "popular" kids. I told them that they should do what they love no matter what anybody says, whether it is drawing manga or collecting insects or writing crossword puzzles or dancing or cooking or whatever. And I assured them that there are so many jobs out there that never seem to show up at typical career fairs, that hopefully they will find a good fit for them.

I don't mean to imply that AAPOR is a bunch of geeks. Of course lots of AAPOR

members are fine athletes who went through college on scholarships, or are wonderful musicians, served as class presidents, and/or were elected prom queen. And their current work benefits from the discipline and leadership skills they learned in high school, from doing those things.

I didn't mean to put down those who do enjoy popular success at a young age, but rather to provide hope to those who are currently misfits, humiliated by students who make fun of them and marginalized by teachers who don't realize their less-obvious gifts. It's easy to miss a unicorn when you are looking for a thoroughbred horse.

The great thing about research is that none of us can do it alone. We usually work as teams, and in building a team a variety of talents is needed; complementary skills and styles make each of us stronger. Even a geek might find a place where they are needed and valued.

These kids go to a small-town high school that doesn't have a Mu Alpha Theta (math) or debate team. I hope they know they might be unicorns, who will find a welcome in other pastures.

Colleen Porter  
Gainesville, FL

P.S. I also confess that I overplayed the nerd thing...I didn't really have to turn on the light saber function of my iphone; setting the timer for my allotted time was probably sufficient.

---- Paul Goodwin <paulg@GSVRESEARCH.COM> wrote:

> These were some smart kids, and were quite up to speed on all kinds of  
> research-related issues. We did a pizza toppings poll and some random  
> sampling exercises, and I even broke out the dreaded histogram. We  
> spent most of the time talking about good questions and bad questions,  
> and their ideas about good questions would certainly be in line with  
> AAPOR standards, if not exceeding them. I kept a bag of M and Ms in  
> reserve in case things went south, but fortunately they were  
> interested enough in my presentation that no extra bribes were  
> necessary. Thanks again to everyone for your suggestions.

>  
>

> Paul Goodwin  
> Goodwin Simon Victoria Research  
> P.O. Box 366  
> Culver City CA 90232  
> 310/558-4761 (phone)  
> 310/210-8984 (mobile)  
> paulg@gsvresearch.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: Mon, 23 Mar 2009 11:27:00 -0400  
Reply-To: "Chase H. Harrison" <CHarrison@GOV.HARVARD.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Chase H. Harrison" <CHarrison@GOV.HARVARD.EDU>  
Organization: Harvard University  
Subject: Conference on Survey Quality -- April 17 -- Harvard PSR  
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Dear AAPOR and NEAAPOR members:

I'd like to remind anyone who would like to attend that the Harvard Program on Survey Research spring conference is this April 17. It is open to the public, and we always extend a particularly warm welcome to members of NEAPOR and AAPOR . If you are planning on attending, please be sure to register on the conference web page at:

[http://www.iq.harvard.edu/psr/survey\\_quality\\_psr\\_spring\\_conference](http://www.iq.harvard.edu/psr/survey_quality_psr_spring_conference)

PSR Conference on Survey Quality  
April 17, 2009  
Tsai Auditorium (CGIS S0101),  
Harvard University  
1730 Cambridge Street  
Cambridge, MA 01238

It is widely recognized that survey research faces methodological challenges which have created general skepticism about survey research as a method among many practitioners and consumers. At the same time, new technologies have dramatically lowered costs for some types of survey methods (especially opt-in web surveys), resulting in a proliferation of new data. Unfortunately, a lack of methodological transparency and gaps between the way that survey methodologists understand survey quality and the way survey data are often reported limit the use of many of these new surveys both for the study of survey methodology and substantive inquiry. This conference is designed to bring together experts in survey methodology and important practitioners from the media, government, and major academic surveys to discuss our current understanding of survey quality, the challenges presented in designing and using survey data in light of rapidly emerging technologies, and the opportunities that increasing variation in survey methods may provide for better understanding the nature of survey data and social phenomena.

Tentative Schedule

8:45--9:00 Continental Breakfast

9:00--9:15 Introduction and Welcome (Sunshine Hillygus)

9:15 -- 10:30 Overview of Survey Quality



"Quality Assurance and Quality Control in Surveys" (Lars Lyberg)

"Adaptive Survey Design Using Bespoke Paradata" (Robert Groves)

10:30 -- 10:45 Coffee Break

10:45-12:00 Survey Quality Issues in Context

"Developing and Implementing Standards for Surveys within the Federal Statistical Service" (Brian Harris-Kojten)

"Total Survey Error in Comparative Perspective" (Tom W. Smith)

12:00-12:45 Lunch

12:45- 2:45 Measuring Quality

"Comparing Various Measures of Survey Accuracy and Summarizing the Findings of Studies Using Each Method" (Jon Krosnick)

"Evaluating the relationship between measurement error bias and nonresponse bias with implications for nonresponse follow-up operations" (Paul Biemer)

"Ask More" (Steve Ansolabehere)

2:45-3:00 Coffee Break

3:00-5:00 Transparency and Reporting

"Survey Reporting Standards" (Gary Langer)

"Transparency and Pre-Election Polls" (Michael Traugott)

"Preserving Survey Quality in a Time of Poll Proliferation" (Kathy Frankovic)

"The Rise and Fall of Truth in Polling" (Phil Meyer)

5:00-6:00 Reception

--

Chase H. Harrison, Ph.D.

Preceptor in Survey Research, Department of Government  
Assistant Director, Program in Survey Research  
Harvard University

1737 Cambridge St.

Cambridge, MA 02138

(617) 384-7251 [Voice]

(617) 495-0438 [FAX]

Email: CHarrison@gov.harvard.edu <mailto:CHarrison@gov.harvard.edu>

Harvard Program on Survey Research

<http://www.iq.harvard.edu/psr/>

-----  
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, 23 Mar 2009 13:05:52 -0400

Reply-To: [hillygus@fas.harvard.edu](mailto:hillygus@fas.harvard.edu)

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

From: "D. Sunshine Hillygus" <[hillygus@FAS.HARVARD.EDU](mailto:hillygus@FAS.HARVARD.EDU)>

Subject: Call for Papers: Special Issue of POQ on 2008 election

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

As a reminder, Public Opinion Quarterly seeks submissions for a special issue of the journal devoted to an examination of the 2008 election. The fast-approaching deadline for manuscript submissions is May 15, 2009. To expedite the review process, it would be helpful to notify the special issue guest editor, Sunshine Hillygus ([hillygus@fas.harvard.edu](mailto:hillygus@fas.harvard.edu)), as to your planned submission topic in advance of the deadline.

We welcome contributions on all topics related to the 2008 U.S. election, and we especially welcome submissions that are both substantive and methodological in nature. Potential topics might include (but are not limited to): the performance of pre-election polls, the impact of new technologies on election polling, social desirability effects in polling about race and gender, measurement issues in evaluating policy attitudes, the estimation of campaign effects, and the implications of early voting for election polling.

To submit a manuscript, please follow the manuscript preparation instructions provided at the journal's website (<http://poq.oupjournals.org>/<http://poq.oupjournals.org>/<http://poq.oupjournals.org>).

Blinded and unblinded electronic copies of the paper should be submitted online at <http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/poq>, and it should be clearly stated in a cover letter that the manuscript is for consideration in the 2008 election special issue. Submissions will be peer-reviewed in accord with normal journal practice.

--

D. Sunshine Hillygus  
Frederick S. Danziger Associate Professor of Government  
Director, Program on Survey Research  
Harvard University  
Cambridge, MA 02138  
(617) 496-4220

-----  
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, 23 Mar 2009 19:28:45 -0400

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: Further thoughts on l'affaire Bunham

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

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Some clarification as to just what it is about AAPOR's censure of Gilbert Burnham makes me so uncomfortable.

Let me preface this by stating that I am not at all in favor of relaxing the AAPOR Code. I was not a member of Tom Guterbock's committee, but I did spend a number of hours with Harry O'Neil helping him polish the language of the revision and later, explain and defend it at the 2004 General Meeting in Phoenix. Some of you may also remember that, when the revised Code was submitted to the full membership for approval the following year, I protested that Council had unilaterally weakened the language adopted in Phoenix, and for that reason voted against it.

That said, I do not believe that either of my original questions has been answered in a meaningful way.

First, the identity of the petitioner. Michael Spagat has indeed

identified himself to AAPORNET members as the person who brought the action before the Standards Committee, but Council has not identified him publicly in any of the statements issued by AAPOR. Mr. Spagat refers us to his paper "Ethical and Data-integrity Problems of the Second Lancet Survey of Mortality in Iraq" for details of his complaint that Burnham had violated the AAPOR Code. That paper is dated September 2008 and is, according to the author, "forthcoming in the journal Defense and Peace Economics."

Secrecy is, of course, essential to protect whistleblowers, but that is clearly not the situation here. The Spagat paper detailing the charges predates Council's initial statement by 6 months and has already been accepted for publication, so why is Council withholding Mr. Spagat's name? Was anonymity requested, and if so, by the complainant or by someone else?

Second, the question of just what is the purpose of the censure statement. Technically, the only thing the AAPOR statement says is that Dr. Burnham has violated the AAPOR Code of Ethics by not providing information demanded of him. But of course that is not the real issue. The real issue is that Dr. Burnham has been accused of falsification and that is the only reason he was asked to provide the information in the first place.

I have no opinion one way or the other about Dr. Burnham or the case against him and I don't know why he has refused to reveal details of his research. It certainly does arouse suspicion and AAPOR is absolutely right to remind people that basic principles of scientific research require that he be more open about his methods or provide compelling reasons for not doing so. But he is not a member of AAPOR and has not agreed to abide by the AAPOR Code, so it is inappropriate for AAPOR to accuse him of violating the AAPOR Code of Ethics.

The fundamental issue is this: AAPOR is not a regulatory body and has no standing to compel anyone to follow its rules, even within its own field of Public Opinion Research. Nor does it have a mandate to adjudicate every dispute that involves survey methodology or practice in some way.

By claiming those powers, AAPOR has set itself up to be taken advantage of by nearly any person who wishes to use our reputation to advance his case in a scientific dispute. If so, the Standards Committee could be very, very busy in coming years.

My greatest fear is that some may try to relax the AAPOR Code to avoid this kind of problem. That would be a tragedy. AAPOR needs to encourage the highest standards of professional behavior, but it also needs to recognize that it will be most effective if it leads by example, not if it acts as a self-appointed enforcer of ethical and professional behavior.

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

---

Date: Mon, 23 Mar 2009 20:41:38 -0400  
Reply-To: "Rockwell, Richard" <richard.rockwell@UCONN.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Rockwell, Richard" <richard.rockwell@UCONN.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Further thoughts on l'affaire Bunham  
Comments: To: jwerner@jwdp.com, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

The "Schedule of Procedures for Dealing with Alleged AAPOR Code Violations" does not provide for release by AAPOR of the name(s) of the complainant(s). "1e. The complaint form and all related materials prepared for Council, the Standards Committee, and the Evaluation Committee (if one is appointed as provided in section 4 below) will be kept confidential, and all Council, Standards Committee, and Evaluation Committee discussions related to the specifics of the complaint will be treated as privileged communication." The Procedures do not permit anything other than what AAPOR did, and thus it is true that "... Council has not identified him publicly in any of the statements issued by AAPOR." Council would have been properly reprimanded had it done so.

In fact, keeping the name of the complainant(s) confidential would seem to be a sovereign remedy against " By claiming those powers, AAPOR has set itself up to be taken advantage of by nearly any person who wishes to use our reputation to advance his case in a scientific dispute." One can hardly advance one's reputation by being anonymous.

The Schedule also provides "1b. Any organization, firm, individual, or group of individuals may be named in such a complaint, whether or not it or they are members of AAPOR." If it is deemed improper for the Committee and the Council to have taken this action, the place to correct that would be revision of the Schedule, not to criticize a specific instance in which the rules have been followed.

AAPOR cannot promulgate a "Code of Professional Ethics and Standards for All Survey Researchers Everywhere." Neither can the AMA. In neither case is the organization prohibited from applying its code to the conduct of researchers who are not members. Indeed, I suspect that many of us would be distressed were AMA to speak only to the ethics of its members, who are less than 20% of practicing physicians.

---

Richard C. ROCKWELL  
Professor and Associate Head  
Department of Sociology  
University of Connecticut Unit 2068  
344 Mansfield Road  
Storrs-Mansfield, CT 06269-2068  
+1.860.486.0086 Office +1.860.486.4422 Department +1.860.486-6356 Fax

richard.rockwell@uconn.edu

---

From: AAPORNET on behalf of Jan Werner  
Sent: Mon 3/23/2009 7:28 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Further thoughts on l'affaire Bunham

Some clarification as to just what it is about AAPOR's censure of Gilbert Burnham makes me so uncomfortable.

Let me preface this by stating that I am not at all in favor of relaxing the AAPOR Code. I was not a member of Tom Guterbock's committee, but I did spend a number of hours with Harry O'Neil helping him polish the language of the revision and later, explain and defend it at the 2004 General Meeting in Phoenix. Some of you may also remember that, when the revised Code was submitted to the full membership for approval the following year, I protested that Council had unilaterally weakened the language adopted in Phoenix, and for that reason voted against it.

That said, I do not believe that either of my original questions has been answered in a meaningful way.

First, the identity of the petitioner. Michael Spagat has indeed identified himself to AAPORNET members as the person who brought the action before the Standards Committee, but Council has not identified him publicly in any of the statements issued by AAPOR. Mr. Spagat refers us to his paper "Ethical and Data-integrity Problems of the Second Lancet Survey of Mortality in Iraq" for details of his complaint that Burnham had violated the AAPOR Code. That paper is dated September 2008 and is, according to the author, "forthcoming in the journal Defense and Peace Economics."

Secrecy is, of course, essential to protect whistleblowers, but that is clearly not the situation here. The Spagat paper detailing the charges predates Council's initial statement by 6 months and has already been accepted for publication, so why is Council withholding Mr. Spagat's name? Was anonymity requested, and if so, by the complainant or by someone else?

Second, the question of just what is the purpose of the censure statement. Technically, the only thing the AAPOR statement says is that Dr. Burnham has violated the AAPOR Code of Ethics by not providing information demanded of him. But of course that is not the real issue. The real issue is that Dr. Burnham has been accused of falsification and that is the only reason he was asked to provide the information in the first place.

I have no opinion one way or the other about Dr. Burnham or the case against him and I don't know why he has refused to reveal details of his research. It certainly does arouse suspicion and AAPOR is absolutely

right to remind people that basic principles of scientific research require that he be more open about his methods or provide compelling reasons for not doing so. But he is not a member of AAPOR and has not agreed to abide by the AAPOR Code, so it is inappropriate for AAPOR to accuse him of violating the AAPOR Code of Ethics.

The fundamental issue is this: AAPOR is not a regulatory body and has no standing to compel anyone to follow its rules, even within its own field of Public Opinion Research. Nor does it have a mandate to adjudicate every dispute that involves survey methodology or practice in some way.

By claiming those powers, AAPOR has set itself up to be taken advantage of by nearly any person who wishes to use our reputation to advance his case in a scientific dispute. If so, the Standards Committee could be very, very busy in coming years.

My greatest fear is that some may try to relax the AAPOR Code to avoid this kind of problem. That would be a tragedy. AAPOR needs to encourage the highest standards of professional behavior, but it also needs to recognize that it will be most effective if it leads by example, not if it acts as a self-appointed enforcer of ethical and professional behavior.

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: Mon, 23 Mar 2009 21:14:43 -0400

Reply-To: JAMES P MURPHY <[jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM](mailto:jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM)>

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

From: JAMES P MURPHY <[jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM](mailto:jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM)>

Subject: Re: Further thoughts on l'affaire Bunham

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

To help contextualize the Burnham case, would someone kindly inform the list of the number of Burnham-like cases (i.e. complaints resulting in censure) that have been processed by AAPOR in, say, each of the past five years? Or

point us to a report containing same.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.  
J.P. MURPHY & COMPANY  
609 921 2432 Princeton, N.J.  
772 219 7671 Stuart, Fla.  
610 408 8800 Mobile  
www.jpMurphy.com

610 408 8800 Mobile

610 408 8800 Mobile

www.jpMurphy.com

jpMurphy@jpMurphy.com

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

From: "Rockwell, Richard" <richard.rockwell@UConn.EDU>



To: <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
Sent: Monday, March 23, 2009 8:41 PM  
Subject: Re: Further thoughts on l'affaire Bunham

> The "Schedule of Procedures for Dealing with Alleged AAPOR Code  
> Violations" does not provide for release by AAPOR of the name(s) of the  
> complainant(s). "1e. The complaint form and all related materials  
> prepared for Council, the Standards Committee, and the Evaluation  
> Committee (if one is appointed as provided in section 4 below) will be  
> kept confidential, and all Council, Standards Committee, and Evaluation  
> Committee discussions related to the specifics of the complaint will be  
> treated as privileged communication." The Procedures do not permit  
> anything other than what AAPOR did, and thus it is true that "... Council  
> has not identified him publicly in any of the statements issued by AAPOR."  
> Council would have been properly reprimanded had it done so.

>  
> In fact, keeping the name of the complainant(s) confidential would seem to  
> be a sovereign remedy against " By claiming those powers, AAPOR has set  
> itself up to be taken advantage of by nearly any person who wishes to use  
> our reputation to advance his case in a scientific dispute." One can  
> hardly advance one's reputation by being anonymous.

>  
> The Schedule also provides "1b. Any organization, firm, individual, or  
> group of individuals may be named in such a complaint, whether or not it  
> or they are members of AAPOR." If it is deemed improper for the Committee  
> and the Council to have taken this action, the place to correct that would  
> be revision of the Schedule, not to criticize a specific instance in which  
> the rules have been followed.

>  
> AAPOR cannot promulgate a "Code of Professional Ethics and Standards for  
> All Survey Researchers Everywhere." Neither can the AMA. In neither case  
> is the organization prohibited from applying its code to the conduct of  
> researchers who are not members. Indeed, I suspect that many of us would  
> be distressed were AMA to speak only to the ethics of its members, who are  
> less than 20% of practicing physicians.

> -----  
> Richard C. ROCKWELL  
> Professor and Associate Head  
> Department of Sociology  
> University of Connecticut Unit 2068  
> 344 Mansfield Road  
> Storrs-Mansfield, CT 06269-2068  
> +1.860.486.0086 Office +1.860.486.4422 Department +1.860.486-6356 Fax  
> richard.rockwell@uconn.edu

>  
>  
> \_\_\_\_\_  
>  
> From: AAPORNET on behalf of Jan Werner  
> Sent: Mon 3/23/2009 7:28 PM  
> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
> Subject: Further thoughts on l'affaire Bunham

>  
>

>  
> Some clarification as to just what it is about AAPOR's censure of  
> Gilbert Burnham makes me so uncomfortable.  
>  
> Let me preface this by stating that I am not at all in favor of relaxing  
> the AAPOR Code. I was not a member of Tom Guterbock's committee, but I  
> did spend a number of hours with Harry O'Neil helping him polish the  
> language of the revision and later, explain and defend it at the 2004  
> General Meeting in Phoenix. Some of you may also remember that, when the  
> revised Code was submitted to the full membership for approval the  
> following year, I protested that Council had unilaterally weakened the  
> language adopted in Phoenix, and for that reason voted against it.  
>  
> That said, I do not believe that either of my original questions has  
> been answered in a meaningful way.  
>  
> First, the identity of the petitioner. Michael Spagat has indeed  
> identified himself to AAPORNET members as the person who brought the  
> action before the Standards Committee, but Council has not identified  
> him publicly in any of the statements issued by AAPOR. Mr. Spagat refers  
> us to his paper "Ethical and Data-integrity Problems of the Second  
> Lancet Survey of Mortality in Iraq" for details of his complaint that  
> Burnham had violated the AAPOR Code. That paper is dated September 2008  
> and is, according to the author, "forthcoming in the journal Defense and  
> Peace Economics."  
>  
> Secrecy is, of course, essential to protect whistleblowers, but that is  
> clearly not the situation here. The Spagat paper detailing the charges  
> predates Council's initial statement by 6 months and has already been  
> accepted for publication, so why is Council withholding Mr. Spagat's  
> name? Was anonymity requested, and if so, by the complainant or by  
> someone else?  
>  
> Second, the question of just what is the purpose of the censure  
> statement. Technically, the only thing the AAPOR statement says is that  
> Dr. Burnham has violated the AAPOR Code of Ethics by not providing  
> information demanded of him. But of course that is not the real issue.  
> The real issue is that Dr. Burnham has been accused of falsification and  
> that is the only reason he was asked to provide the information in the  
> first place.  
>  
> I have no opinion one way or the other about Dr. Burnham or the case  
> against him and I don't know why he has refused to reveal details of his  
> research. It certainly does arouse suspicion and AAPOR is absolutely  
> right to remind people that basic principles of scientific research  
> require that he be more open about his methods or provide compelling  
> reasons for not doing so. But he is not a member of AAPOR and has not  
> agreed to abide by the AAPOR Code, so it is inappropriate for AAPOR to  
> accuse him of violating the AAPOR Code of Ethics.  
>  
> The fundamental issue is this: AAPOR is not a regulatory body and has no  
> standing to compel anyone to follow its rules, even within its own field  
> of Public Opinion Research. Nor does it have a mandate to adjudicate  
> every dispute that involves survey methodology or practice in some way.

> By claiming those powers, AAPOR has set itself up to be taken  
> advantage of by nearly any person who wishes to use our reputation to  
> advance his case in a scientific dispute. If so, the Standards Committee  
> could be very, very busy in coming years.  
>  
> My greatest fear is that some may try to relax the AAPOR Code to avoid  
> this kind of problem. That would be a tragedy. AAPOR needs to encourage  
> the highest standards of professional behavior, but it also needs to  
> recognize that it will be most effective if it leads by example, not if  
> it acts as a self-appointed enforcer of ethical and professional behavior.

> 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: Mon, 23 Mar 2009 22:00:06 -0400  
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: Further thoughts on l'affaire Bunham  
Comments: To: JAMES P MURPHY <[jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM](mailto:jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[8B949ACCACE941E19D539350D24CE27D@D6NFSTF1](mailto:8B949ACCACE941E19D539350D24CE27D@D6NFSTF1)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I would also like to know how many cases have been referred to the

Standards Committee for investigation. I believe the only one that actually resulted in censure, and therefore was publicly acknowledged, was Frank Luntz in 1997.

Jan Werner

---

JAMES P MURPHY wrote:

> To help contextualize the Burnham case, would someone kindly inform the list  
> of the number of Burnham-like cases (i.e. complaints resulting in censure)  
> that have been processed by AAPOR in, say, each of the past five years? Or  
> point us to a report containing same.

>

> James P. Murphy, Ph.D.  
> J.P. MURPHY & COMPANY  
> 609 921 2432 Princeton, N.J.  
> 772 219 7671 Stuart, Fla.  
> 610 408 8800 Mobile  
> www.jpmurphy.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: Mon, 23 Mar 2009 22:19:45 -0400

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: Further thoughts on l'affaire Bunham

Comments: To: "Rockwell, Richard" <[richard.rockwell@UCONN.EDU](mailto:richard.rockwell@UCONN.EDU)>

Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

In-Reply-To:

<[CB9825001B72084D9199A352C35CBFCE05E72AB8@EXCHANGE.B.mgmt.ad.uconn.edu](mailto:CB9825001B72084D9199A352C35CBFCE05E72AB8@EXCHANGE.B.mgmt.ad.uconn.edu)>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Interesting that you mention the AMA, because that organization epitomizes what I hope AAPOR never devolves into.

For over half a century at least, the AMA has been primarily dedicated to lobbying to preserve the economic privileges of doctors, even to the detriment of their patients. One reason less than 20% of practicing physicians belong to the AMA is that many (including my own doctor) absolutely despise it and do not want to be associated with it.

Jan Werner

---

Rockwell, Richard wrote:

> The "Schedule of Procedures for Dealing with Alleged AAPOR Code  
> Violations" does not provide for release by AAPOR of the name(s) of  
> the complainant(s). "1e. The complaint form and all related  
> materials prepared for Council, the Standards Committee, and the  
> Evaluation Committee (if one is appointed as provided in section 4  
> below) will be kept confidential, and all Council, Standards  
> Committee, and Evaluation Committee discussions related to the  
> specifics of the complaint will be treated as privileged  
> communication." The Procedures do not permit anything other than  
> what AAPOR did, and thus it is true that "... Council has not  
> identified him publicly in any of the statements issued by AAPOR."  
> Council would have been properly reprimanded had it done so.  
>  
> In fact, keeping the name of the complainant(s) confidential would  
> seem to be a sovereign remedy against " By claiming those powers,  
> AAPOR has set itself up to be taken advantage of by nearly any person  
> who wishes to use our reputation to advance his case in a scientific  
> dispute." One can hardly advance one's reputation by being  
> anonymous.  
>  
> The Schedule also provides "1b. Any organization, firm, individual,  
> or group of individuals may be named in such a complaint, whether or  
> not it or they are members of AAPOR." If it is deemed improper for  
> the Committee and the Council to have taken this action, the place to  
> correct that would be revision of the Schedule, not to criticize a  
> specific instance in which the rules have been followed.  
>  
> AAPOR cannot promulgate a "Code of Professional Ethics and Standards  
> for All Survey Researchers Everywhere." Neither can the AMA. In  
> neither case is the organization prohibited from applying its code to  
> the conduct of researchers who are not members. Indeed, I suspect  
> that many of us would be distressed were AMA to speak only to the  
> ethics of its members, who are less than 20% of practicing  
> physicians.  
> -----  
> Richard C. ROCKWELL Professor and Associate Head Department of  
> Sociology University of Connecticut Unit 2068 344 Mansfield Road  
> Storrs-Mansfield, CT 06269-2068 +1.860.486.0086 Office  
> +1.860.486.4422 Department +1.860.486-6356 Fax  
> richard.rockwell@uconn.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: Mon, 23 Mar 2009 21:12:12 -0500

Reply-To: Peter Miller <[p-miller@NORTHWESTERN.EDU](mailto:p-miller@NORTHWESTERN.EDU)>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Peter Miller <p-miller@NORTHWESTERN.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Further thoughts on l'affaire Bunham  
Comments: To: jwerner@jwdp.com  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <49C81B2D.7070307@jwdp.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Thanks to Dr. Rockwell for spelling out clearly the requirements of the Code in a standards investigation.

The "real issue" in the Burnham censure was, in fact, his outright refusal to provide information requested in accordance with the Code and standards procedures.

Mr. Werner has challenged AAPOR's authority to censure a nonmember. Why should we give ourselves this mission, which, it must be said, costs a great deal to fulfill? After all, we are not a 'regulatory body.'

We are \*entitled\* to take on this work because we have the expertise, experience and judgment to do it well. No other body is more capable.

We \*need\* to take on this work because there is no other mechanism in our profession to enforce appropriate, basic standards.

Our Code certainly has educational and hortatory value. Enforcement of the Code's provisions enhances this value.

On Mon, Mar 23, 2009 at 6:28 PM, Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com> wrote:

- > Some clarification as to just what it is about AAPOR's censure of
- > Gilbert Burnham makes me so uncomfortable.
- >
- > Let me preface this by stating that I am not at all in favor of relaxing
- > the AAPOR Code. I was not a member of Tom Guterbock's committee, but I
- > did spend a number of hours with Harry O'Neil helping him polish the
- > language of the revision and later, explain and defend it at the 2004
- > General Meeting in Phoenix. Some of you may also remember that, when the
- > revised Code was submitted to the full membership for approval the
- > following year, I protested that Council had unilaterally weakened the
- > language adopted in Phoenix, and for that reason voted against it.
- >
- > That said, I do not believe that either of my original questions has
- > been answered in a meaningful way.
- >
- > First, the identity of the petitioner. Michael Spagat has indeed
- > identified himself to AAPORNET members as the person who brought the
- > action before the Standards Committee, but Council has not identified
- > him publicly in any of the statements issued by AAPOR. Mr. Spagat refers
- > us to his paper "Ethical and Data-integrity Problems of the Second

> Lancet Survey of Mortality in Iraq" for details of his complaint that  
> Burnham had violated the AAPOR Code. That paper is dated September 2008  
> and is, according to the author, "forthcoming in the journal Defense and  
> Peace Economics."  
>  
> Secrecy is, of course, essential to protect whistleblowers, but that is  
> clearly not the situation here. The Spagat paper detailing the charges  
> predates Council's initial statement by 6 months and has already been  
> accepted for publication, so why is Council withholding Mr. Spagat's  
> name? Was anonymity requested, and if so, by the complainant or by  
> someone else?  
>  
> Second, the question of just what is the purpose of the censure  
> statement. Technically, the only thing the AAPOR statement says is that  
> Dr. Burnham has violated the AAPOR Code of Ethics by not providing  
> information demanded of him. But of course that is not the real issue.  
> The real issue is that Dr. Burnham has been accused of falsification and  
> that is the only reason he was asked to provide the information in the  
> first place.  
>  
> I have no opinion one way or the other about Dr. Burnham or the case  
> against him and I don't know why he has refused to reveal details of his  
> research. It certainly does arouse suspicion and AAPOR is absolutely  
> right to remind people that basic principles of scientific research  
> require that he be more open about his methods or provide compelling  
> reasons for not doing so. But he is not a member of AAPOR and has not  
> agreed to abide by the AAPOR Code, so it is inappropriate for AAPOR to  
> accuse him of violating the AAPOR Code of Ethics.  
>  
> The fundamental issue is this: AAPOR is not a regulatory body and has no  
> standing to compel anyone to follow its rules, even within its own field  
> of Public Opinion Research. Nor does it have a mandate to adjudicate  
> every dispute that involves survey methodology or practice in some way.  
> By claiming those powers, AAPOR has set itself up to be taken  
> advantage of by nearly any person who wishes to use our reputation to  
> advance his case in a scientific dispute. If so, the Standards Committee  
> could be very, very busy in coming years.  
>  
> My greatest fear is that some may try to relax the AAPOR Code to avoid  
> this kind of problem. That would be a tragedy. AAPOR needs to encourage  
> the highest standards of professional behavior, but it also needs to  
> recognize that it will be most effective if it leads by example, not if  
> it acts as a self-appointed enforcer of ethical and professional behavior.  
>  
>  
> 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)

>

--

Peter V. Miller  
Department of Communication Studies  
Northwestern University  
Vice-President, American Association for Public Opinion Research  
p-miller@northwestern.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 Mar 2009 11:04:02 -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: Further thoughts on l'affaire Bunham  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: A<[815570ad0903231912m62cd5cf1he77e0631e426c376@mail.gmail.com](mailto:815570ad0903231912m62cd5cf1he77e0631e426c376@mail.gmail.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Dr Burnham was entirely entitled to make such a refusal as he is not a member of AAPOR. I wonder what would be the response of AAPOR members if they received a summons to provide information in response to a complaint made to an organisation they were not members of (and indeed which they may never heard of up to that point)? Mine would consist of two words, the second of which would be 'off'.

AAPOR has the right to comment on such issues (as does any other organisation or person) and, further, the right to claim that its opinion is worth more than others because of specialist expertise but has no realistic claim to \*jurisdiction\* here as Burnham is not a member. The standards committee should have rejected Spagat's complaint on precisely that ground and advised him to submit complaints to organisations of which Burnham actually is a member. I have still not heard any coherent account from those involved in accepting and acting on Spagat's complaint as to why they did so.

I believe AAPOR has weakened itself by its behaviour here and will, as a result, find it more difficult to speak authoritatively on such matters in the future.

I would hope that the relevant issues can be aired out at Conference (and indeed a decision taken that something like this should not happen again in the future) although unfortunately it now looks like I will be



unable to attend. I think that this affair has shown that there is an urgent case for amending the Code to state explicitly that complaints can only be considered against AAPOR members, not least because, as Jan points out, AAPOR will be opening the door to a huge volume of trivial, vexatious and frivolous complaints about any piece of survey research including the vast number of junk surveys reported in the tabloid press as a result of company press releases. But also because that is actually the *\*ethical\** way of going about these things.

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 Peter Miller

>Sent: 24 March 2009 02:12

>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

>Subject: Re: Further thoughts on l'affaire Bunham

>

>Thanks to Dr. Rockwell for spelling out clearly the requirements of the Code

>in a standards investigation.

>

>The "real issue" in the Burnham censure was, in fact, his outright refusal

>to provide information requested in accordance with the Code and standards

>procedures.

>

>Mr. Werner has challenged AAPOR's authority to censure a nonmember.

Why

>should we give ourselves this mission, which, it must be said, costs a

great

>deal to fulfill? After all, we are not a 'regulatory body.'

>

>We are *\*entitled\** to take on this work because we have the expertise,

>experience and judgment to do it well. No other body is more capable.

>

>We *\*need\** to take on this work because there is no other mechanism in

our

>profession to enforce appropriate, basic standards.

>

>Our Code certainly has educational and hortatory value. Enforcement of

the

>Code's provisions enhances this value.

>

>

>

>On Mon, Mar 23, 2009 at 6:28 PM, Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com> wrote:

>

>> Some clarification as to just what it is about AAPOR's censure of

>> Gilbert Burnham makes me so uncomfortable.

>>

>> Let me preface this by stating that I am not at all in favor of

relaxing

>> the AAPOR Code. I was not a member of Tom Guterbock's committee, but

I

>> did spend a number of hours with Harry O'Neil helping him polish the

>> language of the revision and later, explain and defend it at the 2004

>> General Meeting in Phoenix. Some of you may also remember that, when

the

>> revised Code was submitted to the full membership for approval the

>> following year, I protested that Council had unilaterally weakened

the

>> language adopted in Phoenix, and for that reason voted against it.

>>

>> That said, I do not believe that either of my original questions has

>> been answered in a meaningful way.

>>

>> First, the identity of the petitioner. Michael Spagat has indeed

>> identified himself to AAPORNET members as the person who brought the

>> action before the Standards Committee, but Council has not identified

>> him publicly in any of the statements issued by AAPOR. Mr. Spagat

refers

>> us to his paper "Ethical and Data-integrity Problems of the Second

>> Lancet Survey of Mortality in Iraq" for details of his complaint that

>> Burnham had violated the AAPOR Code. That paper is dated September

2008

>> and is, according to the author, "forthcoming in the journal Defense

and

>> Peace Economics."

>>

>> Secrecy is, of course, essential to protect whistleblowers, but that

is

>> clearly not the situation here. The Spagat paper detailing the

charges

>> predates Council's initial statement by 6 months and has already been

>> accepted for publication, so why is Council withholding Mr. Spagat's

>> name? Was anonymity requested, and if so, by the complainant or by

>> someone else?

>>

>> Second, the question of just what is the purpose of the censure

>> statement. Technically, the only thing the AAPOR statement says is

that

>> Dr. Burnham has violated the AAPOR Code of Ethics by not providing

>> information demanded of him. But of course that is not the real

issue.

>> The real issue is that Dr. Burnham has been accused of falsification and  
>> that is the only reason he was asked to provide the information in the  
>> first place.  
>>  
>> I have no opinion one way or the other about Dr. Burnham or the case  
>> against him and I don't know why he has refused to reveal details of his  
>> research. It certainly does arouse suspicion and AAPOR is absolutely  
>> right to remind people that basic principles of scientific research  
>> require that he be more open about his methods or provide compelling  
>> reasons for not doing so. But he is not a member of AAPOR and has not  
>> agreed to abide by the AAPOR Code, so it is inappropriate for AAPOR to  
>> accuse him of violating the AAPOR Code of Ethics.  
>>  
>> The fundamental issue is this: AAPOR is not a regulatory body and has no  
>> standing to compel anyone to follow its rules, even within its own field  
>> of Public Opinion Research. Nor does it have a mandate to adjudicate  
>> every dispute that involves survey methodology or practice in some way.  
>> By claiming those powers, AAPOR has set itself up to be taken  
>> advantage of by nearly any person who wishes to use our reputation to  
>> advance his case in a scientific dispute. If so, the Standards Committee  
>> could be very, very busy in coming years.  
>>  
>> My greatest fear is that some may try to relax the AAPOR Code to avoid  
>> this kind of problem. That would be a tragedy. AAPOR needs to encourage  
>> the highest standards of professional behavior, but it also needs to  
>> recognize that it will be most effective if it leads by example, not if  
>> it acts as a self-appointed enforcer of ethical and professional behavior.  
>>  
>>  
>> 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)  
>>  
>  
>

>  
>--  
>Peter V. Miller  
>Department of Communication Studies  
>Northwestern University  
>Vice-President, American Association for Public Opinion Research  
>p-miller@northwestern.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

>  
>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> .  
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, 24 Mar 2009 08:40:44 -0400  
Reply-To: David Moore <[dmoore62@COMCAST.NET](mailto:dmoore62@COMCAST.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: David Moore <[dmoore62@COMCAST.NET](mailto:dmoore62@COMCAST.NET)>  
Subject: Re: Further thoughts on l'affaire Bunham  
Comments: To: [Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK](mailto:Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK), [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[735BFE980C9E5A4590AA9DC39B50A36D14EA0CDF@SBEXC01.AD.HQ.DEPT](mailto:735BFE980C9E5A4590AA9DC39B50A36D14EA0CDF@SBEXC01.AD.HQ.DEPT)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Iain,

The problem is this - as a scientist who is claiming to have produced results using scientific methodology - you are obligated to respond, in principle, to anyone who asks the kind of questions that AAPOR asked of Dr. Burnham. If you respond with your delicately chosen words of "\*\*\*\* off," that is certainly your right as a citizen of a democratic society, but not your right as a scientist who is claiming to have produced scientific results.

It's not just to AAPOR that Dr. Burnham was in fact obligated to explain his methodology, but to the world. Of course, it's far easier to outline the detailed methodology in the original report, but if that is not done, the scientist has an obligation to respond to reasonable requests - from anyone.

If Dr. Burnham had said, "My survey is not a scientific survey," then I doubt that anyone would have lodged a complaint. But then, of course, few people would have taken his results seriously. But Dr. Burnham wanted them to be taken seriously, at the same time he did not want to subjugate himself to the demands of the scientific enterprise - which is transparency of methodology.

As to the notion that AAPOR has weakened itself, I assume that is based on a non-scientific sample of N=1...?

Cheers!

David

David W. Moore, Ph.D.

Senior Fellow, The Carsey Institute

University of New Hampshire

73 Main Street, Huddleston Hall

Durham, NH 03824

603.868.7002

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Iain Noble

Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2009 7:04 AM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: Re: Further thoughts on l'affaire Bunham

Dr Burnham was entirely entitled to make such a refusal as he is not a member of AAPOR. I wonder what would be the response of AAPOR members if they received a summons to provide information in response to a complaint made to an organisation they were not members of (and indeed which they may never heard of up to that point)? Mine would consist of two words, the second of which would be 'off'.

AAPOR has the right to comment on such issues (as does any other organisation or person) and, further, the right to claim that its opinion is worth more than others because of specialist expertise but has no realistic claim to \*jurisdiction\* here as Burnham is not a member. The standards committee should have rejected Spagat's complaint on precisely that ground and advised him to submit complaints to organisations of which Burnham actually is a member. I have still not heard any coherent account from those involved in accepting and acting on Spagat's complaint as to why they did so.

I believe AAPOR has weakened itself by its behaviour here and will, as a result, find it more difficult to speak authoritatively on such matters in the future.

I would hope that the relevant issues can be aired out at Conference (and indeed a decision taken that something like this should not happen again in the future) although unfortunately it now looks like I will be unable to attend. I think that this affair has shown that there is an

urgent case for amending the Code to state explicitly that complaints can only be considered against AAPOR members, not least because, as Jan points out, AAPOR will be opening the door to a huge volume of trivial, vexatious and frivolous complaints about any piece of survey research including the vast number of junk surveys reported in the tabloid press as a result of company press releases. But also because that is actually the *\*ethical\** way of going about these things.

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 Peter Miller

>Sent: 24 March 2009 02:12

>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

>Subject: Re: Further thoughts on l'affaire Bunham

>

>Thanks to Dr. Rockwell for spelling out clearly the requirements of the  
Code

>in a standards investigation.

>

>The "real issue" in the Burnham censure was, in fact, his outright  
refusal

>to provide information requested in accordance with the Code and  
standards

>procedures.

>

>Mr. Werner has challenged AAPOR's authority to censure a nonmember.

Why

>should we give ourselves this mission, which, it must be said, costs a  
great

>deal to fulfill? After all, we are not a 'regulatory body.'

>

>We are *\*entitled\** to take on this work because we have the expertise,

>experience and judgment to do it well. No other body is more capable.

>

>We *\*need\** to take on this work because there is no other mechanism in  
our

>profession to enforce appropriate, basic standards.

>

>Our Code certainly has educational and hortatory value. Enforcement of  
the



>Code's provisions enhances this value.

>

>

>

>On Mon, Mar 23, 2009 at 6:28 PM, Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com> wrote:

>

>> Some clarification as to just what it is about AAPOR's censure of

>> Gilbert Burnham makes me so uncomfortable.

>>

>> Let me preface this by stating that I am not at all in favor of

relaxing

>> the AAPOR Code. I was not a member of Tom Guterbock's committee, but

I

>> did spend a number of hours with Harry O'Neil helping him polish the

>> language of the revision and later, explain and defend it at the 2004

>> General Meeting in Phoenix. Some of you may also remember that, when

the

>> revised Code was submitted to the full membership for approval the

>> following year, I protested that Council had unilaterally weakened

the

>> language adopted in Phoenix, and for that reason voted against it.

>>

>> That said, I do not believe that either of my original questions has

>> been answered in a meaningful way.

>>

>> First, the identity of the petitioner. Michael Spagat has indeed

>> identified himself to AAPORNET members as the person who brought the

>> action before the Standards Committee, but Council has not identified  
>> him publicly in any of the statements issued by AAPOR. Mr. Spagat  
refers  
>> us to his paper "Ethical and Data-integrity Problems of the Second  
>> Lancet Survey of Mortality in Iraq" for details of his complaint that  
>> Burnham had violated the AAPOR Code. That paper is dated September  
2008  
>> and is, according to the author, "forthcoming in the journal Defense  
and  
>> Peace Economics."  
>>  
>> Secrecy is, of course, essential to protect whistleblowers, but that  
is  
>> clearly not the situation here. The Spagat paper detailing the  
charges  
>> predates Council's initial statement by 6 months and has already been  
>> accepted for publication, so why is Council withholding Mr. Spagat's  
>> name? Was anonymity requested, and if so, by the complainant or by  
>> someone else?  
>>  
>> Second, the question of just what is the purpose of the censure  
>> statement. Technically, the only thing the AAPOR statement says is  
that  
>> Dr. Burnham has violated the AAPOR Code of Ethics by not providing  
>> information demanded of him. But of course that is not the real  
issue.  
>> The real issue is that Dr. Burnham has been accused of falsification

and

>> that is the only reason he was asked to provide the information in

the

>> first place.

>>

>> I have no opinion one way or the other about Dr. Burnham or the case

>> against him and I don't know why he has refused to reveal details of

his

>> research. It certainly does arouse suspicion and AAPOR is absolutely

>> right to remind people that basic principles of scientific research

>> require that he be more open about his methods or provide compelling

>> reasons for not doing so. But he is not a member of AAPOR and has not

>> agreed to abide by the AAPOR Code, so it is inappropriate for AAPOR

to

>> accuse him of violating the AAPOR Code of Ethics.

>>

>> The fundamental issue is this: AAPOR is not a regulatory body and has

no

>> standing to compel anyone to follow its rules, even within its own

field

>> of Public Opinion Research. Nor does it have a mandate to adjudicate

>> every dispute that involves survey methodology or practice in some

way.

>> By claiming those powers, AAPOR has set itself up to be taken

>> advantage of by nearly any person who wishes to use our reputation to

>> advance his case in a scientific dispute. If so, the Standards

Committee

>> could be very, very busy in coming years.

>>

>> My greatest fear is that some may try to relax the AAPOR Code to avoid

>> this kind of problem. That would be a tragedy. AAPOR needs to encourage

>> the highest standards of professional behavior, but it also needs to

>> recognize that it will be most effective if it leads by example, not if

>> it acts as a self-appointed enforcer of ethical and professional behavior.

>>

>>

>> 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)

>>

>

>

>

>--

>Peter V. Miller

>Department of Communication Studies

>Northwestern University

>Vice-President, American Association for Public Opinion Research

>p-miller@northwestern.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)

>

>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> .

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: 8.0.238 / Virus Database: 270.11.23/2016 - Release Date: 03/23/09  
06:52:00

---

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: Tue, 24 Mar 2009 09:05:11 -0500

Reply-To: [Mary.Losch@uni.edu](mailto:Mary.Losch@uni.edu)

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

From: Mary Losch <[Mary.Losch@UNI.EDU](mailto:Mary.Losch@UNI.EDU)>

Subject: Re: Standards Detail

Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

In-Reply-To:

<!!&!AAAAAAAAAAAAAYAAAAAAAAAKDckmbCVxlHn6UiOGrTmAHCgAAAEAAAAACMs3pi7pmJBiHPlycmzG  
W

YBAAAAAA==@comcast.net>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

In response to the question about the last public censure, Jan is correct that it was in 1997 and Frank Luntz was the subject of the censure.

The number of formal complaints of Code violation currently stands at 17 for

2008-2009. There were 6 formal complaints filed last year. Information about Standards activities for previous years can be found in the Annual Meeting Reports published each year in POQ.

Mary Losch  
Standards Chair

On 24 Mar 2009 at 8:40, David Moore wrote:

> Iain,  
>  
> The problem is this - as a scientist who is claiming to have produced  
> results using scientific methodology - you are obligated to respond, in  
> principle, to anyone who asks the kind of questions that AAPOR asked of Dr.  
> Burnham. If you respond with your delicately chosen words of "\*\*\*\* off,"  
> that is certainly your right as a citizen of a democratic society, but not  
> your right as a scientist who is claiming to have produced scientific  
> results.  
>  
>  
>  
> It's not just to AAPOR that Dr. Burnham was in fact obligated to explain his  
> methodology, but to the world. Of course, it's far easier to outline the  
> detailed methodology in the original report, but if that is not done, the  
> scientist has an obligation to respond to reasonable requests - from anyone.  
>  
>  
>  
> If Dr. Burnham had said, "My survey is not a scientific survey," then I  
> doubt that anyone would have lodged a complaint. But then, of course, few  
> people would have taken his results seriously. But Dr. Burnham wanted them  
> to be taken seriously, at the same time he did not want to subjugate himself  
> to the demands of the scientific enterprise - which is transparency of  
> methodology.  
>  
>  
>  
> As to the notion that AAPOR has weakened itself, I assume that is based on a  
> non-scientific sample of N=1...?  
>  
>  
>  
> Cheers!  
>  
> David  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> David W. Moore, Ph.D.  
>

> Senior Fellow, The Carsey Institute

>

> University of New Hampshire

>

> 73 Main Street, Huddleston Hall

>

> Durham, NH 03824

>

> 603.868.7002

>

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Iain Noble

> Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2009 7:04 AM

> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

> Subject: Re: Further thoughts on l'affaire Bunham

>

>

>

> Dr Burnham was entirely entitled to make such a refusal as he is not a

>

> member of AAPOR. I wonder what would be the response of AAPOR members if

>

> they received a summons to provide information in response to a

>

> complaint made to an organisation they were not members of (and indeed

>

> which they may never heard of up to that point)? Mine would consist of

>

> two words, the second of which would be 'off'.

>

>

>

> AAPOR has the right to comment on such issues (as does any other

>

> organisation or person) and, further, the right to claim that its

>

> opinion is worth more than others because of specialist expertise but

>

> has no realistic claim to \*jurisdiction\* here as Burnham is not a

>

> member. The standards committee should have rejected Spagat's complaint

>

> on precisely that ground and advised him to submit complaints to

>

> organisations of which Burnham actually is a member. I have still not

>

> heard any coherent account from those involved in accepting and acting

>

> on Spagat's complaint as to why they did so.

>

>

>

> I believe AAPOR has weakened itself by its behaviour here and will, as a

>

>



> result, find it more difficult to speak authoritatively on such matters  
>  
> in the future.  
>  
>  
>  
> I would hope that the relevant issues can be aired out at Conference  
>  
> (and indeed a decision taken that something like this should not happen  
>  
> again in the future) although unfortunately it now looks like I will be  
>  
> unable to attend. I think that this affair has shown that there is an  
>  
> urgent case for amending the Code to state explicitly that complaints  
>  
> can only be considered against AAPOR members, not least because, as Jan  
>  
> points out, AAPOR will be opening the door to a huge volume of trivial,  
>  
> vexatious and frivolous complaints about any piece of survey research  
>  
> including the vast number of junk surveys reported in the tabloid press  
>  
> as a result of company press releases. But also because that is actually  
>  
> the \*ethical\* way of going about these things.

> 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 Peter Miller

>

> >Sent: 24 March 2009 02:12

>

> >To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

>

> >Subject: Re: Further thoughts on l'affaire Bunham

>

> >

>

> >Thanks to Dr. Rockwell for spelling out clearly the requirements of the

>

> Code

>

> >in a standards investigation.

>

> >

>

> >The "real issue" in the Burnham censure was, in fact, his outright

>

> refusal

>

> >to provide information requested in accordance with the Code and

>

> standards

>

> >procedures.

>

> >

>

> >Mr. Werner has challenged AAPOR's authority to censure a nonmember.

>

> Why

>

> >should we give ourselves this mission, which, it must be said, costs a

>

> great

>

> >deal to fulfill? After all, we are not a 'regulatory body.'

>

> >

>

> >We are \*entitled\* to take on this work because we have the expertise,

>

> >experience and judgment to do it well. No other body is more capable.

>

>>  
>  
>>We \*need\* to take on this work because there is no other mechanism in  
>  
> our  
>  
>>profession to enforce appropriate, basic standards.  
>  
>>  
>  
>>Our Code certainly has educational and hortatory value. Enforcement of  
>  
> the  
>  
>>Code's provisions enhances this value.  
>  
>>  
>  
>>  
>  
>>  
>  
>>On Mon, Mar 23, 2009 at 6:28 PM, Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com> wrote:  
>  
>>  
>  
>>> Some clarification as to just what it is about AAPOR's censure of  
>  
>>> Gilbert Burnham makes me so uncomfortable.  
>  
>>>  
>  
>>> Let me preface this by stating that I am not at all in favor of  
>  
> relaxing  
>  
>>> the AAPOR Code. I was not a member of Tom Guterbock's committee, but  
>  
> I  
>  
>>> did spend a number of hours with Harry O'Neil helping him polish the  
>  
>>> language of the revision and later, explain and defend it at the 2004  
>  
>>> General Meeting in Phoenix. Some of you may also remember that, when  
>  
> the  
>  
>>> revised Code was submitted to the full membership for approval the  
>  
>>> following year, I protested that Council had unilaterally weakened  
>  
> the  
>

>>> language adopted in Phoenix, and for that reason voted against it.  
>  
>>>  
>  
>>> That said, I do not believe that either of my original questions has  
>  
>>> been answered in a meaningful way.  
>  
>>>  
>  
>>> First, the identity of the petitioner. Michael Spagat has indeed  
>  
>>> identified himself to AAPORNET members as the person who brought the  
>  
>>> action before the Standards Committee, but Council has not identified  
>  
>>> him publicly in any of the statements issued by AAPOR. Mr. Spagat  
>  
> refers  
>  
>>> us to his paper "Ethical and Data-integrity Problems of the Second  
>  
>>> Lancet Survey of Mortality in Iraq" for details of his complaint that  
>  
>>> Burnham had violated the AAPOR Code. That paper is dated September  
>  
> 2008  
>  
>>> and is, according to the author, "forthcoming in the journal Defense  
>  
> and  
>  
>>> Peace Economics."  
>  
>>>  
>  
>>> Secrecy is, of course, essential to protect whistleblowers, but that  
>  
> is  
>  
>>> clearly not the situation here. The Spagat paper detailing the  
>  
> charges  
>  
>>> predates Council's initial statement by 6 months and has already been  
>  
>>> accepted for publication, so why is Council withholding Mr. Spagat's  
>  
>>> name? Was anonymity requested, and if so, by the complainant or by  
>  
>>> someone else?  
>  
>>>  
>

>>> Second, the question of just what is the purpose of the  
> statement. Technically, the only thing the AAPOR statement says is  
> that  
> Dr. Burnham has violated the AAPOR Code of Ethics by not providing  
> information demanded of him. But of course that is not the real  
> issue.  
> The real issue is that Dr. Burnham has been accused of falsification  
> and  
> that is the only reason he was asked to provide the information in  
> the  
> first place.  
>>>  
>>> I have no opinion one way or the other about Dr. Burnham or the case  
> against him and I don't know why he has refused to reveal details of  
> his  
> research. It certainly does arouse suspicion and AAPOR is absolutely  
> right to remind people that basic principles of scientific research  
> require that he be more open about his methods or provide compelling  
> reasons for not doing so. But he is not a member of AAPOR and has not  
> agreed to abide by the AAPOR Code, so it is inappropriate for AAPOR  
> to  
>>> accuse him of violating the AAPOR Code of Ethics.  
>>>  
>>> The fundamental issue is this: AAPOR is not a regulatory body and has  
> no  
> standing to compel anyone to follow its rules, even within its own  
> field

>>> of Public Opinion Research. Nor does it have a mandate to adjudicate  
>  
>>> every dispute that involves survey methodology or practice in some  
>  
> way.  
>  
>>> By claiming those powers, AAPOR has set itself up to be taken  
>  
>>> advantage of by nearly any person who wishes to use our reputation to  
>  
>>> advance his case in a scientific dispute. If so, the Standards  
>  
> Committee  
>  
>>> could be very, very busy in coming years.  
>  
>>>  
>  
>>> My greatest fear is that some may try to relax the AAPOR Code to  
>  
> avoid  
>  
>>> this kind of problem. That would be a tragedy. AAPOR needs to  
>  
> encourage  
>  
>>> the highest standards of professional behavior, but it also needs to  
>  
>>> recognize that it will be most effective if it leads by example, not  
>  
> if  
>  
>>> it acts as a self-appointed enforcer of ethical and professional  
>  
> behavior.  
>  
>>>  
>  
>>>  
>  
>>> 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  
>  
>>>  
>  
>>  
>  
>>  
>  
>>  
>  
>>  
>  
>>--  
>  
>>Peter V. Miller  
>  
>>Department of Communication Studies  
>  
>>Northwestern University  
>  
>>Vice-President, American Association for Public Opinion Research  
>  
>>p-miller@northwestern.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  
>  
>>  
>  
>>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> .

>

> 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: 8.0.238 / Virus Database: 270.11.23/2016 - Release Date: 03/23/09

> 06:52:00

>

>

> -----

> 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.

>

-----  
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, 24 Mar 2009 10:41:16 -0400  
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>  
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing  
Subject: Yet more thoughts on the Burnham censure  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <aapornet@asu.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

There are at least two separate issues at stake in this discussion: One is the Code, which we all pledge to adhere to when we join AAPOR. The other is the set of rules and procedures that the Executive Council and the various committees try to follow in handling AAPOR's affairs.

I think the Code could be strengthened with respect to many aspects of our profession, most notably disclosure. I also believe that AAPOR needs to be more outspoken in publicizing these standards and noting when they are not met, whether by AAPOR members or others.

In the situation at hand, I would have liked to see AAPOR issue a statement saying that it had been brought to the attention of the Standards Committee that Dr. Burnham had failed or refused to provide relevant materials to other researchers attempting to evaluate his findings, and that if so, such behavior is contrary to the principles of science and survey research for which AAPOR stands and to which its members are pledged.

I believe AAPOR should take this kind of action far more often. In particular, it should call out its own members when they fail to live up to the standards of open disclosure provided by the Code, as media polls routinely do, even those from such excellent outfits as Pew, CBS/NYT, ABC/WaPo, etc., for whom I have otherwise the greatest admiration and respect.

But this is very different from launching an investigation into the conduct of a researcher and issuing a formal statement of censure for ethics violations. I don't know if any other such full investigations have been carried out since the only previous time AAPOR has issued such a statement, against Frank Luntz in 1997, at the behest of Warren Mitofsky. At that time, I had a vigorous private discussion with Warren about the wisdom of the action, during which I brought up many of the same points I have in the current situation.

Michael Spagat's paper does make a strong case against the Burnham survey in question, but his is one side in a heated debate. We have not heard from Dr. Burnham, nor from the Lancet, which would appear to be the party with the most at stake. It is troubling that they have not responded publicly, and they should properly be criticized for that failure. That can be done as I have indicated above, without making AAPOR look like it has taken one side in the dispute, as the formal censure for ethics violations does.

My greatest concern about this whole affair is this: The Spagat paper, in my reading, seems structured so as to induce AAPOR into taking a formal position in his dispute with Dr. Burnham. Mr. Spagat is currently listed in the online AAPOR directory as a member, although he does not appear in the last (2006) printed directory I received, but whether or not he is a member should not matter. What does matter is that any perception, correct or incorrect, that AAPOR can be manipulated into appearing to support one side in a debate sets a terrible precedent. It also has the potential to severely damage our reputation as an impartial professional organization.

Jan Werner

-----  
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, 24 Mar 2009 15:15:26 -0000

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

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Iain Noble <Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK>

Subject: Re: Further thoughts on l'affaire Bunham

Comments: To: [dmoore62@comcast.net](mailto:dmoore62@comcast.net), [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

In-Reply-To:

<!&!AAAAAAAAAAAAAYAAAAAAAAAKDckmbCVxlHn6UiOGrTmAHCgAAAEAAAACMs3pi7pmJBiHPlycmzG  
W

YBAAAAAA==@comcast.net>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

David

=20

You=20are=20confusing=20debate=20and=20disciplinary=20procedures.=20AAPOR=20=  
is=20entirely  
entitled=20to=20ask=20that=20Dr=20Burnham=20make=20public=20relevant=20inf=  
ormation=20about  
the=20study=20in=20question.=20It=20is=20entirely=20entitled=20to=20pronou=  
nce=20(after  
proper=20consideration)=20on=20whether=20or=20not=20his=20methods=20are=20=  
flawed  
methodologically.=20It=20is=20not=20entitled=20to=20subject=20him=20to=20i=  
ts=20Standards  
Procedures=20and=20censure=20him=20subsequently=20for=20refusing=20to=20co=  
-operate=20with  
them.=20The=20decision=20to=20open=20those=20proceedings=20against=20him=20=  
let=20AAPOR=20be  
conscripted=20into=20a=20campaign=20(which=20may=20or=20may=20not=20be=20j=  
ustified)=20to

discredit=20this=20research,=20something=20which=20should=20never=20have=20=  
happened.=20I  
believe=20there=20are=20two=20key=20issues=20here=20a)=20the=20ethical=20p=  
ropriety=20of  
launching=20Standards=20Procedures=20against=20a=20non-member=20and=20b)=20=  
how=20the  
organisation=20should=20behave=20when=20attempts=20are=20made=20to=20draw=20=  
it=20into  
ongoing=20controversies=20by=20someone=20who=20is=20clearly=20has=20a=20le=  
ading=20role=20on  
one=20specific=20side.=20I=20have=20made=20my=20views=20clear=20on=20the=20=  
first=20(you=20can't  
and=20shouldn't=20do=20it)=20and=20on=20the=20second=20I=20am=20unclear=20=  
still=20about=20what  
consideration=20was=20given=20to=20this=20issue=20when=20the=20Spagat=20co=  
mplaint=20was  
received.=20YMMV.

=20

I=20am=20not=20against=20AAPOR=20taking=20a=20public=20stand=20on=20such=20=  
an=20issue,=20far=20from  
it=20--20I=20believe=20that's=20a=20major=20part=20of=20what=20AAPOR=20exi=  
sts=20to=20do=20--20but=20I=20do  
think=20it=20should=20be=20done=20in=20an=20appropriate=20and=20considered=  
=20manner=20and=20that  
has=20not=20happened=20here.

=20

Iain=20Noble=20  
Department=20for=20Children,=20Schools=20and=20Families=20  
Young=20People=20Analysis=20Division=20--20Youth=20Research=20Team,=20

4th=20Floor,=20Sanctuary=20Buildings  
Great=20Smith=20Street  
London=20SW1P=203BT

0207=20925=206226=20

=20

Mobile:=200753=20832=208523

=20

---

From:=20David=20Moore=20[mailto:dmoore62@comcast.net]=20  
Sent:=2024=20March=202009=2012:41  
To:=20NOBLE,=20Iain;=20AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject:=20RE:=20Further=20thoughts=20on=20l'affaire=20Bunham

=20

Iain,

The=20problem=20is=20this=20-20as=20a=20scientist=20who=20is=20claiming=20=  
to=20have=20produced  
results=20using=20scientific=20methodology=20-20you=20are=20obligated=20t=  
o=20respond,=20in  
principle,=20to=20anyone=20who=20asks=20the=20kind=20of=20questions=20that=  
=20AAPOR=20asked=20of  
Dr.=20Burnham.=20If=20you=20respond=20with=20your=20delicately=20chosen=20=  
words=20of=20"\*\*\*\*  
off,"=20that=20is=20certainly=20your=20right=20as=20a=20citizen=20of=20a=20=  
democratic=20society,  
but=20not=20your=20right=20as=20a=20scientist=20who=20is=20claiming=20to=20=  
have=20produced  
scientific=20results.

=20

It's=20not=20just=20to=20AAPOR=20that=20Dr.=20Burnham=20was=20in=20fact=20=  
obligated=20to=20explain  
his=20methodology,=20but=20to=20the=20world.=20Of=20course,=20it's=20far=20=  
easier=20to=20outline  
the=20detailed=20methodology=20in=20the=20original=20report,=20but=20if=20=  
that=20is=20not  
done,=20the=20scientist=20has=20an=20obligation=20to=20respond=20to=20reas=  
onable=20requests  
-20from=20anyone.

=20

If=20Dr.=20Burnham=20had=20said,=20"My=20survey=20is=20not=20a=20scientific=  
c=20survey,"=20then=20I  
doubt=20that=20anyone=20would=20have=20lodged=20a=20complaint.=20But=20the=  
n,=20of=20course,  
few=20people=20would=20have=20taken=20his=20results=20seriously.=20But=20D=  
r.=20Burnham  
wanted=20them=20to=20be=20taken=20seriously,=20at=20the=20same=20time=20he=  
=20did=20not=20want=20to  
subjugate=20himself=20to=20the=20demands=20of=20the=20scientific=20enterpr=  
ise=20-20which=20is  
transparency=20of=20methodology.

=20

As=20to=20the=20notion=20that=20AAPOR=20has=20weakened=20itself,=20I=20ass=  
ume=20that=20is=20based  
on=20a=20non-scientific=20sample=20of=20N=3D1...?

=20

Cheers!

David

=20

=20

David=20W.=20Moore,=20Ph.D.

Senior=20Fellow,=20The=20Carsey=20Institute

University=20of=20New=20Hampshire

73=20Main=20Street,=20Huddleston=20Hall

Durham,=20NH=20003824

603.868.7002

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

From:=20AAPORNET=20[mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu]=20On=20Behalf=20Of=20Iain=20Noble

Sent:=20Tuesday,=20March=202024,=202009=207:04=20AM

To:=20AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject:=20Re:=20Further=20thoughts=20on=20l'affaire=20Bunham

=20

Dr=20Burnham=20was=20entirely=20entitled=20to=20make=20such=20a=20refusal=20as=20he=20is=20not=20a

member=20of=20AAPOR.=20I=20wonder=20what=20would=20be=20the=20response=20of=20AAPOR=20members=20if

they=20received=20a=20summons=20to=20provide=20information=20in=20response=20to=20a

complaint=20made=20to=20an=20organisation=20they=20were=20not=20members=20of=20(and=20indeed

which=20they=20may=20never=20heard=20of=20up=20to=20that=20point)?=20Mine=20would=20consist=20of

two=20words,=20the=20second=20of=20which=20would=20be=20'off'.

=20

AAPOR=20has=20the=20right=20to=20comment=20on=20such=20issues=20(as=20does=20any=20other

organisation=20or=20person)=20and,=20further,=20the=20right=20to=20claim=20that=20its

opinion=20is=20worth=20more=20than=20others=20because=20of=20specialist=20

expertise=20but

has=20no=20realistic=20claim=20to=20\*jurisdiction\*=20here=20as=20Burnham=20=  
is=20not=20a

member.=20The=20standards=20committee=20should=20have=20rejected=20Spagat'=  
s=20complaint

on=20precisely=20that=20ground=20and=20advised=20him=20to=20submit=20compl=  
aints=20to

organisations=20of=20which=20Burnham=20actually=20is=20a=20member.=20I=20h=  
ave=20still=20not

heard=20any=20coherent=20account=20from=20those=20involved=20in=20acceptin=  
g=20and=20acting

on=20Spagat's=20complaint=20as=20to=20why=20they=20did=20so.

=20

I=20believe=20AAPOR=20has=20weakened=20itself=20by=20its=20behaviour=20her=  
e=20and=20will,=20as=20a

result,=20find=20it=20more=20difficult=20to=20speak=20authoritatively=20on=  
=20such=20matters

in=20the=20future.

=20

I=20would=20hope=20that=20the=20relevant=20issues=20can=20be=20aired=20out=  
=20at=20Conference

(and=20indeed=20a=20decision=20taken=20that=20something=20like=20this=20sh=  
ould=20not=20happen

again=20in=20the=20future)=20although=20unfortunately=20it=20now=20looks=20=  
like=20I=20will=20be

unable=20to=20attend.=20I=20think=20that=20this=20affair=20has=20shown=20t=  
hat=20there=20is=20an

urgent=20case=20for=20amending=20the=20Code=20to=20state=20explicitly=20th=  
at=20complaints

can=20only=20be=20considered=20against=20AAPOR=20members,=20not=20least=20=  
because,=20as=20Jan

points=20out,=20AAPOR=20will=20be=20opening=20the=20door=20to=20a=20huge=20=  
volume=20of=20trivial,

vexatious=20and=20frivolous=20complaints=20about=20any=20piece=20of=20surv=  
ey=20research

including=20the=20vast=20number=20of=20junk=20surveys=20reported=20in=20th=  
e=20tabloid=20press

as=20a=20result=20of=20company=20press=20releases.=20But=20also=20because=20=  
that=20is=20actually

the=20\*ethical\*=20way=20of=20going=20about=20these=20things.

=20

=20

Iain=20Noble

Department=20for=20Children,=20Schools=20and=20Families

Young=20People=20Analysis=20Division=20--=20Youth=20Research=20Team,

=20

=20

4th=20Floor,=20Sanctuary=20Buildings

Great=20Smith=20Street

London=20SW1P=203BT

=20

0207=20925=206226

=20

Mobile:=200753=20832=208523

=20

=20

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

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

>Sent:=2024=20March=202009=2002:12

>To:=20AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

>Subject:=20Re:=20Further=20thoughts=20on=20I'affaire=20Bunham

>=20

>Thanks=20to=20Dr.=20Rockwell=20for=20spelling=20out=20clearly=20the=20req=  
uirements=20of=20the

Code

>in=20a=20standards=20investigation.

>=20

>The=20"real=20issue"=20in=20the=20Burnham=20censure=20was,=20in=20fact,=20=  
his=20outright

refusal

>to=20provide=20information=20requested=20in=20accordance=20with=20the=20C=  
ode=20and

standards

>procedures.

>=20

>Mr.=20Werner=20has=20challenged=20AAPOR's=20authority=20to=20censure=20a=20=  
nonmember.

Why

>should=20we=20give=20ourselves=20this=20mission,=20which,=20it=20must=20b=  
e=20said,=20costs=20a

great

>deal=20to=20fulfill?=20=20After=20all,=20we=20are=20not=20a=20'regulatory=  
=20body.'

>=20

>We=20are=20\*entitled\*=20to=20take=20on=20this=20work=20because=20we=20hav=  
e=20the=20expertise,

>experience=20and=20judgment=20to=20do=20it=20well.=20=20No=20other=20body=  
=20is=20more=20capable.

>=20

>We=20\*need\*=20to=20take=20on=20this=20work=20because=20there=20is=20no=20=  
other=20mechanism=20in

our

>profession=20to=20enforce=20appropriate,=20basic=20standards.

>=20



>Our=20Code=20certainly=20has=20educational=20and=20hortatory=20value.=20=20=  
Enforcement=20of

the

>Code's=20provisions=20enhances=20this=20value.

>=20

>=20

>=20

>On=20Mon,=20Mar=202023,=202009=20at=206:28=20PM,=20Jan=20Werner=20<jwerner@=  
jwdp.com>=20wrote:

>=20

>>=20Some=20clarification=20as=20to=20just=20what=20it=20is=20about=20AAPOR=  
R's=20censure=20of

>>=20Gilbert=20Burnham=20makes=20me=20so=20uncomfortable.

>>=20

>>=20Let=20me=20preface=20this=20by=20stating=20that=20I=20am=20not=20at=20=  
all=20in=20favor=20of

relaxing

>>=20the=20AAPOR=20Code.=20I=20was=20not=20a=20member=20of=20Tom=20Guterbo=  
ck's=20committee,=20but

I

>>=20did=20spend=20a=20number=20of=20hours=20with=20Harry=20O'Neil=20helpi=  
ng=20him=20polish=20the

>>=20language=20of=20the=20revision=20and=20later,=20explain=20and=20defen=  
d=20it=20at=20the=202004

>>=20General=20Meeting=20in=20Phoenix.=20Some=20of=20you=20may=20also=20re=  
member=20that,=20when

the

>>=20revised=20Code=20was=20submitted=20to=20the=20full=20membership=20for=  
=20approval=20the

>>=20following=20year,=20I=20protested=20that=20Council=20had=20unilateral=  
ly=20weakened

the

>>=20language=20adopted=20in=20Phoenix,=20and=20for=20that=20reason=20vote=  
d=20against=20it.

>>=20

>>=20That=20said,=20I=20do=20not=20believe=20that=20either=20of=20my=20ori=  
ginal=20questions=20has

>>=20been=20answered=20in=20a=20meaningful=20way.

>>=20

>>=20First,=20the=20identity=20of=20the=20petitioner.=20Michael=20Spagat=20=  
has=20indeed

>>=20identified=20himself=20to=20AAPORNET=20members=20as=20the=20person=20=  
who=20brought=20the

>>=20action=20before=20the=20Standards=20Committee,=20but=20Council=20has=20=  
not=20identified

>>=20him=20publicly=20in=20any=20of=20the=20statements=20issued=20by=20AAP=  
OR.=20Mr.=20Spagat

refers

>>=20us=20to=20his=20paper=20"Ethical=20and=20Data-integrity=20Problems=20=  
of=20the=20Second

>>=20Lancet=20Survey=20of=20Mortality=20in=20Iraq"=20for=20details=20of=20=  
his=20complaint=20that

>>=20Burnham=20had=20violated=20the=20AAPOR=20Code.=20That=20paper=20is=20=  
dated=20September

2008

>>=20and=20is,=20according=20to=20the=20author,=20"forthcoming=20in=20the=20=  
journal=20Defense

and

>>=20Peace=20Economics."

>>=20

>>=20Secrecy=20is,=20of=20course,=20essential=20to=20protect=20whistleblow=  
ers,=20but=20that

is

>>=20clearly=20not=20the=20situation=20here.=20The=20Spagat=20paper=20deta=  
iling=20the

charges

>>=20predates=20Council's=20initial=20statement=20by=206=20months=20and=20has=20already=20been

>>=20accepted=20for=20publication,=20so=20why=20is=20Council=20withholding=20Mr.=20Spagat's

>>=20name?=20Was=20anonymity=20requested,=20and=20if=20so,=20by=20the=20complainant=20or=20by

>>=20someone=20else?

>>=20

>>=20Second,=20the=20question=20of=20just=20what=20is=20the=20purpose=20of=20the=20censure

>>=20statement.=20Technically,=20the=20only=20thing=20the=20AAPOR=20statement=20says=20is

that

>>=20Dr.=20Burnham=20has=20violated=20the=20AAPOR=20Code=20of=20Ethics=20by=20not=20providing

>>=20information=20demanded=20of=20him.=20=20But=20of=20course=20that=20is=20not=20the=20real

issue.

>>=20The=20real=20issue=20is=20that=20Dr.=20Burnham=20has=20been=20accused=20of=20falsification

and

>>=20that=20is=20the=20only=20reason=20he=20was=20asked=20to=20provide=20the=20information=20in

the

>>=20first=20place.

>>=20

>>=20I=20have=20no=20opinion=20one=20way=20or=20the=20other=20about=20Dr.=20Burnham=20or=20the=20case

>>=20against=20him=20and=20I=20don't=20know=20why=20he=20has=20refused=20to=20reveal=20details=20of

his

>>=20research.=20It=20certainly=20does=20arouse=20suspicion=20and=20AAPOR=20is=20absolutely

>>=20right=20to=20remind=20people=20that=20basic=20principles=20of=20scientific=20research

>>=20require=20that=20he=20be=20more=20open=20about=20his=20methods=20or=20provide=20compelling

>>=20reasons=20for=20not=20doing=20so.=20But=20he=20is=20not=20a=20member=20of=20AAPOR=20and=20has=20not

>>=20agreed=20to=20abide=20by=20the=20AAPOR=20Code,=20so=20it=20is=20inappropriate=20for=20AAPOR

to

>>=20accuse=20him=20of=20violating=20the=20AAPOR=20Code=20of=20Ethics.

>>=20

>>=20The=20fundamental=20issue=20is=20this:=20AAPOR=20is=20not=20a=20regulatory=20body=20and=20has

no

>>=20standing=20to=20compel=20anyone=20to=20follow=20its=20rules,=20even=20within=20its=20own

field

>>=20of=20Public=20Opinion=20Research.=20Nor=20does=20it=20have=20a=20mandate=20to=20adjudicate

>>=20every=20dispute=20that=20involves=20survey=20methodology=20or=20practice=20in=20some

way.

>>=20=20By=20claiming=20those=20powers,=20AAPOR=20has=20set=20itself=20up=20to=20be=20taken

>>=20advantage=20of=20by=20nearly=20any=20person=20who=20wishes=20to=20use=20our=20reputation=20to

>>=20advance=20his=20case=20in=20a=20scientific=20dispute.=20If=20so,=20these=20Standards

Committee

>>=20could=20be=20very,=20very=20busy=20in=20coming=20years.

>>=20

>>=20My=20greatest=20fear=20is=20that=20some=20may=20try=20to=20relax=20th=  
e=20AAPOR=20Code=20to

avoid

>>=20this=20kind=20of=20problem.=20That=20would=20be=20a=20tragedy.=20AAPOR=  
R=20needs=20to

encourage

>>=20the=20highest=20standards=20of=20professional=20behavior,=20but=20it=20=  
also=20needs=20to

>>=20recognize=20that=20it=20will=20be=20most=20effective=20if=20it=20lead=  
s=20by=20example,=20not

if

>>=20it=20acts=20as=20a=20self-appointed=20enforcer=20of=20ethical=20and=20=  
professional

behavior.

>>=20

>>=20

>>=20Jan=20Werner

>>=20

>>=20-----

>>=20Archives:=20<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

>>=20Vacation=20hold?=20Send=20email=20to=20listserv@asu.edu=20with=20this=  
=20text:

>>=20set=20aapornet=20nomail

>>=20On=20your=20return=20send=20this:=20set=20aapornet=20mail

>>=20Please=20ask=20authors=20before=20quoting=20outside=20AAPORNET.

>>=20Problems?-don't=20reply=20to=20this=20message,=20write=20to:

aapornet-request@asu.edu

>>=20

>=20

>=20

>=20

>--

>Peter=20V.=20Miller

>Department=20of=20Communication=20Studies

>Northwestern=20University

>Vice-President,=20American=20Association=20for=20Public=20Opinion=20Resea=  
rch

>p-miller@northwestern.edu

>=20

>-----

>Archives:=20<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

>Vacation=20hold?=20Send=20email=20to=20listserv@asu.edu=20with=20this=20t=  
ext:

>set=20aapornet=20nomail

>On=20your=20return=20send=20this:=20set=20aapornet=20mail

>Please=20ask=20authors=20before=20quoting=20outside=20AAPORNET.

>Problems?-don't=20reply=20to=20this=20message,=20write=20to:

aapornet-request@asu.edu

>=20

>This=20email=20was=20received=20from=20the=20INTERNET=20and=20scanned=20b=  
y=20the=20Government

Secure

>Intranet=20anti-virus=20service=20supplied=20by=20Cable&Wireless=20in=20p=  
artnership

with=20MessageLabs.

>(CCTM=20Certificate=20Number=202007/11/0032.)=20In=20case=20of=20problems=  
,=20please

call=20your

>organisation's=20IT=20Helpdesk.

>Communications=20via=20the=20GSI=20may=20be=20automatically=20logged,=20m=

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>.

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: 08.0.238 / Virus Database: 20270.11.23/2016 - Release Date:

03/23/09 2006:52:00

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=20original=20of=20this=20email=20was=20scanned=20for=20viruses=20by=20the=20Government=20Secure=20Intranet=20virus=20scanning=20service=20supplied=20by=20Cable&Wireless=20in=20partnership=20with=20MessageLabs.=20(CCTM=20Certificate=20Number=202007/11/0032.)=20On=20leaving=20the=20GSI=20this=20email=20was=20certified=20virus=20free.  
Communications=20via=20the=20GSI=20may=20be=20automatically=20logged,=20monitored=20and/or=20recorded=20for=20legal=20purposes.

-----  
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, 24 Mar 2009 15:02:39 -0400  
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: Margin of error for online samples  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

I'm stymied by the inclusion of a margin of error for an online panel.? Is there something I'm not remembering to think about?

This from today's Zogby release:

A sampling of Zogby International's online panel, which is representative of the adult population of the US, was invited to participate. Slight weights were added region, party, age, race, religion, gender, education to more accurately reflect the population. The margin of error is +/- 1.5 percentage points. Margins of error are higher in sub-groups.

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.  
Selzer & Company  
Des Moines

-----  
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, 24 Mar 2009 12:13:15 -0700  
Reply-To: Michael Sullivan <[michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM](mailto:michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Michael Sullivan <[michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM](mailto:michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Margin of error for online samples  
Comments: To: [jannselzer@AOL.COM](mailto:jannselzer@AOL.COM), [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[8CB7ACA3C9526D2-9B8-DE4@webmail-db05.sysops.aol.com](mailto:8CB7ACA3C9526D2-9B8-DE4@webmail-db05.sysops.aol.com)>



MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Very interesting observation! Of course, margins of error for conventional telephone surveys in which response rates are generally less than 70% probably shouldn't be reported either.

Michael J. Sullivan, Ph.D.  
Chairman  
Freeman, Sullivan & Co.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of J. Ann Selzer  
Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2009 12:03 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Margin of error for online samples

I'm stymied by the inclusion of a margin of error for an online panel?  
Is there something I'm not remembering to think about?

This from today's Zogby release:

A sampling of Zogby International's online panel, which is representative of the adult population of the US, was invited to participate. Slight weights were added region, party, age, race, religion, gender, education to more accurately reflect the population. The margin of error is +/- 1.5 percentage points. Margins of error are higher in sub-groups.

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.  
Selzer & Company  
Des Moines

-----  
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, 24 Mar 2009 15:40:01 -0400  
Reply-To: "Fahimi, Mansour" <[mfahimi@M-S-G.COM](mailto:mfahimi@M-S-G.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Fahimi, Mansour" <[mfahimi@M-S-G.COM](mailto:mfahimi@M-S-G.COM)>

Subject: Re: Margin of error for online samples  
Comments: To: Michael Sullivan <michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

With a response rate of about 70% there is a good chance that all walks of life are represented - albeit at somewhat misaligned rates. So, if effective nonresponse adjustments are implemented and the resulting variance inflations are disclosed then margin of error begins to make a lot of sense. On the other hand, with an online panel which group of respondents are going to represent those who do not have access to the internet?

\_Mansour.

---

From: AAPORNET on behalf of Michael Sullivan  
Sent: Tue 3/24/2009 3:13 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Margin of error for online samples

Very interesting observation! Of course, margins of error for conventional telephone surveys in which response rates are generally less than 70% probably shouldn't be reported either.

Michael J. Sullivan, Ph.D.  
Chairman  
Freeman, Sullivan & Co.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of J. Ann Selzer  
Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2009 12:03 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Margin of error for online samples

I'm stymied by the inclusion of a margin of error for an online panel.? Is there something I'm not remembering to think about?

This from today's Zogby release:

A sampling of Zogby International's online panel, which is representative of the adult population of the US, was invited to participate. Slight weights were added region, party, age, race, religion, gender, education to more accurately reflect the population. The margin of error is +/- 1.5 percentage points. Margins of error are

higher in sub-groups.

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.  
Selzer & Company  
Des Moines

---

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.

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*  
Information contained in this e-mail transmission is privileged and confidential. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, do not read, distribute or reproduce this transmission (including any attachments). If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify the sender by telephone or email reply.  
\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

---

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, 24 Mar 2009 15:53:27 -0400  
Reply-To: "Painter, John S." <[PainterJS@VMI.EDU](mailto:PainterJS@VMI.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Painter, John S." <[PainterJS@VMI.EDU](mailto:PainterJS@VMI.EDU)>  
Subject: A question about margin of error and power analysis  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: A<[19C7D9BC73C7914BAB5D21A6C05F2AD7011B1663@Delmar2.m-s-g.com](mailto:A19C7D9BC73C7914BAB5D21A6C05F2AD7011B1663@Delmar2.m-s-g.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I am preparing in-house guidelines for how to specify an appropriate sample size. Thus far I have been relying on the statistical power literature to guide my thinking.

A colleague is making the case that a discussion of margin of error should be included for situations when the sample is being compared to a set standard (e.g., 70% of students are proficient). My uniformed (I am

not a statistician) thinking is that using margin of error projections to specify a desired sample size is a form of power analysis (e.g., nonparametric testing of proportions) and the conventional formulas (e.g., Cohen) already cover this scenario. Am I wrong???

Hope this makes sense (because it doesn't to me : )

Thank you,  
John

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Fahimi, Mansour  
Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2009 3:40 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Margin of error for online samples

With a response rate of about 70% there is a good chance that all walks of life are represented - albeit at somewhat misaligned rates. So, if effective nonresponse adjustments are implemented and the resulting variance inflations are disclosed then margin of error begins to make a lot of sense. On the other hand, with an online panel which group of respondents are going to represent those who do not have access to the internet?

Mansour.

---

From: AAPORNET on behalf of Michael Sullivan  
Sent: Tue 3/24/2009 3:13 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Margin of error for online samples

Very interesting observation! Of course, margins of error for conventional telephone surveys in which response rates are generally less than 70% probably shouldn't be reported either.

Michael J. Sullivan, Ph.D.  
Chairman  
Freeman, Sullivan & Co.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of J. Ann Selzer  
Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2009 12:03 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Margin of error for online samples

I'm stymied by the inclusion of a margin of error for an online panel?  
Is there something I'm not remembering to think about?

This from today's Zogby release:

A sampling of Zogby International's online panel, which is representative of the adult population of the US, was invited to participate. Slight weights were added region, party, age, race, religion, gender, education to more accurately reflect the population. The margin of error is +/- 1.5 percentage points. Margins of error are higher in sub-groups.

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.  
Selzer & Company  
Des Moines

-----  
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.

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*  
Information contained in this e-mail transmission is privileged and confidential. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, do not read, distribute or reproduce this transmission (including any attachments). If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify the sender by telephone or email reply.  
\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

-----  
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, 24 Mar 2009 16:02:56 -0400

Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>  
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing  
Subject: Re: Margin of error for online samples  
Comments: To: jannselzer@AOL.COM  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
In-Reply-To: <8CB7ACA3C9526D2-9B8-DE4@webmail-db05.sysops.aol.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

If the sample was randomly selected from the online panel, then it makes sense to compute a margin of error with respect to the panel as sampling frame. If the panel itself were also randomly selected from the adult U.S. population, it would be possible to compute a margin of error with respect to the adult U.S. population.

Of course, if pigs had wings, they could fly.

Jan Werner

---

J. Ann Selzer wrote:

> I'm stymied by the inclusion of a margin of error for an online  
> panel.? Is there something I'm not remembering to think about?  
>  
> This from today's Zogby release:  
>  
>  
> A sampling of Zogby International's online panel, which is  
> representative of the adult population of the US, was invited to  
> participate. Slight weights were added region, party, age, race,  
> religion, gender, education to more accurately reflect the  
> population. The margin of error is +/- 1.5 percentage points. Margins  
> of error are higher in sub-groups.  
>  
>  
> J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D. Selzer & Company Des Moines  
>  
> ----- 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, 24 Mar 2009 13:36:51 -0700

Reply-To: Michael Sullivan <michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Michael Sullivan <michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM>  
Subject: Re: A question about margin of error and power analysis  
Comments: To: "Painter, John S." <PainterJS@VMI.EDU>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
In-Reply-To: <1A5D283567B2B847AF7F34E7B32F709FFDF2A7@EMAIL.vmi.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

They are related but different. Power is ability of the sample to detect a difference of a designated between the mean for a given population or subpopulation and a specific alternative value. It is usually presented as a probability. The margin of error is a measure of the estimated percentage deviation of the sampled mean from the mean of the sampling distribution with a given probability. So we say the margin of error is plus or minus X percent with y% confidence. In practices, power increases with sample size. However, the ability of a sample to discriminate a difference between the sampled outcome and a specific alternative value also depends on the size of the difference one is trying to observe. Bottom line, you can be really precise from the point of view of alpha but still insufficiently precise to discriminate a given difference. There is a pretty good discussion of power on Wikipedia

Michael J. Sullivan, Ph.D.  
Chairman  
Freeman, Sullivan & Co.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Painter, John S.  
Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2009 12:53 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: A question about margin of error and power analysis

I am preparing in-house guidelines for how to specify an appropriate sample size. Thus far I have been relying on the statistical power literature to guide my thinking.

A colleague is making the case that a discussion of margin of error should be included for situations when the sample is being compared to a set standard (e.g., 70% of students are proficient). My unformed (I am not a statistician) thinking is that using margin of error projections to specify a desired sample size is a form of power analysis (e.g., nonparametric testing of proportions) and the conventional formulas (e.g., Cohen) already cover this scenario. Am I wrong???

Hope this makes sense (because it doesn't to me : )

Thank you,  
John

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Fahimi, Mansour  
Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2009 3:40 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Margin of error for online samples

With a response rate of about 70% there is a good chance that all walks of life are represented - albeit at somewhat misaligned rates. So, if effective nonresponse adjustments are implemented and the resulting variance inflations are disclosed then margin of error begins to make a lot of sense. On the other hand, with an online panel which group of respondents are going to represent those who do not have access to the internet?

\_Mansour.

---

From: AAPORNET on behalf of Michael Sullivan  
Sent: Tue 3/24/2009 3:13 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Margin of error for online samples

Very interesting observation! Of course, margins of error for conventional telephone surveys in which response rates are generally less than 70% probably shouldn't be reported either.

Michael J. Sullivan, Ph.D.  
Chairman  
Freeman, Sullivan & Co.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of J. Ann Selzer  
Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2009 12:03 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Margin of error for online samples

I'm stymied by the inclusion of a margin of error for an online panel.?  
Is there something I'm not remembering to think about?

This from today's Zogby release:

A sampling of Zogby International's online panel, which is representative of the adult population of the US, was invited to participate. Slight weights were added region, party, age, race, religion, gender, education to more accurately reflect the population.



The margin of error is +/- 1.5 percentage points. Margins of error are higher in sub-groups.

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.  
Selzer & Company  
Des Moines

-----  
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.

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*  
Information contained in this e-mail transmission is privileged and confidential. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, do not read, distribute or reproduce this transmission (including any attachments). If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify the sender by telephone or email reply.  
\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

-----  
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.

-----  
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, 24 Mar 2009 14:06:25 -0700  
Reply-To: "Stephen J. Blumberg" <[swb5@CDC.GOV](mailto:swb5@CDC.GOV)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Stephen J. Blumberg" <[swb5@CDC.GOV](mailto:swb5@CDC.GOV)>  
Subject: Re: Yet more thoughts on the Burnham censure

Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

I believe that Jan offers a "middle ground" here that is worth further discussion, especially as Council considers possible modifications to the Code and the Schedule of Procedures.

Jan suggests that, when a non-member survey researcher has engaged in conduct that is inconsistent with the AAPOR Code of Professional Ethics and Practices, AAPOR should not censure for "violation of the Code," but rather should publicly announce that the individual's actions are inconsistent with the standards of ethics and practices of professional survey researchers.

In my opinion, a formal investigation would still be necessary to determine if the standards were inconsistent and to provide the non-member with an opportunity for due process. And, in my opinion, such a public statement is akin to saying that the non-member violated our Code of Professional Ethics and Practices. However, perhaps the tone of the message would be more acceptable to some.

Any thoughts, favorable or unfavorable, are welcome.

Stephen Blumberg  
Associate Standards Chair

-----  
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, 24 Mar 2009 14:05:15 -0700  
Reply-To: Michael Sullivan <[michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM](mailto:michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Michael Sullivan <[michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM](mailto:michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Margin of error for online samples  
Comments: To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com), [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[49C93C70.9070000@jwdp.com](mailto:49C93C70.9070000@jwdp.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I don't think so. The margin of error should be calculated on the basis of the observed sample, not on the basis of the selected sample. Is the observed sample representative of either the population of interest or the sample frame? It depends on whether or not there is non-response

bias. If non-response bias is present, the margin of error estimate obtainable using conventional computing techniques will greatly overstate the precision of the sample estimate.

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, March 24, 2009 1:03 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Margin of error for online samples

If the sample was randomly selected from the online panel, then it makes sense to compute a margin of error with respect to the panel as sampling frame. If the panel itself were also randomly selected from the adult U.S. population, it would be possible to compute a margin of error with respect to the adult U.S. population.

Of course, if pigs had wings, they could fly.

Jan Werner

---

J. Ann Selzer wrote:

- > I'm stymied by the inclusion of a margin of error for an online
- > panel.? Is there something I'm not remembering to think about?
- >
- > This from today's Zogby release:
- >
- >
- > A sampling of Zogby International's online panel, which is
- > representative of the adult population of the US, was invited to
- > participate. Slight weights were added region, party, age, race,
- > religion, gender, education to more accurately reflect the population.
  
- > The margin of error is +/- 1.5 percentage points. Margins of error are
  
- > higher in sub-groups.
- >
- >
- > J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D. Selzer & Company Des Moines
- >
- > ----- 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.

-----  
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, 24 Mar 2009 16:41:44 -0500  
Reply-To: "G. Donald Ferree, Jr." <[gferree@SSC.WISC.EDU](mailto:gferree@SSC.WISC.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "G. Donald Ferree, Jr." <[gferree@SSC.WISC.EDU](mailto:gferree@SSC.WISC.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Yet more thoughts on the Burnham censure  
Comments: To: "Stephen J. Blumberg" <[swb5@CDC.GOV](mailto:swb5@CDC.GOV)>  
Comments: cc: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[LISTSERV%200903241406257564.4CD4@LISTS.ASU.EDU](mailto:LISTSERV%200903241406257564.4CD4@LISTS.ASU.EDU)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Colleagues,

The "middle ground" may have some merit insofar as it clarifies the judgement AAPOR is making and insofar as confusion over just what we censoring blocks the intended effect of improving survey research and insulating our profession from damage from research which does not meet our standards but is identified in the public mind as "a survey".

Clearly, only two groups have a special explicit responsibility to adhere to the AAPOR code as such and to give special weight to inquiries from AAPOR: (a) members who have voluntarily (albeit as a condition of membership) subscribed to the code and (b) those who may not be AAPOR members but claim to adhere to the code, whether as a statement of solidarity or quasi-advertising.

But, as has been noted by others, ALL reputable researchers should adhere to the code insofar as it embodies professional standards of research, and this applies both to how surveys are conducted and how they are reported, regardless of membership in the organization or whether one has explicitly claimed to adhere to

the code's standards. There seems to be prima facie doubt that Burnham meets that test in terms of methods, and no doubt whatsoever that he has chosen NOT to disclose enough to determine the quality of the work. We should not be more upset that he disregarded a request from AAPOR than if he had refused to answer legitimate questions from anyone in the public or broader research community. But we should also not excuse his refusal to divulge simply because he is not an AAPOR member.

Finally, if we wish to promote a healthy debate about what Burnham actually DID, confusion over what our censure means might make that less likely. I am by no means suggesting that the standards inquiry was anything other than thorough, fair, and in accordance with our own rules. But if there are ways for the future that we can make our points while avoiding confusion more effectively, then we should by all means explore them. If some mistakenly conclude that we are trying to subject an outsider to our unwarranted authority, that can obscure a healthy debate on how one best tackles such questions as the level of civilian casualties in Iraq.

In the present case, I think AAPOR was precisely correct in criticizing Burnham for non-disclosure, and regret that his non-responsiveness stands in the way of a dispassionate evaluation of what was actually done.

Don  
> I believe that Jan offers a "middle ground" here that is worth further discussion, especially as Council considers possible modifications to the Code and the Schedule of Procedures.  
>  
> Jan suggests that, when a non-member survey researcher has engaged in conduct that is inconsistent with the AAPOR Code of Professional Ethics and Practices, AAPOR should not censure for "violation of the Code," but rather should publicly announce that the individual's actions are inconsistent with the standards of ethics and practices of professional survey researchers.  
>  
> In my opinion, a formal investigation would still be necessary to determine if the standards were inconsistent and to provide the non-member with an opportunity for due process. And, in my opinion, such a public statement is akin to saying that the non-member violated our Code of Professional Ethics and Practices. However,

perhaps the tone of the message would be more acceptable to some.

>  
> Any thoughts, favorable or unfavorable, are welcome.  
>  
> Stephen Blumberg  
> Associate Standards Chair

>  
> -----  
> 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, 24 Mar 2009 15:18:39 -0700  
Reply-To: Robert Worcester <[rmworcester@YAHOO.COM](mailto:rmworcester@YAHOO.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Robert Worcester <[rmworcester@YAHOO.COM](mailto:rmworcester@YAHOO.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Margin of error for online samples  
Comments: To: Michael Sullivan <[michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM](mailto:michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Comments: cc: Ben Page <[ben.page@ipsos-mori.com](mailto:ben.page@ipsos-mori.com)>, Julia Clark <[julia.clark@ipsos-mori.com](mailto:julia.clark@ipsos-mori.com)>, Bobby Duffy <[Bobby.Duffy@Ipsos-MORI.com](mailto:Bobby.Duffy@Ipsos-MORI.com)>, Kerry Colville <[Kerry.Colville@Ipsos-MORI.com](mailto:Kerry.Colville@Ipsos-MORI.com)>, [clifford.young@ipsos.com.br](mailto:clifford.young@ipsos.com.br)  
In-Reply-To: <[F90D102CAA90F547B081DE4C879A009C02834124@ex-be-012-sfo.shared.themessagecenter.com](mailto:F90D102CAA90F547B081DE4C879A009C02834124@ex-be-012-sfo.shared.themessagecenter.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Colleagues, please enter unrepresentative universe into the consideration of all of this, and the need for significantly larger weighting factors to bring the internet panel 'samples' into line, even when they start out as 'representative' by demographics and other behavioural metrics. I do not have comparable figures for the USA, but someone does if they'll do the cross tabbing as Ipsos MORI has in Britain now for some five or so years. The most recent data I have from aggregates of monthly representative samples of c. 2,000 respondents nationwide show that the 'internet anywhere' penetration in Britain ('access to the internet', not even use) is now, from fourth quarter 2008 data, n = 3D 5,927, =A071% overall, but drops off significantly among the 65+ population to 33%, one in three, and worse among the 65+ living on the state pension and other benefits, just 11%. =0A=0AThe British surrogates for the US occupation codes are our AB, C1, C2 and DE classifications: Among the quarter or so of adults who are among the professional and managerial ABs, =A0eight in ten have access to the internet, among white collar C1s, another quarter roughly, three in four, among blue collar families =

, another quarter, six in ten, and among the DEs of all ages, under four in ten. Many people here are surprised that nearly a quarter (23%) of those in the 16-24 cohort do not have access to the internet. Especially for local governments, health service, social services, the lowest penetration in the British population is those these public services most need to reach with their messages, and most public servants need to listen to their needs.

-----  
From: Michael Sullivan <michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM>  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2009 9:05:15 AM  
Subject: Re: Margin of error for online samples

I don't think so. The margin of error should be calculated on the basis of the observed sample, not on the basis of the selected sample. Is the observed sample representative of either the population of interest or the sample frame? It depends on whether or not there is non-response bias. If non-response bias is present, the margin of error estimate obtainable using conventional computing techniques will greatly overstate the precision of the sample estimate.

-----  
From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jan Werner  
Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2009 1:03 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Margin of error for online samples

If the sample was randomly selected from the online panel, then it makes sense to compute a margin of error with respect to the panel as sampling frame. If the panel itself were also randomly selected from the adult U.S. population, it would be possible to compute a margin of error with respect to the adult U.S. population. Of course, if pigs had wings, they could fly.

-----  
From: J. Ann Selzer [mailto:annselzer@desmoines.com] On Behalf Of J. Ann Selzer  
Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2009 1:03 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Margin of error for online samples

I'm stymied by the inclusion of a margin of error for an online panel. Is there something I'm not remembering to think about? This from today's Zogby release: A sampling of Zogby International's online panel, which is representative of the adult population of the US, was invited to participate. Slight weights were added region, party, age, race, religion, gender, education to more accurately reflect the population. The margin of error is +/- 1.5 percentage points. Margins of error are higher in sub-groups.

-----  
From: J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D. Selzer & Company Des Moines  
Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2009 1:03 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Margin of error for online samples

-----  
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.

-----  
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, 24 Mar 2009 16:00:16 -0700  
Reply-To: Paul Goodwin <paulg@GSVRESEARCH.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Paul Goodwin <paulg@GSVRESEARCH.COM>  
Subject: presidential approval by region  
Comments: To: "AAPORNET@ASU. EDU" <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

I've been asked by a colleague to find current numbers that break out presidential approval or favorability ratings by region, such as north/south/east/midwest/west or some similar configuration. Can anyone point me to a site where this is accessible? Thanks all.

Paul Goodwin  
Goodwin Simon Victoria Research  
P.O. Box 366  
Culver City CA 90232  
310/558-4761 (phone)  
310/210-8984 (mobile)  
paulg@gsvresearch.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, 24 Mar 2009 16:01:17 -0700  
Reply-To: Mario Callegaro <[mcallegaro@KNOWLEDGENETWORKS.COM](mailto:mcallegaro@KNOWLEDGENETWORKS.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mario Callegaro <[mcallegaro@KNOWLEDGENETWORKS.COM](mailto:mcallegaro@KNOWLEDGENETWORKS.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Margin of error for online samples  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
In-Reply-To: A<[F90D102CAA90F547B081DE4C879A009C02834124@ex-be-012-sfo.shared.themessagecenter.com](mailto:F90D102CAA90F547B081DE4C879A009C02834124@ex-be-012-sfo.shared.themessagecenter.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

The discussion about margin of error also depends on the type of sample.

If the online sample used by Zogby is an opt-in sample [I gather that from its website: "Signup here to take Zogby Polls online") then as AAPOR said some time ago: "The reporting of a margin of sampling error associated with an opt-in or self-identified sample (that is, in a survey or poll where respondents are self-selecting) is misleading".

A full discussion of margin of error for opt-in sample is found on the AAPOR



website at:

<http://www.aapor.org/whenrespondentsselectthemselves?s=margin%20of%20error>

Discussion about the margin of sampling error is found at:

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

Mario Callegaro Ph.D.

Survey Research Scientist

Knowledge Networks

[mcallegaro@knowledgenetworks.com](mailto:mcallegaro@knowledgenetworks.com)

<http://www.knowledgenetworks.com>

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)] On Behalf Of Michael Sullivan

Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2009 2:05 PM

To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

Subject: Re: Margin of error for online samples

I don't think so. The margin of error should be calculated on the basis of the observed sample, not on the basis of the selected sample. Is the observed sample representative of either the population of interest or the sample frame? It depends on whether or not there is non-response bias. If non-response bias is present, the margin of error estimate obtainable using conventional computing techniques will greatly overstate the precision of the sample estimate.

MS

Michael J. Sullivan, Ph.D.

Chairman

Freeman, Sullivan & Co.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)] On Behalf Of Jan Werner

Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2009 1:03 PM

To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

Subject: Re: Margin of error for online samples

If the sample was randomly selected from the online panel, then it makes sense to compute a margin of error with respect to the panel as sampling frame. If the panel itself were also randomly selected from the adult U.S. population, it would be possible to compute a margin of error with respect to the adult U.S. population.

Of course, if pigs had wings, they could fly.

Jan Werner

---

J. Ann Selzer wrote:  
> I'm stymied by the inclusion of a margin of error for an online  
> panel.? Is there something I'm not remembering to think about?  
>  
> This from today's Zogby release:  
>  
>  
> A sampling of Zogby International's online panel, which is  
> representative of the adult population of the US, was invited to  
> participate. Slight weights were added region, party, age, race,  
> religion, gender, education to more accurately reflect the population.  
  
> The margin of error is +/- 1.5 percentage points. Margins of error are  
  
> higher in sub-groups.  
>  
>  
> J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D. Selzer & Company Des Moines  
>  
> ----- 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.

---

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, 24 Mar 2009 21:06:56 -0400  
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: MRA Helps Kill Legislation in Maryland,  
Mississippi and Rhode Island - Would Have Crippled Research with  
Health Care Practitioners  
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

MRA Helps Kill Legislation in Maryland, Mississippi and Rhode Island -  
Would Have Crippled Research with Health Care Practitioners:

<http://www.mra-net.org/article.cfm?aID=3D538>

<<http://www.mra-net.org/article.cfm?aID=3D538>>=20

(Glastonbury, Conn.): MRA scored several recent victories in the ongoing fight against legislation to require public reporting of survey research incentives for health care practitioners or that ban them outright. MRA recently helped to convince legislators in Maryland and Rhode Island to withdraw their bills and helped to defeat legislation in Mississippi.=20

LaToya Lang, MRA's State Legislative Director, commented that, "with more and more states attempting to restrict or publicly disclose research incentives for health care practitioners, MRA values every win we can get."

After communication with MRA, the sponsors in Maryland of H. 1477 and S. 196 agreed to withdraw their legislation. S. 196 would have required public reporting of payments made to health care practitioners by pharmaceutical manufacturers and explicitly included survey research incentives. H. 1477 would have required public reporting of aggregate spending on pharmaceutical marketing, including payments to physicians for participation in survey research.

MRA advocacy in Mississippi helped convince legislators in the State House to defeat H.B. 811 in the Public Health and Human Services Committee and the Judiciary Committee. H.B. 811 was one of the most expansive bills MRA has seen, requiring public reporting for research incentives to any physician, nurse practitioner or their immediate family members that originated from pharmaceutical manufacturers.

Rhode Island's H. 5645 and S. 707 would have banned gifts to health care practitioners from pharmaceutical companies, including survey research incentives of any dollar amount. Communication from MRA helped convince the bills' sponsors to reconsider their approach and withdraw the legislation.

The successes in Maryland, Mississippi and Rhode Island follow MRA's defeat of S. B. 99 in New Mexico earlier this month:

<http://www.mra-net.org/article.cfm?aID=3D532>

Research incentives to doctors have been (often inadvertently) caught up in ongoing attempts at the state level to restrict "gifts" to physicians from pharmaceutical, medical device, and medical supply manufacturers. Such "gifts" are assumed to be buying influence on behalf of the manufacturers.

=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.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, 24 Mar 2009 21:26:39 -0400  
Reply-To: "Bickart, Barbara A" <[bickart@BU.EDU](mailto:bickart@BU.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Bickart, Barbara A" <[bickart@BU.EDU](mailto:bickart@BU.EDU)>  
Subject: Announcement: Governance Structure Transition at the Journal of  
Consumer Research  
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

To all AAPOR Members....=20

=20

AAPOR is one of eleven sponsoring organizations for the Journal of Consumer Research. As AAPOR's representative to the Policy Board of the Journal of Consumer Research, I wanted to pass on this announcement that was emailed today to all JCR subscribers...

=20

Announcement:

Governance Structure Transition at the Journal of Consumer Research

Over the past year, the JCR Policy Board has explored new governance structures in response to steady and significant annual increases in manuscript submissions to the Journal. This heavy manuscript load is beginning to create an unsustainable workload for a single editor, who also has other professional responsibilities outside of his/her editorial role. Earlier this month, the Policy Board met and approved a new transitional governance structure. John Deighton has requested permission to appoint three Editors to work with him: Deborah MacInnis, Ann McGill, and Baba Shiv. The Policy Board unanimously approved this proposal and the appointment of Debbie, Ann, and Baba. John will now serve as Editor-in-Chief for the duration of his term, and Debbie, Ann, and Baba will serve with him.

Please see John's Editorial on the JCR website (<http://ejcr.org/governance.html>) for details of how this will work. Essential highlights are that the Editors will be assigned manuscripts by John and will handle the choice of Associate Editors and reviewers and will make editorial decisions. John will retain ownership of revisions that are in process; new manuscripts will be divided equally among the Editor-in-Chief and the three Editors. Moreover, John's responsibility is to ensure uniformity of standards so that the journal will continue as a single interdisciplinary journal and not a collection of sections.

All parties were in agreement that at the end of John Deighton's term, the policy board will conduct a full and open search for the next Editor-in-Chief, and will at that time decide on a new, more permanent governance structure. We also wish to allay any concerns among potential candidates for the upcoming editorship that the newly appointed editors would have an inside track. The board is committed to attracting the broadest possible candidate pool when we open that search next year, to allow JCR to retain its position as the foremost interdisciplinary journal devoted to the study of consumer behavior.=20

We are grateful to Debbie, Ann, and Baba for their willingness to take on this vital service to the field and to John Deighton for his continued stewardship of the journal.=20

John Lynch, President  
Journal of Consumer Research Policy Board

March 23, 2009

=20

=20

=20

Barbara Bickart

Associate Professor of Marketing=20

Boston University

595 Commonwealth Ave.

Boston, MA 02215

617-353-3458

bickart@bu.edu

=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: Wed, 25 Mar 2009 08:40:15 -0400  
Reply-To: Jason Boxt <[jboxt@GLOVERPARKGROUP.COM](mailto:jboxt@GLOVERPARKGROUP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jason Boxt <[jboxt@GLOVERPARKGROUP.COM](mailto:jboxt@GLOVERPARKGROUP.COM)>  
Subject: question about online surveys and margin of error  
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

Can someone either explain briefly or point me to a good source or two the =  
arguments against the validity of reporting a margin for error on an online=  
survey, and summarize where the research community has drawn lines in the =  
debate (assuming there is in fact a debate to speak of)? And for the sake =  
of discussion, let's imagine a hypothetical online survey here reflects a c=  
ustom sample - say high income adults - rather than the general population.=  
I certainly understand the pitfalls of online methodology where it concer=  
ns a broadly-defined population.

With thanks,

jason

[cid:image001.jpg@01C9AD25.4A3285B0]

-----  
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, 25 Mar 2009 09:11:25 -0400  
Reply-To: "Fahimi, Mansour" <[mfahimi@M-S-G.COM](mailto:mfahimi@M-S-G.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Fahimi, Mansour" <[mfahimi@M-S-G.COM](mailto:mfahimi@M-S-G.COM)>  
Subject: Re: question about online surveys and margin of error  
Comments: To: Jason Boxt <[jboxt@GLOVERPARKGROUP.COM](mailto:jboxt@GLOVERPARKGROUP.COM)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To:  
[A<4B057B6CD4B082488FADE7ABB7AAEA970341B4C22D@exchange2007.hq.gpg.local>](mailto:A<4B057B6CD4B082488FADE7ABB7AAEA970341B4C22D@exchange2007.hq.gpg.local>)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Jason,

=20

The issue is actually fairly simple. You just need to find your comfortable position on the continuum that extends from a purely academic stand to one that completely favors pragmatism. The former claims without true selection probabilities all these discussions, such as margin of error and power of tests, go out of the window. On the other hand, the latter position attempts to manufacture probability-based samples by making the sample representative with respect to a handful of demographics and then impute selection probabilities. As such, drawing the line - no matter where - is subject to subjectivity.

=20

\_Mansour.

=20

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jason Boxt

Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2009 8:40 AM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: question about online surveys and margin of error

=20

Can someone either explain briefly or point me to a good source or two the arguments against the validity of reporting a margin for error on an online survey, and summarize where the research community has drawn lines in the debate (assuming there is in fact a debate to speak of)? And for the sake of discussion, let's imagine a hypothetical online survey here reflects a custom sample - say high income adults - rather than the general population. I certainly understand the pitfalls of online methodology where it concerns a broadly-defined population.

=20

With thanks,

=20

jason

=20

=20

=20

=20

[cid:image001.jpg@01C9AD25.4A3285B0]

=20

=20

=20

-----

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

\*\*\*\*\*  
 \*\*\*\*\*  
 =20 Information contained in this e-mail transmission is privileged and c=  
 onfidential. If you are not the intended recipient of this email,=20  
 =20 do not read, distribute or reproduce this transmission (including any=  
 =20 attachments). If you have received this e-mail in error, please=20  
 =20 immediately notify the sender by telephone or email reply.  
 \*\*\*\*\*  
 \*\*\*\*\*

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

=====  
 Date: Wed, 25 Mar 2009 10:52:23 -0400  
 Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com  
 Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
 From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>  
 Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing  
 Subject: Some earlier AAPOR standards actions  
 Comments: To: AAPORNET <aapornet@asu.edu>  
 MIME-Version: 1.0  
 Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
 Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

In "The Vanishing Newspaper" Philip Meyer relates that "In 1991, AAPOR censured Planned Parenthood of Minnesota for using a poll to assemble a database of names and addresses of potential supporters without telling the respondents that their names would be used for nonresearch purposes. In that same year, a similar finding was made in a case involving the National Right to Life Committee."

I don't remember that, but I'm sure Phil is correct, since he was AAPOR president in 1990 (I certainly do remember his address at the 1990 conference in Lancaster, PA).



The book contains an interesting section on professional standards for journalists, with specific mention of AAPOR as a potential role model. Given the current discussion, I'm not sure I'd agree with that today.

Nonetheless, the cases cited above provide clear examples of situations where I think it would be appropriate for AAPOR to publicly censure persons or groups for their behavior, without fear of being drawn in as a party to a dispute between researchers.

Jan Werner

---

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, 25 Mar 2009 11:48:25 -0400  
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: Standards  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=utf-8  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Well, I think the question of whether council members read AAPORnet has been answered resoundingly, and I appreciate the thoughtful responses.

However, I want to clarify that last week when I suggested recognizing research that exemplified standards of disclosure, I was referring to CLEAR REPORTING of research findings, rather than exemplary research per se.

It is possible to have research that may not be particularly sound methodologically, but is nevertheless reported quite clearly so that without great effort people can see what what was done. I could name a report I helped write.

On the other hand, it is also possible, even common, for important research findings to be methodologically sound, but not communicated clearly.

The recent censure was reportedly not for anything Burnham et al. did or didn't do, but their failure to disclose adequately.

In this day of virtually unlimited webspace, thorough disclosure is no longer restricted by the practical limitations of past decades, or even what can be fit into a traditional academic publication (because they'll often add online appendices). However, it is also possible to have a lot of stuff cranked out and yet still not answer all the standards of minimum disclosure; mere volume does not suffice.

The difference between the reporting of findings and the methods used is clear in my mind from having been a journalist trying to pull together something on deadline, a situation when accurate and comprehensive reporting by researchers

is such a blessing. I remember calling up a state agency and asking, "So the bar of that graph on your website looks like a third, but the label says 8 percent?" and they responded that it was 38% but a graphic was covering up the 3...oops! And the methods of data collection were rarely laid out in a way that answered all my questions.

So it's the excellent disclosure that I wish there was some way to emphasize, not research per se. Unless one is arguing (and I think that the case could be made) that one can't have truly exemplary research without good disclosure.

Colleen Porter  
Gainesville, FL

---- Peter Miller <p-miller@northwestern.edu> wrote:

> Here is an attempt to answer Colleen's questions.

>

> The Code does not specify any further consequences tied to censure.

>

> We have some ways of recognizing positive examples of research in awards

> distributed at the annual meeting (e.g. Innovators, Policy Impact).

>

> In addition, the Poll Review section of \*POQ\* periodically publishes papers

> highlighting exemplary research.

>

> But I personally think we need to take a more proactive stance on standards

> issues. I have begun exploring ideas with Council and I will try to start

> some initiatives this year.

>

>

>

> On Wed, Mar 18, 2009 at 10:49 AM, Colleen Porter

<colleen\_porter@cox.net>wrote:

>

>> I appreciate the many thoughtful comments and would just like to add a few

>> points for consideration:

>>

>> First, are there any consequences to censure by AAPOR? Does it mean

>> that one can no longer be a referee for POQ (which Burnham has done),

>> present at an AAPOR conference, or publish in POQ or Survey Practice?

This

>> gets pretty tricky because as mentioned earlier it should be the work that

>> is on trial, not the researcher in a personal way. Yet in many states,

>> someone convicted of a felony cannot practice law. And as a practical

>> matter, it would make an easier explanation of the censure--that there are

>> specific consequences from the organization. Even though the real reason,

>> from our point of view, is sticking up for standards.

>>

>> Second, is there a way to be more positive about the need for disclosure?

>> Like once a year coming up with a list of something like the five best

>> survey reports, that exemplified our standards, exceed the minimum

>> disclosure, and share methodological details in a very clear way? I am

>> wondering, if for every year since Luntz, we'd had annual press releases

>> sent not just to lay media but also to professional organization

newsletters

>> across various fields, etc. honoring the Pew Religious Landscape Survey  
>> and  
>> the ABC News Where Things Stand in Iraq survey and so on, that folks would  
>> have a better sense of what the standards are, that many surveys meet or  
>> exceed them. And even if a journalist never ran a story about the award  
>> list per se, they would understand the concept of expected disclosure,  
>> and  
>> know who to call if they have questions. It just seems that if we were  
>> being positive more, then our voice would be even stronger when raised in  
>> warning and concern.

>>  
>> Colleen Porter  
>> Gainesville, FL

>>  
>> -----  
>> 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.

>>  
>  
>  
>  
> --  
> 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> .  
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, 25 Mar 2009 11:27:11 -0500  
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: Re: Standards  
Comments: To: [colleen\\_porter@cox.net](mailto:colleen_porter@cox.net)  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <20090325114825.YRMQK.524969.imal@eastrmwml40>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Thanks for this comment. I agree that we need ways to recognize good disclosure as a way of promoting it.

On Wed, Mar 25, 2009 at 10:48 AM, Colleen Porter  
<[colleen\\_porter@cox.net](mailto:colleen_porter@cox.net)> wrote:

> Well, I think the question of whether council members read AAPORnet has  
> been answered resoundingly, and I appreciate the thoughtful responses.  
>  
> However, I want to clarify that last week when I suggested recognizing  
> research that exemplified standards of disclosure, I was referring to CLEAR  
> REPORTING of research findings, rather than exemplary research per se.  
>  
> It is possible to have research that may not be particularly sound  
> methodologically, but is nevertheless reported quite clearly so that without  
> great effort people can see what what was done. I could name a report I  
> helped write.  
>  
> On the other hand, it is also possible, even common, for important research  
> findings to be methodologically sound, but not communicated clearly.  
>  
> The recent censure was reportedly not for anything Burnham et al. did or  
> didn't do, but their failure to disclose adequately.  
>  
> In this day of virtually unlimited webspace, thorough disclosure is no  
> longer restricted by the practical limitations of past decades, or even what  
> can be fit into a traditional academic publication (because they'll often  
> add online appendices). However, it is also possible to have a lot of stuff  
> cranked out and yet still not answer all the standards of minimum  
> disclosure; mere volume does not suffice.  
>  
> The difference between the reporting of findings and the methods used is  
> clear in my mind from having been a journalist trying to pull together  
> something on deadline, a situation when accurate and comprehensive reporting  
> by researchers is such a blessing. I remember calling up a state agency and  
> asking, "So the bar of that graph on your website looks like a third, but  
> the label says 8 percent?" and they responded that it was 38% but a graphic  
> was covering up the 3....oops! And the methods of data collection were  
> rarely laid out in a way that answered all my questions.  
>  
> So it's the excellent disclosure that I wish there was some way to  
> emphasize, not research per se. Unless one is arguing (and I think that  
> the case could be made) that one can't have have truly exemplary research  
> without good disclosure.  
>  
> Colleen Porter  
> Gainesville, FL  
>  
> ---- Peter Miller <p-miller@northwestern.edu> wrote:  
>> Here is an attempt to answer Colleen's questions.  
>>  
>> The Code does not specify any further consequences tied to censure.  
>>  
>> We have some ways of recognizing positive examples of research in awards  
>> distributed at the annual meeting (e.g. Innovators, Policy Impact).  
>>  
>> In addition, the Poll Review section of \*POQ\* periodically publishes  
> papers  
>> highlighting exemplary research.  
>>

>> But I personally think we need to take a more proactive stance on  
> standards  
>> issues. I have begun exploring ideas with Council and I will try to  
> start  
>> some initiatives this year.  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>> On Wed, Mar 18, 2009 at 10:49 AM, Colleen Porter <colleen\_porter@cox.net  
>>wrote:  
>>  
>>> I appreciate the many thoughtful comments and would just like to add a  
> few  
>>> points for consideration:  
>>>  
>>> First, are there any consequences to censureship by AAPOR? Does it  
> mean  
>>> that one can no longer be a referee for POQ (which Burnham has done),  
>>> present at an AAPOR conference, or publish in POQ or Survey Practice?  
> This  
>>> gets pretty tricky because as mentioned earlier it should be the work  
> that  
>>> is on trial, not the researcher in a personal way. Yet in many states,  
>>> someone convicted of a felony cannot practice law. And as a practical  
>>> matter, it would make an easier explanation of the censure--that there  
> are  
>>> specific consequences from the organization. Even though the real  
> reason,  
>>> from our point of view, is sticking up for standards.  
>>>  
>>> Second, is there a way to be more positive about the need for  
> disclosure?  
>>> Like once a year coming up with a list of something like the five best  
>>> survey reports, that exemplified our standards, exceed the minimum  
>>> disclosure, and share methodological details in a very clear way? I  
> am  
>>> wondering, if for every year since Luntz, we'd had annual press  
> releases  
>>> sent not just to lay media but also to professional organization  
> newsletters  
>>> across various fields, etc. honoring the Pew Religious Landscape Survey  
> and  
>>> the ABC News Where Things Stand in Iraq survey and so on, that folks  
> would  
>>> have a better sense of what the standards are, that many surveys meet  
> or  
>>> exceed them. And even if a journalist never ran a story about the  
> award  
>>> list per se, they would understand the concept of expected disclosure,  
> and  
>>> know who to call if they have questions. It just seems that if we were  
>>> being positive more, then our voice would be even stronger when raised  
> in  
>>> warning and concern.

>>>  
>>> Colleen Porter  
>>> Gainesville, FL  
>>>  
>>> -----  
>>> 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.

>>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>> --  
>> 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> .  
> 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)  
>

--  
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> .  
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, 25 Mar 2009 09:39:46 -0700  
Reply-To: Michael Sullivan <[michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM](mailto:michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Michael Sullivan <[michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM](mailto:michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM)>  
Subject: Re: question about online surveys and margin of error  
Comments: To: "Fahimi, Mansour" <[mfahimi@M-S-G.COM](mailto:mfahimi@M-S-G.COM)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[19C7D9BC73C7914BAB5D21A6C05F2AD7020F27E5@Delmar2.m-s-g.com](mailto:19C7D9BC73C7914BAB5D21A6C05F2AD7020F27E5@Delmar2.m-s-g.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

It's not really a subjective choice between the practices advocated by  
the pointie headed academics and the practices advocated by the parties

who have to execute survey research quickly and inexpensively.

I don't have time to really go into this, but here is a way to think about the problem and some sources to read. The margin of error as it has been called is a measure of the expected sampling error given the inherent variation of the variable of interest in the population and sample size. It's calculation assumes that the probability of selection for each and every observation is known (usually  $1/N$  but sometimes a more complicated quantity). If that's not true the margin of error estimate obtainable from conventional computing formulae are not interpretable as the expected value of the sampling error...period. So margin of error shouldn't be reported when anything other than probability sampling is used because it will convey a level of measurement validity and precision that is unwarranted. Now, Jason's hypothetical says it is a custom sample. Well, a custom sample could be a probability sample or it could be a sample of convenience. Whether it is appropriate to report margins of error depends on whether it is a probability sample. If it is a probability sample from a large list of possible high income respondents (say you have 20,000 list members and you more or less perfectly observe a randomly selected subset of 400), then it is appropriate to report margin of error calculations on this "frame". It would be up to the researcher to clearly describe the list and how it was assembled and to state unequivocally that this sample is not representative of some broader population of high income people in America or whatever the underlying population of real interest is.

"Sampling Techniques: third edition" by William Cochran contains a pretty good though somewhat mathematical discussion of the reasoning underlying what I have just said. In the end, internet access is just like magazine readerhip (the source of probably the most infamous incident of survey misinterpretation ever). There is a natural screen in place that is creating the list that makes it difficult to generalize the results outside the range of the list.

Hope this helps

Michael J. Sullivan, Ph.D.  
Chairman  
Freeman, Sullivan & Co.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Fahimi, Mansour  
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2009 6:11 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: question about online surveys and margin of error

Jason,

The issue is actually fairly simple. You just need to find your comfortable position on the continuum that extends from a purely

academic stand to one that completely favors pragmatism. The former claims without true selection probabilities all these discussions, such as margin of error and power of tests, go out of the window. On the other hand, the latter position attempts to manufacture probability-based samples by making the sample representative with respect to a handful of demographics and then impute selection probabilities. As such, drawing the line - no matter where - is subject to subjectivity.

\_Mansour.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jason Box  
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2009 8:40 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: question about online surveys and margin of error

Can someone either explain briefly or point me to a good source or two the arguments against the validity of reporting a margin for error on an online survey, and summarize where the research community has drawn lines in the debate (assuming there is in fact a debate to speak of)? And for the sake of discussion, let's imagine a hypothetical online survey here reflects a custom sample - say high income adults - rather than the general population. I certainly understand the pitfalls of online methodology where it concerns a broadly-defined population.

With thanks,

jason

[cid:image001.jpg@01C9AD25.4A3285B0]



-----  
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)

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*  
Information contained in this e-mail transmission is privileged and confidential. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, do not read, distribute or reproduce this transmission (including any attachments). If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify the sender by telephone or email reply.  
\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

-----  
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: Wed, 25 Mar 2009 12:50:52 -0400  
Reply-To: fred goldner <[fgoldner@COMCAST.NET](mailto:fgoldner@COMCAST.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: fred goldner <[fgoldner@COMCAST.NET](mailto:fgoldner@COMCAST.NET)>  
Subject: Re: Yet more thoughts on the Burnham censure  
Comments: To: "G. Donald Ferree, Jr." <[gferree@SSC.WISC.EDU](mailto:gferree@SSC.WISC.EDU)>, [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

Having been away I just read through all the Burnham comments and while I am especially impressed by the thoughtfulness of Jan Werner's comments I find that --unless I missed it-- one crucial ethical issue has yet to be raised. The Burnham survey come out when the high or low estimates of civilian casualties were part of a political debate about the conduct and justification of the Iraq war. Did our our standards committee investigate the methodology employed by all those who issued casualty figures or did they only inquire about Burnham's methodology because someone had questioned his? Whether they employed so-called formal surveys all estimates or official counts were based on the reporting of individuals --army

commanders, hospital employees etc.. It would be irresponsible to inquire about the methodology employed by one side resulting in censure without doing the same for other sources. While it might have been appropriate for a journal to do so for a submission it would not be appropriate for AAPOR to take such a one sided stand. I apologize if I missed something and AAPOR did indeed appropriately ascertain the methodology used by those who issued "official" numbers.

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

From: "G. Donald Ferree, Jr." <gferree@SSC.WISC.EDU>

To: <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2009 5:41 PM

Subject: Re: Yet more thoughts on the Burnham censure

> Colleagues,

>

> The "middle ground" may have some merit insofar as it clarifies the

> judgement AAPOR

> is making and insofar as confusion over just what we censuring blocks the

> intended

> effect of improving survey research and insulating our profession from

> damage from

> research which does not meet our standards but is identified in the public

> mind as

> "a survey".

>

> Clearly, only two groups have a special explicit responsibility to adhere

> to the

> AAPOR code as such and to give special weight to inquiries from AAPOR:

> (a) members

> who have voluntarily (albeit as a condition of membership) subscribed to

> the code

> and (b) those who may not be AAPOR members but claim to adhere to the

> code, whether

> as a statement of solidarity or quasi-advertising.

>

> But, as has been noted by others, ALL reputable researchers should adhere

> to the

> code insofar as it embodies professional standards of research, and this

> applies

> both to how surveys are conducted and how they are reported, regardless of

> membership in the organization or whether one has explicitly claimed to

> adhere to

> the code's standards. There seems to be prima facie doubt that Burnham

> meets that

> test in terms of methods, and no doubt whatsoever that he has chosen NOT

> to disclose

> enough to determine the quality of the work. We should not be more upset

> that he

> disregarded a request from AAPOR than if he had refused to answer

> legitimate

> questions from anyone in the public or broader research community. But we

> should

> also not excuse his refusal to divulge simply because he his not an AAPOR

> member.  
>  
> Finally, if we wish to promote a healthy debate about what Burnham  
> actually DID,  
> confusion over what our censure means might make that less likely. I am  
> by no means  
> suggesting that the standards inquiry was anything other than thorough,  
> fair, and in  
> accordance with our own rules. But if there are ways for the future that  
> we can  
> make our points while avoiding confusion more effectively, then we should  
> by all  
> means explore them. If some mistakenly conclude that we are trying to  
> subject an  
> outsider to our unwarranted authority, that can obscure a healthy debate  
> on how one  
> best tackles such questions as the level of civilian casualties in Iraq.  
>  
> In the present case, I think AAPOR was precisely correct in criticizing  
> Burnham for  
> non-disclosure, and regret that his non-responsiveness stands in the way  
> of a  
> dispassionate evaluation of what was actually done.  
>  
> Don  
>> I believe that Jan offers a "middle ground" here that is worth further  
>> discussion,  
> especially as Council considers possible modifications to the Code and the  
> Schedule of Procedures.  
>>  
>> Jan suggests that, when a non-member survey researcher has engaged in  
>> conduct that  
> is inconsistent with the AAPOR Code of Professional Ethics and Practices,  
> AAPOR  
> should not censure for "violation of the Code," but rather should publicly  
> announce that the individual's actions are inconsistent with the standards  
> of  
> ethics and practices of professional survey researchers.  
>>  
>> In my opinion, a formal investigation would still be necessary to  
>> determine if the  
> standards were inconsistent and to provide the non-member with an  
> opportunity for  
> due process. And, in my opinion, such a public statement is akin to  
> saying that  
> the non-member violated our Code of Professional Ethics and Practices.  
> However,  
> perhaps the tone of the message would be more acceptable to some.  
>>  
>> Any thoughts, favorable or unfavorable, are welcome.  
>>  
>> Stephen Blumberg  
>> Associate Standards Chair  
>>

>> -----  
>> 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.

-----  
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, 25 Mar 2009 10:13:48 -0700  
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: Yet more thoughts on the Burnham censure  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[EF37D84EF91A4217B7E9248FAC24FBEB@D1DSTC21](mailto:EF37D84EF91A4217B7E9248FAC24FBEB@D1DSTC21)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Look, I don't know any of the details of the studies, but you can be sure none of the methodologies used will be perfect or even close to perfect given the conditions on the ground. Everyone understands that the various studies produce ESTIMATES, and these estimates have varying confidences in them and are subject to varying sensitivities.

That is not really the issue. Burnham produced estimates that were wildly at variance with all previous estimates. As with any scientific discourse where this happens, one seeks to understand the divergent numbers first. So scientists (even before AAPOR) asked Burnham "So what methods did you use to get these numbers?" and Burnham replied "I won't tell you?". AAPOR censured his nondisclosure, NOT HIS METHODS.

As you have seen in some of these posts, others are doing their best to debate his (apparent) methods and others' methods, but how can you discuss Burnham's methods if he won't fully disclose his methodology? If there is unfairness, it was only caused by Burnham.

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 fred goldner

Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2009 9:51 AM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: Re: Yet more thoughts on the Burnham censure

Having been away I just read through all the Burnham comments and while I am

especially impressed by the thoughtfulness of Jan Werner's comments I find

that --unless I missed it-- one crucial ethical issue has yet to be raised.

The Burnham survey come out when the high or low estimates of civilian casualties were part of a political debate about the conduct and justification of the Iraq war. Did our our standards committee investigate

the methodology employed by all those who issued casualty figures or did they only inquire about Burnham's methodology because someone had questioned his? Whether they employed so-called formal surveys all estimates

or official counts were based on the reporting of individuals --army commanders, hospital employees etc.. It would be irresponsible to inquire

about the methodology employed by one side resulting in censure without doing the same for other sources. While it might have been appropriate for a

journal to do so for a submission it would not be appropriate for AAPOR to

take such a one sided stand. I apologize if I missed something and AAPOR did

indeed appropriately ascertain the methodology used by those who issued "official" numbers.

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

From: "G. Donald Ferree, Jr." <gferree@SSC.WISC.EDU>

To: <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2009 5:41 PM

Subject: Re: Yet more thoughts on the Burnham censure

> Colleagues,

>

> The "middle ground" may have some merit insofar as it clarifies the

> judgement AAPOR

> is making and insofar as confusion over just what we censuring blocks the

> intended

> effect of improving survey research and insulating our profession from

> damage from

> research which does not meet our standards but is identified in the

public

> mind as

> "a survey".

>

> Clearly, only two groups have a special explicit responsibility to  
adhere  
> to the  
> AAPOR code as such and to give special weight to inquiries from AAPOR:  
> (a) members  
> who have voluntarily (albeit as a condition of membership) subscribed  
to  
> the code  
> and (b) those who may not be AAPOR members but claim to adhere to the  
> code, whether  
> as a statement of solidarity or quasi-advertising.  
>  
> But, as has been noted by others, ALL reputable researchers should  
adhere  
> to the  
> code insofar as it embodies professional standards of research, and  
this  
> applies  
> both to how surveys are conducted and how they are reported,  
regardless of  
> membership in the organization or whether one has explicitly claimed  
to  
> adhere to  
> the code's standards. There seems to be prima facie doubt that  
Burnham  
> meets that  
> test in terms of methods, and no doubt whatsoever that he has chosen  
NOT  
> to disclose  
> enough to determine the quality of the work. We should not be more  
upset  
> that he  
> disregarded a request from AAPOR than if he had refused to answer  
> legitimate  
> questions from anyone in the public or broader research community.  
But we  
> should  
> also not excuse his refusal to divulge simply because he his not an  
AAPOR  
> member.  
>  
> Finally, if we wish to promote a healthy debate about what Burnham  
> actually DID,  
> confusion over what our censure means might make that less likely. I  
am  
> by no means  
> suggesting that the standards inquiry was anything other than  
thorough,  
> fair, and in  
> accordance with our own rules. But if there are ways for the future  
that  
> we can  
> make our points while avoiding confusion more effectively, then we  
should

> by all  
> means explore them. If some mistakenly conclude that we are trying  
to  
> subject an  
> outsider to our unwarranted authority, that can obscure a healthy  
debate  
> on how one  
> best tackles such questions as the level of civilian casualties in  
Iraq.  
>  
> In the present case, I think AAPOR was precisely correct in  
criticizing  
> Burnham for  
> non-disclosure, and regret that his non-responsiveness stands in the  
way  
> of a  
> dispassionate evaluation of what was actually done.  
>  
> Don  
>> I believe that Jan offers a "middle ground" here that is worth  
further  
>> discussion,  
> especially as Council considers possible modifications to the Code and  
the  
> Schedule of Procedures.  
>>  
>> Jan suggests that, when a non-member survey researcher has engaged in  
>> conduct that  
> is inconsistent with the AAPOR Code of Professional Ethics and  
Practices,  
> AAPOR  
> should not censure for "violation of the Code," but rather should  
publicly  
> announce that the individual's actions are inconsistent with the  
standards  
> of  
> ethics and practices of professional survey researchers.  
>>  
>> In my opinion, a formal investigation would still be necessary to  
>> determine if the  
> standards were inconsistent and to provide the non-member with an  
> opportunity for  
> due process. And, in my opinion, such a public statement is akin to  
> saying that  
> the non-member violated our Code of Professional Ethics and Practices.  
> However,  
> perhaps the tone of the message would be more acceptable to some.  
>>  
>> Any thoughts, favorable or unfavorable, are welcome.  
>>  
>> Stephen Blumberg  
>> Associate Standards Chair  
>>  
>> -----

>> 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.

-----  
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: Wed, 25 Mar 2009 12:50:01 -0500  
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: Re: Yet more thoughts on the Burnham censure  
Comments: To: fred goldner <[fgoldner@comcast.net](mailto:fgoldner@comcast.net)>  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <[EF37D84EF91A4217B7E9248FAC24FBEB@D1DSTC21](mailto:EF37D84EF91A4217B7E9248FAC24FBEB@D1DSTC21)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Thanks to Lance Pollack for his post.

Fred Goldner's reading of AAPOR's responsibility is fundamentally mistaken.

The censure of Gilbert Burnham was a public announcement that he did not disclose basic information about his research. The censure did not address the findings of the research. The censure did not take a side in the dispute between Spagat and Burnham. The inference, apparently drawn by several contributors to this discussion, that AAPOR was "used" by Spagat or that it endorsed Spagat's position is erroneous.

In standards cases, the Association responds to complaints about violations of the Code. The Association is not the Spanish Inquisition. It does not seek out parties to punish for their views. It *does* respond to complaints about violations of the Code. Those charged with handling complaints are not dupes or people "with an agenda."

Complaints can come from any source. They may, indeed, come from people who have "an axe to grind." That they may do so does not mean that the



Association's finding of a Code violation implies that the Association endorses the viewpoints of the complainant. The issue is whether the Code was violated or not. The Code does not mandate disclosure of information just to "people who agree with me" or even to "people of good will." It mandates disclosure regardless of the source of the query.

Readers might have noticed from Mary Losch's most recent post that there have been two cases of public censure over the past 12 years. During this period, there have been many more standards complaints. The inference from these facts is that public censure is rare. Many standards complaints are determined to be out-of-scope (concerning something not in the Code) or unfounded. Many others are resolved when the accused party discloses information on response to the Association's inquiry. Censure is usually not the outcome of a standards case. The \*possibility\* of censure may lead to disclosure of methodological information that was not disclosed in response to queries from individuals.

I encourage interested readers to look at David Marker's review of Iraq surveys in the summer 2008 issue of POQ. Marker argues, among other things, that survey estimation of war dead is generally a better approach than 'counting' procedures.

On Wed, Mar 25, 2009 at 11:50 AM, fred goldner <fgoldner@comcast.net> wrote:

> Having been away I just read through all the Burnham comments and while I  
> am  
> especially impressed by the thoughtfulness of Jan Werner's comments I find  
> that --unless I missed it-- one crucial ethical issue has yet to be  
> raised.  
> The Burnham survey come out when the high or low estimates of civilian  
> casualties were part of a political debate about the conduct and  
> justification of the Iraq war. Did our our standards committee investigate  
> the methodology employed by all those who issued casualty figures or did  
> they only inquire about Burnham's methodology because someone had  
> questioned his? Whether they employed so-called formal surveys all  
> estimates  
> or official counts were based on the reporting of individuals --army  
> commanders, hospital employees etc.. It would be irresponsible to inquire  
> about the methodology employed by one side resulting in censure without  
> doing the same for other sources. While it might have been appropriate for  
> a  
> journal to do so for a submission it would not be appropriate for AAPOR to  
> take such a one sided stand. I apologize if I missed something and AAPOR  
> did  
> indeed appropriately ascertain the methodology used by those who issued  
> "offical" numbers.

>

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

> From: "G. Donald Ferree, Jr." <gferree@SSC.WISC.EDU>

> To: <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

> Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2009 5:41 PM

> Subject: Re: Yet more thoughts on the Burnham censure

>  
>  
> Colleagues,  
>>  
>> The "middle ground" may have some merit insofar as it clarifies the  
>> judgement AAPOR  
>> is making and insofar as confusion over just what we censuring blocks the  
>> intended  
>> effect of improving survey research and insulating our profession from  
>> damage from  
>> research which does not meet our standards but is identified in the public  
>> mind as  
>> "a survey".  
>>  
>> Clearly, only two groups have a special explicit responsibility to adhere  
>> to the  
>> AAPOR code as such and to give special weight to inquiries from AAPOR:  
>> (a) members  
>> who have voluntarily (albeit as a condition of membership) subscribed to  
>> the code  
>> and (b) those who may not be AAPOR members but claim to adhere to the  
>> code, whether  
>> as a statement of solidarity or quasi-advertising.  
>>  
>> But, as has been noted by others, ALL reputable researchers should adhere  
>> to the  
>> code insofar as it embodies professional standards of research, and this  
>> applies  
>> both to how surveys are conducted and how they are reported, regardless of  
>> membership in the organization or whether one has explicitly claimed to  
>> adhere to  
>> the code's standards. There seems to be prima facie doubt that Burnham  
>> meets that  
>> test in terms of methods, and no doubt whatsoever that he has chosen NOT  
>> to disclose  
>> enough to determine the quality of the work. We should not be more upset  
>> that he  
>> disregarded a request from AAPOR than if he had refused to answer  
>> legitimate  
>> questions from anyone in the public or broader research community. But we  
>> should  
>> also not excuse his refusal to divulge simply because he is not an AAPOR  
>> member.  
>>  
>> Finally, if we wish to promote a healthy debate about what Burnham  
>> actually DID,  
>> confusion over what our censure means might make that less likely. I am  
>> by no means  
>> suggesting that the standards inquiry was anything other than thorough,  
>> fair, and in  
>> accordance with our own rules. But if there are ways for the future that  
>> we can  
>> make our points while avoiding confusion more effectively, then we should  
>> by all

>> means explore them. If some mistakenly conclude that we are trying to  
>> subject an  
>> outsider to our unwarranted authority, that can obscure a healthy debate  
>> on how one  
>> best tackles such questions as the level of civilian casualties in Iraq.  
>>  
>> In the present case, I think AAPOR was precisely correct in criticizing  
>> Burnham for  
>> non-disclosure, and regret that his non-responsiveness stands in the way  
>> of a  
>> dispassionate evaluation of what was actually done.  
>>  
>> Don  
>>  
>>> I believe that Jan offers a "middle ground" here that is worth further  
>>> discussion,  
>>>  
>> especially as Council considers possible modifications to the Code and the  
>> Schedule of Procedures.  
>>  
>>>  
>>> Jan suggests that, when a non-member survey researcher has engaged in  
>>> conduct that  
>>>  
>> is inconsistent with the AAPOR Code of Professional Ethics and Practices,  
>> AAPOR  
>> should not censure for "violation of the Code," but rather should publicly  
>> announce that the individual's actions are inconsistent with the standards  
>> of  
>> ethics and practices of professional survey researchers.  
>>  
>>>  
>>> In my opinion, a formal investigation would still be necessary to  
>>> determine if the  
>>>  
>> standards were inconsistent and to provide the non-member with an  
>> opportunity for  
>> due process. And, in my opinion, such a public statement is akin to  
>> saying that  
>> the non-member violated our Code of Professional Ethics and Practices.  
>> However,  
>> perhaps the tone of the message would be more acceptable to some.  
>>  
>>>  
>>> Any thoughts, favorable or unfavorable, are welcome.  
>>>  
>>> Stephen Blumberg  
>>> Associate Standards Chair  
>>>  
>>> -----  
>>> 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.

>>

>

> -----

> 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)

>

--  
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> .  
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, 25 Mar 2009 14:24:29 -0400  
Reply-To: Paul Gurwitz <[pgurwitz@RENAISS.COM](mailto:pgurwitz@RENAISS.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Paul Gurwitz <[pgurwitz@RENAISS.COM](mailto:pgurwitz@RENAISS.COM)>  
Subject: Re: MRA Helps Kill Legislation in Maryland,  
Mississippi and Rhode Island - Would Have Crippled Research with  
Health Care Practitioners  
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

While I certainly understand the importance of the law's not confusing survey research incentives to physician respondents with pharmaceutical company sales incentives to physicians, it seems to me that the market research industry has to walk a fine line here.

There is no question in my mind that pharmaceutical company "incentives" to physicians for prescribing given products is a real problem in this country from both an ethical and an economic point of view. As such, there is an evident public interest in states' reining in at least the more abusive practices.

At the same time, we market researchers risk getting caught in the net,

even though the incentives concerned are of a totally different nature, since the physicians are being rewarded for participating in a survey rather than for prescribing a company's product. As such, we undoubtedly have a legitimate interest in making sure that legislation targeting marketing incentives does not unfairly penalize our work.

I think a problem may arise, though, when MRA or another representative of the market research industry lobbies to "kill" such legislation, instead of working to have survey research incentives exempted from it. This approach may create the appearance that the market research industry is supporting the current practices of the pharmaceutical business. I'm afraid that this could harm the credibility of our industry, as well as associating it in the public mind with practices that many people (and possibly many within our industry) disapprove of.

I'm not saying that our business shouldn't defend itself aggressively against harmful legislation; just that how it is done makes a difference.

Paul M. Gurwitz, Ph.D.  
Managing Director  
Renaissance Research & Consulting

-----  
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, 25 Mar 2009 14:56:03 -0400  
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: MRA Helps Kill Legislation in Maryland,  
Mississippi and Rhode Island - Would Have Crippled Research with  
Health Care Practitioners  
Comments: To: Paul Gurwitz <[pgurwitz@RENAISS.COM](mailto:pgurwitz@RENAISS.COM)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: A<[49CA76DD.2040203@renaiss.com](mailto:A49CA76DD.2040203@renaiss.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Paul, our strategy is always to lobby first for an exemption for research incentives.

I look forward to you joining the Marketing Research Association and helping generate change at the grassroots level as part of our State Capitol Network. We always appreciate feedback and suggestions from members on our government affairs activities.

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>

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Paul Gurwitz  
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2009 2:24 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: MRA Helps Kill Legislation in Maryland, Mississippi and Rhode Island - Would Have Crippled Research with Health Care Practitioners

While I certainly understand the importance of the law's not confusing survey research incentives to physician respondents with pharmaceutical company sales incentives to physicians, it seems to me that the market research industry has to walk a fine line here.

There is no question in my mind that pharmaceutical company "incentives" to physicians for prescribing given products is a real problem in this country from both an ethical and an economic point of view. As such, there is an evident public interest in states' reining in at least the more abusive practices.

At the same time, we market researchers risk getting caught in the net, even though the incentives concerned are of a totally different nature, since the physicians are being rewarded for participating in a survey rather than for prescribing a company's product. As such, we undoubtedly have a legitimate interest in making sure that legislation targeting marketing incentives does not unfairly penalize our work.

I think a problem may arise, though, when MRA or another representative of the market research industry lobbies to "kill" such legislation, instead of working to have survey research incentives exempted from it. This approach may create the appearance that the market research industry is supporting the current practices of the pharmaceutical business. I'm afraid that this could harm the credibility of our industry, as well as associating it in the public mind with practices that many people (and possibly many within our industry) disapprove of.

I'm not saying that our business shouldn't defend itself aggressively against harmful legislation; just that how it is done makes a difference.

Paul M. Gurwitz, Ph.D.  
Managing Director  
Renaissance Research & Consulting

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

aapornet-request@asu.edu

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

Date: Wed, 25 Mar 2009 16:09:29 -0400  
Reply-To: fred goldner <fgoldner@COMCAST.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: fred goldner <fgoldner@COMCAST.NET>  
Subject: Re: Yet more thoughts on the Burnham censure  
Comments: To: Peter Miller <p-miller@NORTHWESTERN.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

Sorry to have to respond but Miller's fundamental mistake is to posit this as a Spagat-Burnham conflict rather than a conflict in the much larger political context. My question remains: did AAPOR give the other (albeit less divergent) sources the same opportunity to be censured for non-disclosure?

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

From: "Peter Miller" <p-miller@NORTHWESTERN.EDU>  
To: <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2009 1:50 PM  
Subject: Re: Yet more thoughts on the Burnham censure

> Thanks to Lance Pollack for his post.  
>  
> Fred Goldner's reading of AAPOR's responsibility is fundamentally  
> mistaken.  
>  
> The censure of Gilbert Burnham was a public announcement that he did not  
> disclose basic information about his research. The censure did not  
> address  
> the findings of the research. The censure did not take a side in the  
> dispute between Spagat and Burnham. The inference, apparently drawn by  
> several contributors to this discussion, that AAPOR was "used" by Spagat  
> or  
> that it endorsed Spagat's position is erroneous.  
>  
> In standards cases, the Association responds to complaints about  
> violations  
> of the Code. The Association is not the Spanish Inquisition. It does not  
> seek out parties to punish for their views. It *does* respond to  
> complaints  
> about violations of the Code. Those charged with handling complaints are  
> not dupes or people "with an agenda."  
>  
> Complaints can come from any source. They may, indeed, come from people  
> who

> have "an axe to grind." That they may do so does not mean that the  
> Association's finding of a Code violation implies that the Association  
> endorses the viewpoints of the complainant. The issue is whether the Code  
> was violated or not. The Code does not mandate disclosure of information  
> just to "people who agree with me" or even to "people of good will." It  
> mandates disclosure regardless of the source of the query.

>  
> Readers might have noticed from Mary Losch's most recent post that there  
> have been two cases of public censure over the past 12 years. During this  
> period, there have been many more standards complaints. The inference  
> from  
> these facts is that public censure is rare. Many standards complaints are  
> determined to be out-of-scope (concerning something not in the Code) or  
> unfounded. Many others are resolved when the accused party discloses  
> information on response to the Association's inquiry. Censure is usually  
> not the outcome of a standards case. The \*possibility\* of censure may  
> lead  
> to disclosure of methodological information that was not disclosed in  
> response to queries from individuals.

>  
> I encourage interested readers to look at David Marker's review of Iraq  
> surveys in the summer 2008 issue of POQ. Marker argues, among other  
> things,  
> that survey estimation of war dead is generally a better approach than  
> 'counting' procedures.

>  
>  
>  
> On Wed, Mar 25, 2009 at 11:50 AM, fred goldner <fgoldner@comcast.net>  
> wrote:

>  
>> Having been away I just read through all the Burnham comments and while I  
>> am  
>> especially impressed by the thoughtfulness of Jan Werner's comments I  
>> find  
>> that --unless I missed it-- one crucial ethical issue has yet to be  
>> raised.  
>> The Burnham survey come out when the high or low estimates of civilian  
>> casualties were part of a political debate about the conduct and  
>> justification of the Iraq war. Did our our standards committee  
>> investigate  
>> the methodology employed by all those who issued casualty figures or did  
>> they only inquire about Burnham's methodology because someone had  
>> questioned his? Whether they employed so-called formal surveys all  
>> estimates  
>> or official counts were based on the reporting of individuals --army  
>> commanders, hospital employees etc.. It would be irresponsible to inquire  
>> about the methodology employed by one side resulting in censure without  
>> doing the same for other sources. While it might have been appropriate  
>> for  
>> a  
>> journal to do so for a submission it would not be appropriate for AAPOR  
>> to  
>> take such a one sided stand. I apologize if I missed something and AAPOR



>> did  
>> indeed appropriately ascertain the methodology used by those who issued  
>> "official" numbers.

>>  
>> ----- Original Message -----  
>> From: "G. Donald Ferree, Jr." <gferree@SSC.WISC.EDU>  
>> To: <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
>> Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2009 5:41 PM  
>> Subject: Re: Yet more thoughts on the Burnham censure

>>  
>>  
>> Colleagues,

>>>  
>>> The "middle ground" may have some merit insofar as it clarifies the  
>>> judgement AAPOR  
>>> is making and insofar as confusion over just what we censuring blocks  
>>> the  
>>> intended  
>>> effect of improving survey research and insulating our profession from  
>>> damage from  
>>> research which does not meet our standards but is identified in the  
>>> public  
>>> mind as  
>>> "a survey".

>>>  
>>> Clearly, only two groups have a special explicit responsibility to  
>>> adhere  
>>> to the  
>>> AAPOR code as such and to give special weight to inquiries from AAPOR:  
>>> (a) members  
>>> who have voluntarily (albeit as a condition of membership) subscribed to  
>>> the code  
>>> and (b) those who may not be AAPOR members but claim to adhere to the  
>>> code, whether  
>>> as a statement of solidarity or quasi-advertising.

>>>  
>>> But, as has been noted by others, ALL reputable researchers should  
>>> adhere  
>>> to the  
>>> code insofar as it embodies professional standards of research, and this  
>>> applies  
>>> both to how surveys are conducted and how they are reported, regardless  
>>> of  
>>> membership in the organization or whether one has explicitly claimed to  
>>> adhere to  
>>> the code's standards. There seems to be prima facie doubt that Burnham  
>>> meets that  
>>> test in terms of methods, and no doubt whatsoever that he has chosen NOT  
>>> to disclose  
>>> enough to determine the quality of the work. We should not be more  
>>> upset  
>>> that he  
>>> disregarded a request from AAPOR than if he had refused to answer  
>>> legitimate

>>> questions from anyone in the public or broader research community. But  
>>> we  
>>> should  
>>> also not excuse his refusal to divulge simply because he his not an  
>>> AAPOR  
>>> member.  
>>>  
>>> Finally, if we wish to promote a healthy debate about what Burnham  
>>> actually DID,  
>>> confusion over what our censure means might make that less likely. I am  
>>> by no means  
>>> suggesting that the standards inquiry was anything other than thorough,  
>>> fair, and in  
>>> accordance with our own rules. But if there are ways for the future  
>>> that  
>>> we can  
>>> make our points while avoiding confusion more effectively, then we  
>>> should  
>>> by all  
>>> means explore them. If some mistakenly conclude that we are trying  
>>> to  
>>> subject an  
>>> outsider to our unwarranted authority, that can obscure a healthy debate  
>>> on how one  
>>> best tackles such questions as the level of civilian casualties in Iraq.  
>>>  
>>> In the present case, I think AAPOR was precisely correct in criticizing  
>>> Burnham for  
>>> non-disclosure, and regret that his non-responsiveness stands in the way  
>>> of a  
>>> dispassionate evaluation of what was actually done.  
>>>  
>>> Don  
>>>  
>>>> I believe that Jan offers a "middle ground" here that is worth further  
>>>> discussion,  
>>>>  
>>> especially as Council considers possible modifications to the Code and  
>>> the  
>>> Schedule of Procedures.  
>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> Jan suggests that, when a non-member survey researcher has engaged in  
>>>> conduct that  
>>>>  
>>> is inconsistent with the AAPOR Code of Professional Ethics and Practices,  
>>> AAPOR  
>>> should not censure for "violation of the Code," but rather should  
>>> publicly  
>>> announce that the individual's actions are inconsistent with the  
>>> standards  
>>> of  
>>> ethics and practices of professional survey researchers.  
>>>

>>>>  
>>>> In my opinion, a formal investigation would still be necessary to  
>>>> determine if the  
>>>>  
>>> standards were inconsistent and to provide the non-member with an  
>>> opportunity for  
>>> due process. And, in my opinion, such a public statement is akin to  
>>> saying that  
>>> the non-member violated our Code of Professional Ethics and Practices.  
>>> However,  
>>> perhaps the tone of the message would be more acceptable to some.  
>>>

>>>> Any thoughts, favorable or unfavorable, are welcome.  
>>>>

>>>> Stephen Blumberg  
>>>> Associate Standards Chair  
>>>>

>>>> -----  
>>>> 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.  
>>>>

>>>> -----  
>>>> 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)  
>>>>

>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> --  
>>>> 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> .  
>>>> 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: Wed, 25 Mar 2009 17:07:43 -0400  
Reply-To: "Langley, Ronald" <[langley@EMAIL.UKY.EDU](mailto:langley@EMAIL.UKY.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Langley, Ronald" <[langley@EMAIL.UKY.EDU](mailto:langley@EMAIL.UKY.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Yet more thoughts on the Burnham censure  
Comments: To: fred goldner <[fgoldner@COMCAST.NET](mailto:fgoldner@COMCAST.NET)>, "AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
In-Reply-To: <[BC56EFB5E22347E8B8F00E2F9C0D7C14@D1DSTC21](mailto:BC56EFB5E22347E8B8F00E2F9C0D7C14@D1DSTC21)>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Regardless of the scope of the conflict, a careful reading of the Schedule of Procedures for Investigating Code Violations makes it very clear that it is beyond the scope of the Standards Committee to initiate investigations, censure individuals, or otherwise act as the survey police unless a formal complaint is brought to the committee. As Miller points out, AAPOR did not take a side in the dispute about the appropriateness of Burnham's methods, only on the complaint brought before the committee about failure to disclose. Complaints about other sources or methodologies were not brought before the committee and some reported findings were not based on survey methods and as such are well beyond the scope of AAPOR in any event.

That being said, there may be some merit to modifying the procedures to have different responses for complaints against members vs. nonmembers. This is why the Standards Committee is currently engaged in a discussion about possible recommendations to the Council on changes to the procedures. If you read the current Code and Schedule of Procedures, it is clear that the Standards Chair and the rest of the AAPOR Council did exactly what they were expected to do.

Ron Langley

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>] On Behalf Of fred goldner  
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2009 4:09 PM  
To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Subject: Re: Yet more thoughts on the Burnham censure

Sorry to have to respond but Miller's fundamental mistake is to posit this as a Spagat-Burnham conflict rather than a conflict in the much larger political context. My question remains: did AAPOR give the other (albeit less divergent) sources the same opportunity to be censured for non-disclosure?

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

From: "Peter Miller" <[p-miller@NORTHWESTERN.EDU](mailto:p-miller@NORTHWESTERN.EDU)>  
To: <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2009 1:50 PM  
Subject: Re: Yet more thoughts on the Burnham censure

> Thanks to Lance Pollack for his post.  
>  
> Fred Goldner's reading of AAPOR's responsibility is fundamentally  
> mistaken.  
>  
> The censure of Gilbert Burnham was a public announcement that he did not  
> disclose basic information about his research. The censure did not  
> address  
> the findings of the research. The censure did not take a side in the  
> dispute between Spagat and Burnham. The inference, apparently drawn by  
> several contributors to this discussion, that AAPOR was "used" by Spagat  
> or  
> that it endorsed Spagat's position is erroneous.  
>  
> In standards cases, the Association responds to complaints about  
> violations  
> of the Code. The Association is not the Spanish Inquisition. It does not  
> seek out parties to punish for their views. It *does* respond to  
> complaints  
> about violations of the Code. Those charged with handling complaints are  
> not dupes or people "with an agenda."  
>  
> Complaints can come from any source. They may, indeed, come from people  
> who  
> have "an axe to grind." That they may do so does not mean that the  
> Association's finding of a Code violation implies that the Association  
> endorses the viewpoints of the complainant. The issue is whether the Code  
> was violated or not. The Code does not mandate disclosure of information  
> just to "people who agree with me" or even to "people of good will." It  
> mandates disclosure regardless of the source of the query.  
>  
> Readers might have noticed from Mary Losch's most recent post that there  
> have been two cases of public censure over the past 12 years. During this  
> period, there have been many more standards complaints. The inference  
> from  
> these facts is that public censure is rare. Many standards complaints are  
> determined to be out-of-scope (concerning something not in the Code) or  
> unfounded. Many others are resolved when the accused party discloses  
> information on response to the Association's inquiry. Censure is usually  
> not the outcome of a standards case. The *possibility* of censure may  
> lead  
> to disclosure of methodological information that was not disclosed in  
> response to queries from individuals.  
>  
> I encourage interested readers to look at David Marker's review of Iraq  
> surveys in the summer 2008 issue of POQ. Marker argues, among other  
> things,  
> that survey estimation of war dead is generally a better approach than  
> 'counting' procedures.  
>  
>  
>

> On Wed, Mar 25, 2009 at 11:50 AM, fred goldner <fgoldner@comcast.net>  
> wrote:  
>  
>> Having been away I just read through all the Burnham comments and while I  
>> am  
>> especially impressed by the thoughtfulness of Jan Werner's comments I  
>> find  
>> that --unless I missed it-- one crucial ethical issue has yet to be  
>> raised.  
>> The Burnham survey come out when the high or low estimates of civilian  
>> casualties were part of a political debate about the conduct and  
>> justification of the Iraq war. Did our our standards committee  
>> investigate  
>> the methodology employed by all those who issued casualty figures or did  
>> they only inquire about Burnham's methodology because someone had  
>> questioned his? Whether they employed so-called formal surveys all  
>> estimates  
>> or official counts were based on the reporting of individuals --army  
>> commanders, hospital employees etc.. It would be irresponsible to inquire  
>> about the methodology employed by one side resulting in censure without  
>> doing the same for other sources. While it might have been appropriate  
>> for  
>> a  
>> journal to do so for a submission it would not be appropriate for AAPOR  
>> to  
>> take such a one sided stand. I apologize if I missed something and AAPOR  
>> did  
>> indeed appropriately ascertain the methodology used by those who issued  
>> "offical" numbers.  
>>

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

>> From: "G. Donald Ferree, Jr." <gferree@SSC.WISC.EDU>

>> To: <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

>> Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2009 5:41 PM

>> Subject: Re: Yet more thoughts on the Burnham censure

>>

>>

>> Colleagues,

>>>

>>> The "middle ground" may have some merit insofar as it clarifies the

>>> judgement AAPOR

>>> is making and insofar as confusion over just what we censuring blocks

>>> the

>>> intended

>>> effect of improving survey research and insulating our profession from

>>> damage from

>>> research which does not meet our standards but is identified in the

>>> public

>>> mind as

>>> "a survey".

>>>

>>> Clearly, only two groups have a special explicit responsibility to

>>> adhere

>>> to the

>>> AAPOR code as such and to give special weight to inquiries from AAPOR:  
>>> (a) members  
>>> who have voluntarily (albeit as a condition of membership) subscribed to  
>>> the code  
>>> and (b) those who may not be AAPOR members but claim to adhere to the  
>>> code, whether  
>>> as a statement of solidarity or quasi-advertising.  
>>>  
>>> But, as has been noted by others, ALL reputable researchers should  
>>> adhere  
>>> to the  
>>> code insofar as it embodies professional standards of research, and this  
>>> applies  
>>> both to how surveys are conducted and how they are reported, regardless  
>>> of  
>>> membership in the organization or whether one has explicitly claimed to  
>>> adhere to  
>>> the code's standards. There seems to be prima facie doubt that Burnham  
>>> meets that  
>>> test in terms of methods, and no doubt whatsoever that he has chosen NOT  
>>> to disclose  
>>> enough to determine the quality of the work. We should not be more  
>>> upset  
>>> that he  
>>> disregarded a request from AAPOR than if he had refused to answer  
>>> legitimate  
>>> questions from anyone in the public or broader research community. But  
>>> we  
>>> should  
>>> also not excuse his refusal to divulge simply because he his not an  
>>> AAPOR  
>>> member.  
>>>  
>>> Finally, if we wish to promote a healthy debate about what Burnham  
>>> actually DID,  
>>> confusion over what our censure means might make that less likely. I am  
>>> by no means  
>>> suggesting that the standards inquiry was anything other than thorough,  
>>> fair, and in  
>>> accordance with our own rules. But if there are ways for the future  
>>> that  
>>> we can  
>>> make our points while avoiding confusion more effectively, then we  
>>> should  
>>> by all  
>>> means explore them. If some mistakenly conclude that we are trying  
>>> to  
>>> subject an  
>>> outsider to our unwarranted authority, that can obscure a healthy debate  
>>> on how one  
>>> best tackles such questions as the level of civilian casualties in Iraq.  
>>>  
>>> In the present case, I think AAPOR was precisely correct in criticizing  
>>> Burnham for

>>> non-disclosure, and regret that his non-responsiveness stands in the way  
>>> of a  
>>> dispassionate evaluation of what was actually done.  
>>>  
>>> Don  
>>>  
>>>> I believe that Jan offers a "middle ground" here that is worth further  
>>>> discussion,  
>>>>  
>>> especially as Council considers possible modifications to the Code and  
>>> the  
>>> Schedule of Procedures.  
>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> Jan suggests that, when a non-member survey researcher has engaged in  
>>>> conduct that  
>>>>  
>>> is inconsistent with the AAPOR Code of Professional Ethics and Practices,  
>>> AAPOR  
>>> should not censure for "violation of the Code," but rather should  
>>> publicly  
>>> announce that the individual's actions are inconsistent with the  
>>> standards  
>>> of  
>>> ethics and practices of professional survey researchers.  
>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> In my opinion, a formal investigation would still be necessary to  
>>>> determine if the  
>>>>  
>>> standards were inconsistent and to provide the non-member with an  
>>> opportunity for  
>>> due process. And, in my opinion, such a public statement is akin to  
>>> saying that  
>>> the non-member violated our Code of Professional Ethics and Practices.  
>>> However,  
>>> perhaps the tone of the message would be more acceptable to some.  
>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> Any thoughts, favorable or unfavorable, are welcome.  
>>>>  
>>>> Stephen Blumberg  
>>>> Associate Standards Chair  
>>>>  
>>>> -----  
>>>> 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.

>>>

>>

>> -----

>> 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

>>

>

>

>

> --

> Peter V. Miller  
> Department of Communication Studies  
> Northwestern University  
> Vice-President, American Association for Public Opinion Research  
> p-miller@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

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

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

=====  
Date: Thu, 26 Mar 2009 15:57:57 +0100  
Reply-To: Edith de Leeuw <edithl@XS4ALL.NL>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Edith de Leeuw <edithl@XS4ALL.NL>  
Subject: panels, sleepers & dropout  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU, WAPOR@UNL.EDU, SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Dear colleagues and friends.

First of all apologies for cross-posting, but I wanted to reach as many survey experts as possible :-)

Hopefully you can help out with suggestions. It concerns the following.

We are analyzing response data for a panel, wondering if our short survey attitude questionnaire predicts nonresponse later on in time. Our first

analyses worked fine. We did a simpel prediction of proportion completed questionnaires in a certain time period. Worked fine.

A colleague suggested to go a step further and also try to predict 'sleepers' and 'drop-out'. But we could not find a clear set of definitions.

What is a sleeper?: XX times not responded, but what is XX?

What is a drop-out (when panel member requests to leave panel, when panel administrator removes panel member, the sum of both?)

I found one clear definition in the draft ISO 26362 for access panels.

Where they use the term active panel member. Active panel member : A panel member who has participated in at least one survey if requested, or has updated his/her profile data, or has registered to join the panel, within the last 12 months.

I would really appreciate your comments and suggestions, and of course I will keep you all up-to-date with a summary of teh answers and with our analysis results when they are there :-)

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

-----  
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, 26 Mar 2009 12:10:20 -0700

Reply-To: [jd9622flh@yahoo.com](mailto:jd9622flh@yahoo.com)

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

From: Josh De La Rosa <[jd9622flh@YAHOO.COM](mailto:jd9622flh@YAHOO.COM)>

Subject: Census Communications Campaign

Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

On Monday the Government Accountability Office released its latest testimony regarding the 2010 Census.

"Communications Campaign Has Potential to Boost Participation

In general, the design of the Bureau's communications campaign appears to be comprehensive, integrated, shaped by the Bureau's experience in the 2000 Census, and targeted to hard-to-count populations. The programs GAO reviewed are in the planning or early implementation phases, and future success will depend on how well the Bureau moves from the design to operational phases."

<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09525t.pdf?source=ra>

In addition, NPR noticed the story yesterday. However, NPR had a slightly different analysis.

"Recession Adds To Hurdles Facing U.S. Census

A year from now, the U.S. will conduct its decennial population count. The findings are used to re-apportion congressional districts, disburse federal funding even decide where new traffic lights go. But the economic crisis threatens to make this daunting task even harder. There is special concern about minority groups, which are traditionally hard to count."

<http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=102322605>

Best,

Josh De La Rosa

-----  
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 Mar 2009 07:00:26 -0400

Reply-To: Survey Practice <[survprac@INDIANA.EDU](mailto:survprac@INDIANA.EDU)>

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

From: Survey Practice <[survprac@INDIANA.EDU](mailto:survprac@INDIANA.EDU)>

Subject: Survey Practice March 2009

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

This month, Survey Practice introduces a new feature - a list of books recently published in public opinion and survey methods. Mario Callegaro has agreed to create an updated list about twice each year. If you have any books that you would like included, send them to the Survey Practice email address.

One challenge faced by many survey designers is estimating the time required to administer questionnaires. Sandra Berry provides an easy-to-use method of estimating questionnaire length for telephone surveys. If you have other methods, please share them and we'll publish them in a subsequent issue.

Many survey methodologists have warned us about focusing too much on response rates and not necessarily assume that higher rates leads to better quality data. Dan Merkle and Murray Edelman provide evidence that an experiment that generated a higher response rate produced some bias that reduced the quality of the data.

The article on telephone survey hang-ups during the survey introduction (HUDIs) by Barbara O'Hare and Diane Buck presents some data that can be used to compare your experiences with HUDIs. We see this type of short article as helping all of us to get a sense of our common experiences with survey challenges. Again, we welcome you to send your experiences and we will summarize in a later issue of Survey Practice.

Please consider submitting an article for the special issue on the uses of non-probability sampling.

The articles are at <http://www.surveypractice.org>

John Kennedy  
Diane O'Rourke  
David Moore  
Andy Peytchev

[survprac@indiana.edu](mailto:survprac@indiana.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: Fri, 27 Mar 2009 06:49:00 -0700  
Reply-To: Emilia Petrova <[emilia\\_petrova@YAHOO.COM](mailto:emilia_petrova@YAHOO.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Emilia Petrova <[emilia\\_petrova@YAHOO.COM](mailto:emilia_petrova@YAHOO.COM)>  
Subject: Use of government logos  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Is anyone familiar with papers or presentations on the

Dear Colleagues, Is anyone familiar with papers or presentations on the impact of using Federal government logos on envelopes, prenotification letters, or other survey materials? Please respond offline to [epytcheva@rti.org](mailto:epytcheva@rti.org). Thank you, Emilia Peytcheva  
Research Survey Methodologist  
ARTI International  
3040 Cornwallis Road  
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709  
Tel. 919-541-7217  
[epytcheva@rti.org](mailto:epytcheva@rti.org)

-----  
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, 28 Mar 2009 20:55:50 -0700  
Reply-To: "P. Moy" <[pmoy@U.WASHINGTON.EDU](mailto:pmoy@U.WASHINGTON.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "P. Moy" <[pmoy@U.WASHINGTON.EDU](mailto:pmoy@U.WASHINGTON.EDU)>  
Subject: Final Call for WAPOR Proposals - 1 April deadline  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII; format=flowed

Dear AAPORnet,

WAPOR's annual conference this year will convene in Lausanne, Switzerland 11-13 September. For those of you interested in presenting your research there, the call for (abstract) submissions is below.

Many thanks, Patricia

-----  
Patricia Moy

Christy Cressey Professor of Communication  
Adjunct Faculty, Political Science

University of Washington  
Box 353740  
Seattle, WA 98195

(v) 1 206 543 9676  
(f) 1 206 616 3762  
(e) [pmoy@u.washington.edu](mailto:pmoy@u.washington.edu)

Associate Editor, Public Opinion Quarterly  
<http://poq.oxfordjournals.org>

----- Forwarded message -----

WAPOR Call for Papers  
"Public Opinion and Survey Research in a Changing World"  
Friday, September 11th to Sunday, September 13th, 2009  
Lausanne, Switzerland  
Swiss Foundation for Research in Social Sciences & the University of Lausanne

The World Association for Public Opinion Research (WAPOR) will hold its 62nd annual conference September 11-13, 2009 in Lausanne, Switzerland, 20 minutes outside of Geneva. The theme of this conference emphasizes the

dual nature of the study of public opinion -- namely, how social, political, economic, and technological changes can influence not only public opinion about various issues, but also how survey research is conducted. Conference sessions will focus on changing public opinion as well as challenges to survey research.

We welcome proposals that deal with any issue(s) related to public opinion and survey research, including:

- Mixed-mode studies
- Survey quality
- Non-response
- Questionnaire design
- Sampling
- Public opinion and civil society
- Public opinion and democracy
- Peace-building and conflict resolution
- The gender gap
- Political behavior
- Social equality
- Media and public opinion

WAPOR seeks to bring together scholars with a historical, sociological, economic, and political or communication science background who would like to present and discuss original research papers. Of course, the role of methodology in survey research is of key significance as well. We welcome academics and practitioners who emphasize the more practical aspects of the field.

The ESOMAR annual meeting will be held in nearby Montreux a few days after the WAPOR conference, and we encourage ESOMAR members to consider submitting a proposal.

Proposals should include a general description of the research paper (research topic, specific research questions or hypotheses, methods and results, as applicable) as well as full contact information (mailing address, e-mail address and telephone number) for each (co-)author or participant on a separate page. The proposals, which typically run 500-750 words, should be submitted to [wapor@fors.unil.ch](mailto:wapor@fors.unil.ch) no later than 1 April 2009.

#### Deadlines:

- Abstract submission: 1 April 2009
- Notification of conference decision: 1 May 2009
- Paper submission: 1 August 2009
- Final registration: 1 September 2009

#### Hotel and Registration Details:

Information will follow, please see [www.unl.edu/wapor](http://www.unl.edu/wapor) for more details!

#### Contact:

Dominique Joye (Chair)      Kathrin Kissau  
University of Lausanne      FORS  
Faculte des sciences sociales et politiques University of Lausanne

Batiment VIDY                      Batiment VIDY  
1015 Lausanne Switzerland      1015 Lausanne Switzerland  
Tel: +41 21 692 38 88              Tel: +41 21 692 37 49  
Fax: +41 21 692 37 35              Fax: +41 21 692 37 35  
dominique.joye@unil.ch              kathrin.kissau@fors.unil.ch

Renaë Reis  
Executive Coordinator  
WAPOR  
201 North 13th Street  
Lincoln, NE68588-0242  
USA  
P: 402-472-7720  
F: 402-472-7727  
<http://www.wapor.org>

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

=====  
Date:            Mon, 30 Mar 2009 08:56:20 -0700  
Reply-To:       Monica Evans Lombe <[mevanslombe@GOAMP.COM](mailto:mevanslombe@GOAMP.COM)>  
Sender:         AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From:          Monica Evans Lombe <[mevanslombe@GOAMP.COM](mailto:mevanslombe@GOAMP.COM)>  
Subject:        Report of the AAPOR Ad Hoc Committee on the 2008 Presidential  
                 Primary Polling  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Dear AAPORites:

The report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the 2008 Presidential Primary  
Polling is now available on our web site ([www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org)). A press release  
(text included and shown below) will be circulated later this morning.

The report is a fascinating read not just for those interested in  
presidential election polling -- but for all our members. Beyond  
providing insights with respect to the 2008 presidential primary polling,  
the report brings together (for the first time) information illustrating  
the variety of methodologies currently being used for political polling.

The Executive Council wishes to recognize and commend the efforts of the  
members of the ad hoc committee, most notably the work of the chair of the

committee, Michael Traugott.

We would also like to recognize and commend the polling organizations who promptly supplied micro-level data (well beyond what is required by the

AAPOR Code) so that the committee could pursue its work: CBS News,

Field Research Corporation, Gallup, Opinion Dynamics, Public Policy Institute, SurveyUSA, and the University of New Hampshire.

The findings of the committee will be the topic of a special panel session at the annual conference. The session is scheduled for Sunday, May 17th.

Details concerning the conference can be found at <http://www.aapor.org/2009aaporconference>.

In addition, the report's findings will be the subject of an AAPOR-organized special invited session at the Joint Statistical Meetings Factors Affecting the Accuracy of the 2008 Presidential Election Polling will be held on August 3, 2009 at 10:30 a.m. at the JSM in Washington, D.C.

I look forward to seeing you at the Annual Meetings in May.

Dick Kulka  
President

Text of press release:

### Investigating the 2008 Presidential Primary Polls

LENEXA, Kansas ----- After an extensive investigation, a committee of the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) has identified several factors that contributed to inaccuracies in 2008 Presidential Primary polls, most notably the miscalling of the New Hampshire Democratic primary.

This analysis suggests some important explanations for the errors in the 2008 New Hampshire Presidential Primary and raises significant questions

for research on pre-election polling methods, said AAPOR President



Richard Kulka.

The special AAPOR committee composed of leading academic and private sector experts in public opinion and survey research conducted the analysis. The results show that several methodological factors combined

to undermine the accuracy of predictions in New Hampshire, South Carolina, Wisconsin and California. Although the limited data available made it

impossible to conduct definitive tests of all likely sources of different

poll performance, the following factors were identified as likely reasons

for polling errors in New Hampshire, where many polls mistakenly predicted an Obama victory:

The New Hampshire primaries occurred only five days after the Iowa caucuses, truncating the polling period in New Hampshire.

Most commercial polling firms conducted interviews on the first or

second call, but respondents who required more effort to contact were more

likely to support Senator Clinton. Instead of re-working their initial

samples to reach these hard-to-contact people, pollsters typically added

new households to the sample, skewing the results toward the opinions of

those who were easy to reach on the phone, and who typically supported

Senator Obama.

Non-response patterns, identified by comparing characteristics of

the pre-election samples with the exit poll samples, suggest that some

groups who supported Senator Clinton such as union members and those with

less education were under-represented in pre-election polls, possibly

because they were more difficult to reach.

Variations in likely voter models could explain some of the

estimation problems in individual polls. Application of the Gallup likely

voter model, for example, produced a larger error than was present in the

unadjusted data. The influx of first-time voters may have had adverse

effects on likely voter models.

The committee also concluded that several factors were unlikely to have

contributed to estimation errors in the New Hampshire pre-primary polls.

Among these factors was the so-called "Bradley effect" in which it is

hypothesized that poll respondents say they support a Black candidate

order to appear unbiased, but then cast their ballots for a white candidate in the privacy of the voting booth.

Many New Hampshire polls predicted Barack Obama would beat Hillary

Clinton in that state," said Michael Traugott, committee chair.

So when

Clinton won, some people pointed to latent racism as the reason. But

the data we have from a wide variety of New Hampshire pre-election and

exit polls, we found no evidence that whites over-represented their support for Obama.

Other factors that the committee discounted:

The exclusion of cell phone only (CPO) individuals from samples

did not seem to have an effect.

Use of a two-part "trial heat" question (intended to reduce the

number of "undecided" responses) does not appear to have affected

distributions of candidate preference.

There is little evidence that Independents made a late decision to

vote in the New Hampshire Republican primary.

A number of other possible explanations for the error in the New Hampshire

primary polls were considered, but insufficient information was available

to evaluate them. These explanations include the order of names on the

ballot and the short time frame for polling in New Hampshire following the

Iowa caucus.

Traugott noted that the analysis also revealed wide variation in the most

important question respondents are asked "the so-called "trial heat"

question about which candidate they prefer in the coming election. In New

Hampshire, there were 11 different question wordings used in the

Democratic primary, and 10 different wordings used in the Republican primary. In some versions, the candidates' names were not mentioned at all. In others, only the major candidates were named. Some polls randomized the candidates' names, while others did not.

We also learned that some polling firms are buying lists of registered voters with phone numbers, and then they are contacting people with interactive voice response technology -- basically computerized calls -- and that they're taking information from the person who answers the phone which may or may not be the person identified in the sample, said Traugott. This should be a focus of further research. Another firm interviewed any registered voter in the household.

For the report, supported in part by a grant from the University of Michigan Institute for Social Research (ISR), Traugott and colleagues analyzed individual, household-level response data provided by seven polling organizations. They also compared information on question wording, weighting, interviewer characteristics, sampling frames, and other methodological issues from up to 19 other firms, in many cases relying on publicly available information gleaned from the Internet.

A special panel session concerning the findings of the committee will be part of the Association's annual conference, to be held in May. Details concerning the conference can be found at <http://www.aapor.org/2009aaporconference>

The full report is available on the AAPOR website at [www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org).

#####

The American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) is the leading professional organization of public opinion and survey research professionals in the U.S., with members from academia, media, government, the non-profit sector and private industry. AAPOR members embrace 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 and desires. It promotes a better public understanding of this role, as well as the sound and ethical conduct and use of public opinion research.

-----

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, 30 Mar 2009 12:18:58 -0400

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: Re: Report of the AAPOR Ad Hoc Committee on the 2008  
Presidential

Primary Polling

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

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

As an AAPOR member who inquired several times--at first privately and eventually via aapornet--about the planned report on the New Hampshire Primary, I am very glad to have the report available and to see that it addresses carefully all the questions that were raised at the time. It also points to future changes that should be useful for pre-election polling and for surveys generally. -Howard

---

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, 30 Mar 2009 11:34:40 -0500

Reply-To: "Houston, Brian (HSC)" <[Brian-Houston@OUHSC.EDU](mailto:Brian-Houston@OUHSC.EDU)>

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

From: "Houston, Brian (HSC)" <[Brian-Houston@OUHSC.EDU](mailto:Brian-Houston@OUHSC.EDU)>

Subject: Web-based surveys with adolescents

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

All-

We are assessing mental health outcomes in adolescents and are thinking about replacing our standard phone survey with a web-based survey.

We will still contact our adolescents via RDD (actually, we are recruiting the adolescents from an adult sample), but if the adolescent agrees to participate we will provide them a link to the survey instead of conducting the survey via phone.

Does anyone have references or information supporting the effectiveness of web-based surveys versus phone surveys with adolescents (just interested in the impact of the medium on responses, since the sampling/recruitment will not be directly affected, though perhaps adolescents would be more willing

to participate since it is a web-based survey)?

Please reply off list. Thanks.

---

J. Brian Houston, Ph.D.  
Assistant Professor of Research  
Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences  
Program Director  
Terrorism and Disaster Center  
University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center  
920 Stanton L. Young Blvd., WP 3470  
Oklahoma City, OK 73104  
Phone: 405.271.8001 Ext. 47633  
FAX: 405.271.8775  
www.tdc.ouhsc.edu<http://www.tdc.ouhsc.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: Mon, 30 Mar 2009 09:41:16 -0700  
Reply-To: [Doug.A.Strand@KP.ORG](mailto:Doug.A.Strand@KP.ORG)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Douglas Strand <[Doug.A.Strand@KP.ORG](mailto:Doug.A.Strand@KP.ORG)>  
Subject: Re: Report of the AAPOR Ad Hoc Committee on the 2008  
Presidential  
PrimaryPolling  
Comments: To: [mevanslombe@GOAMP.COM](mailto:mevanslombe@GOAMP.COM)  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[LISTSERV%200903300856208784.9AB7@LISTS.ASU.EDU](mailto:LISTSERV%200903300856208784.9AB7@LISTS.ASU.EDU)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="ISO-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Many thanks and kudos to Michael Traugott and the committee members for a=20  
very helpful report.

However, I had heard that the study members (at least one of them) wanted=20  
the report to identify those organizations that did not cooperate at all=20  
or that only partially cooperated. I don't see that kind of listing in=20  
the report. I do see a table that shows what information they were able=20  
to get on survey administration from various organizations, including the=20  
many (alas!) appearances of "NA" in the response rate column.

Are we to infer that if any major organization (e.g., TV networks)=20  
published or broadcasted poll results on the primary states studied but=20  
did not appear in this AAPOR report, then that organization did not=20  
cooperate at all or at least not fully with the AAPOR investigation? It=20  
would be somewhat disappointing if we had to read between the lines to try =

to figure that out.

But maybe I am missing some such listing of cooperation/noncooperation in the report?

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.

Monica Evans Lombe <mevanslombe@GOAMP.COM>  
Sent by: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
03/30/2009 08:56 AM  
Please respond to  
Monica Evans Lombe <mevanslombe@GOAMP.COM>

To  
AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
cc

Subject  
Report of the AAPOR Ad Hoc Committee on the 2008 Presidential Primary Polling

Dear AAPORites:

The report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the 2008 Presidential Primary Polling is now available on our web site ([www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org)). A press release =

(text included and shown below) will be circulated later this morning.

The report is a fascinating read -- not just for those interested in presidential election polling -- but for all our members. Beyond providing insights with respect to the 2008 presidential primary polling, the report brings together (for the first time) information illustrating the variety of methodologies currently being used for political polling.

The Executive Council wishes to recognize and commend the efforts of the members of the ad hoc committee, most notably the work of the chair of the

committee, Michael Traugott.

We would also like to recognize and commend the polling organizations who promptly supplied micro-level data (well beyond what is required by the AAPOR Code) so that the committee could pursue its work: CBS News, Field Research Corporation, Gallup, Opinion Dynamics, Public Policy Institute, SurveyUSA, and the University of New Hampshire.

The findings of the committee will be the topic of a special panel session

at the annual conference. The session is scheduled for Sunday, May 17th. Details concerning the conference can be found at <http://www.aapor.org/2009aaporconference>.

In addition, the report's findings will be the subject of an AAPOR-organized special invited session at the Joint Statistical Meetings: Factors Affecting the Accuracy of the 2008 Presidential Election Polling will be held on August 3, 2009 at 10:30 a.m. at the JSM in Washington, D.C.

I look forward to seeing you at the Annual Meetings in May.

Dick Kulka  
President

Text of press release:

### Investigating the 2008 Presidential Primary Polls

LENEXA, Kansas ----- After an extensive investigation, a committee of

the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) has identified several factors that contributed to inaccuracies in 2008 Presidential Primary polls, most notably the miscalling of the New Hampshire Democratic primary.

This analysis suggests some important explanations for the errors in the 2008 New Hampshire Presidential Primary and raises significant questions for research on pre-election polling methods, said AAPOR President Richard Kulka.

The special AAPOR committee composed of leading academic and private sector experts in public opinion and survey research conducted the analysis. The results show that several methodological factors combined to undermine the accuracy of predictions in New Hampshire, South Carolina,

Wisconsin and California. Although the limited data available made it impossible to conduct definitive tests of all likely sources of different poll performance, the following factors were identified as likely reasons for polling errors in New Hampshire, where many polls mistakenly predicted an Obama victory:

The New Hampshire primaries occurred only five days after the Iowa caucuses, truncating the polling period in New Hampshire.

Most commercial polling firms conducted interviews on the first or second call, but respondents who required more effort to contact were more

likely to support Senator Clinton. Instead of re-working their initial samples to reach these hard-to-contact people, pollsters typically added new households to the sample, skewing the results toward the opinions of those who were easy to reach on the phone, and who typically supported Senator Obama.

Non-response patterns, identified by comparing the characteristics of the pre-election samples with the exit poll samples, suggest that some groups who supported Senator Clinton—such as union members and those with less education—were under-represented in pre-election polls, possibly because they were more difficult to reach.

Variations in likely voter models could explain some of the estimation problems in individual polls. Application of the Gallup likely

voter model, for example, produced a larger error than was present in the unadjusted data. The influx of first-time voters may have had adverse effects on likely voter models.

The committee also concluded that several factors were unlikely to have



contributed to estimation errors in the New Hampshire pre-primary polls.<sup>20</sup> Among these factors was the so-called “Bradley effect”<sup>9D</sup> in which individuals hypothesized that poll respondents say they support a Black candidate in order to appear unbiased, but then cast their ballots for a white candidate in the privacy of the voting booth.<sup>20</sup>

Many New Hampshire polls predicted Barack Obama would beat Hillary Clinton in that state,<sup>9D</sup> said Michael Traugott, committee chair. So when Clinton won, some people pointed to latent racism as the reason. But the data we have from a wide variety of New Hampshire pre-election and exit polls, we found no evidence that whites over-represented their support for Obama.<sup>9D</sup>

Other factors that the committee discounted:

The exclusion of cell phone only (CPO) individuals from samples did not seem to have an effect.

Use of a two-part “trial heat” question (intended to reduce the number of “undecided” responses) does not appear to have affected distributions of candidate preference.

There is little evidence that Independents made a late decision to vote in the New Hampshire Republican primary.<sup>20</sup>

A number of other possible explanations for the error in the New Hampshire primary polls were considered, but insufficient information was available to evaluate them. These explanations include the order of names on the ballot and the short time frame for polling in New Hampshire following the

Iowa caucus.<sup>20</sup>

Traugott noted that the analysis also revealed wide variation in the most important question respondents are asked the so-called “trial heat” question about which candidate they prefer in the coming election. In New

Hampshire, there were 11 different question wordings used in the Democratic primary, and 10 different wordings used in the Republican primary. In some versions, the candidates’ names were not mentioned

at=20

all. In others, only the =E2??major=E2?=9D candidates were named. Some po=  
lls=20

randomized the candidates=E2?? names, while others did not.=20

=E2??We also learned that some polling firms are buying lists of=20  
registered=20

voters with phone numbers, and then they are contacting people with=20  
interactive voice response technology --basically computerized calls --=20  
and that they=E2??re taking information from the person who answers the=20  
phone=20

which may or may not be the person identified in the sample, =E2?=9D said=20  
Traugott. =E2??This should be a focus of further research.=E2?=9D Another=  
=20

firm=20  
interviewed any registered voter in the household.=20

For the report, supported in part by a grant from the University of=20  
Michigan Institute for Social Research (ISR), Traugott and colleagues=20  
analyzed individual, household-level response data provided by seven=20  
polling organizations. They also compared information on question=20  
wording, weighting, interviewer characteristics, sampling frames, and=20  
other methodological issues from up to 19 other firms, in many cases=20  
relying on publicly available information gleaned from the Internet.

A special panel session concerning the findings of the committee will be=20  
part of the Association=E2??s annual conference, to be held in May. Details=  
=20

concerning the conference can be found at=20  
<http://www.aapor.org/2009aaporconference>

The full report is available on the AAPOR website at [www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org).=20

#####

The American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) is the=20  
leading professional organization of public opinion and survey research=20  
professionals in the U.S., with members from academia, media, government,=20  
the non-profit sector and private industry. AAPOR members embrace the=20  
principle that public opinion research is essential to a healthy=20  
democracy, providing information crucial to informed policymaking and=20  
giving voice to the nation=E2??s beliefs, attitudes and desires. It=20  
promotes=20  
a better public understanding of this role, as well as the sound and=20  
ethical conduct and use of public opinion research.=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.

-----  
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, 30 Mar 2009 11:59:23 -0500  
Reply-To: Nancy A Mathiowetz <[nancym2@UWM.EDU](mailto:nancym2@UWM.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nancy A Mathiowetz <[nancym2@UWM.EDU](mailto:nancym2@UWM.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Report of the AAPOR Ad Hoc Committee on the 2008  
Presidential  
PrimaryPolling  
Comments: To: Doug A Strand <[Doug.A.Strand@KP.ORG](mailto:Doug.A.Strand@KP.ORG)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[OF5724FD4F.4873C5C1-ON88257589.005A7CD8-88257589.005BAB4F@kp.org](mailto:OF5724FD4F.4873C5C1-ON88257589.005A7CD8-88257589.005BAB4F@kp.org)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=utf-8  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Hi Doug,=20

If you look at Table 4 of the report, it lists all of the polling organizat=  
ions from whom data were requested and the states in which the organization=  
conducted polls of interest to the committee.=20

The request for information was limited to organizations that conducted a p=  
oll within a limited time frame (10-14 days) prior to the primary election.=  
=C2=A0=20

So there is nothing to read between the lines --only organizations listed i=  
n Table 4 were sent requests for information.=20

Regards,=20

Nancy=20

---

=20

Nancy A. Mathiowetz=20  
Past President=20

American Association for Public Opinion Research=20

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

From: "Douglas Strand" <Doug.A.Strand@KP.ORG>=20

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU=20

Sent: Monday, March 30, 2009 11:41:16 AM GMT -06:00 US/Canada Central=20

Subject: Re: Report of the AAPOR Ad Hoc Committee on the 2008 Presidential =  
Primary Polling=20

Many thanks and kudos to Michael Traugott and the committee members for a=  
=20  
very helpful report.=20

However, I had heard that the study members (at least one of them) wanted=  
=20  
the report to identify those organizations that did not =C2=A0cooperate at =  
all=20  
or that only partially =C2=A0cooperated. =C2=A0I don't see that kind of lis=  
ting in=20  
the report. =C2=A0I do see a table that shows what information they were ab=  
le=20  
to get on survey administration from various organizations, including the=  
=20  
many (alas!) appearances of "NA" in the response rate column.=20

Are we to infer that if any major organization (e.g., TV networks)=20  
published or broadcasted poll results on the primary states studied but=20  
did not appear in this AAPOR report, then that organization did not=20  
cooperate at all or at least not fully with the AAPOR investigation? =C2=A0=  
It=20  
would be somewhat disappointing if we had to read between the lines to try=  
=20  
to figure that out.=20

But maybe I am missing some such listing of cooperation/noncooperation in=  
=20  
the report?=20

Douglas Strand, Ph.D.=20

Consultant=20

National Market Research=20

Kaiser Foundation Health Plan=20

1 Kaiser Plaza=20

Oakland, CA 94612=20

Phone: 510-271-5603=20

E-mail: =C2=A0doug.a.strand@kp.org=20

Fax: =C2=A0510- 267-2130=20

NOTICE TO RECIPIENT: =C2=A0If you are not the intended recipient of this=20  
e-mail, you are prohibited from sharing, copying, or otherwise using or=20  
disclosing its contents. =C2=A0If you have received this e-mail in error,=

=20  
please notify the sender immediately by reply e-mail and permanently=20  
delete this e-mail and any attachments without reading, forwarding or=20  
saving them. =C2=A0Thank you.=20

Monica Evans Lombe <mevanslombe@GOAMP.COM>=20  
Sent by: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>=20  
03/30/2009 08:56 AM=20  
Please respond to=20  
Monica Evans Lombe <mevanslombe@GOAMP.COM>=20

To=20  
AAPORNET@ASU.EDU=20  
cc=20

Subject=20  
Report of the AAPOR Ad Hoc Committee on the 2008 Presidential Primary=20  
Polling=20

Dear AAPORites:=20

The report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the 2008 Presidential Primary=20  
Polling is now available on our web site ([www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org)). =C2=A0A press rel=  
ease=20

(text included and shown below) will be circulated later this morning.=20

The report is a fascinating read =C3=A2??not just for those interested in=  
=20  
presidential election polling -- but for all our members. =C2=A0Beyond=20  
providing insights with respect to the 2008 presidential primary polling,=  
=20  
the report brings together (for the first time) information illustrating=20  
the variety of methodologies currently being used for political polling.=20

The Executive Council wishes to recognize and commend the efforts of the=20  
members of the ad hoc committee, most notably the work of the chair of the=  
=20

committee, Michael Traugott.=20

We would also like to recognize and commend the polling organizations who=  
=20  
promptly supplied micro-level data (well beyond what is required by the=20  
AAPOR Code) =C2=A0so that the committee could pursue its work: =C2=A0CBS N=

ews,=20  
Field Research Corporation, Gallup, Opinion Dynamics, Public Policy=20  
Institute, SurveyUSA, and the University of New Hampshire.=20

The findings of the committee will be the topic of a special panel session=  
=20

at the annual conference. =C2=A0The session is scheduled for Sunday, May 17=  
th.=20

Details concerning the conference can be found at=20  
<http://www.aapor.org/2009aaporconference>.=20

In addition, the report=C3=A2??s findings will be the subject of an AAPOR-=  
=20

organized special invited session at the Joint Statistical=20  
Meetings =C3=A2??Factors Affecting the Accuracy of the 2008 Presidential=20  
Election=20

Polling=C3=A2?=EF=BF=BD will be held on August 3, 2009 at 10:30 a.m. at the=  
JSM in=20  
Washington, D.C.=20

I look forward to seeing you at the Annual Meetings in May.=20

Dick Kulka=20  
President=20

=C2=A0=20  
Text of press release:=20

Investigating the 2008 Presidential Primary Polls=20

LENEXA, Kansas =C2=A0----- =C2=A0 =C2=A0After an extensive investigation, =  
a committee of=20

the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) has=20  
identified several factors that contributed to inaccuracies in 2008=20  
Presidential Primary polls, most notably the miscalling of the New=20  
Hampshire Democratic primary.=20

=C3=A2??This analysis suggests some important explanations for the errors i=  
n=20  
the=20  
2008 New Hampshire Presidential Primary and raises significant questions=20  
for research on pre-election polling methods,=C3=A2?=EF=BF=BD said AAPOR Pr=  
esident=20  
Richard Kulka.=20

The special AAPOR committee composed of leading academic and private=20  
sector experts in public opinion and survey research conducted the=20  
analysis. =C2=A0The results show that several methodological factors combin=

ed=20

to undermine the accuracy of predictions in New Hampshire, South Carolina,=  
=20

Wisconsin and California. =C2=A0Although the limited data available made it=  
=20

impossible to conduct definitive tests of all likely sources of different=  
=20

poll performance, the following factors were identified as likely reasons=  
=20

the for polling errors in New Hampshire, where many polls mistakenly=  
predicted an Obama victory:=20

=C2=A0=20

=C3=AF=EF=BF=BD=C2=AE =C2=A0 =C2=A0 =C2=A0 =C2=A0 =C2=A0 =C2=A0 =C2=A0 =C2=A0The N=  
ew Hampshire primaries occurred only five days after=20

the Iowa=20

caucuses, truncating the polling period in New Hampshire.=20

=C3=AF=EF=BF=BD=C2=AE =C2=A0 =C2=A0 =C2=A0 =C2=A0 =C2=A0 =C2=A0 =C2=A0Most =  
commercial polling firms conducted interviews on the=20

first or=20

second call, but respondents who required more effort to contact were more=  
=20

likely to support Senator Clinton. Instead of re-working their initial=20

samples to reach these hard-to-contact people, pollsters typically added=20

new households to the sample, skewing the results toward the opinions of=20

those who were easy to reach on the phone, and who typically supported=20

Senator Obama.=20

=C3=AF=EF=BF=BD=C2=AE =C2=A0 =C2=A0 =C2=A0 =C2=A0 =C2=A0 =C2=A0 =C2=A0Non-r=  
esponse patterns, identified by comparing=20

characteristics of=20

the pre-election samples with the exit poll samples, suggest that some=20

groups who supported Senator Clinton=C3=A2??such as union members and those=  
=20

with=20

less education=C3=A2??were under-represented in pre-election polls, possibl=  
y=20

because they were more difficult to reach.=20

=C3=AF=EF=BF=BD=C2=AE =C2=A0 =C2=A0 =C2=A0 =C2=A0 =C2=A0 =C2=A0 =C2=A0Varia=  
tions in likely voter models could explain some of=20

the=20

estimation problems in individual polls. =C2=A0Application of the Gallup li=  
kely=20

voter model, for example, produced a larger error than was present in the=  
=20

unadjusted data. =C2=A0The influx of first-time voters may have had adverse=  
=20

effects on likely voter models.=20

The committee also concluded that several factors were unlikely to have=20

contributed to estimation errors in the New Hampshire pre-primary polls.<sup>20</sup> Among these factors was the so-called “Bradley effect”<sup>20</sup> in which it is hypothesized that poll respondents say they support a Black candidate in order to appear unbiased, but then cast their ballots for a white candidate in the privacy of the voting booth.<sup>20</sup>

Many New Hampshire polls predicted Barack Obama would beat Hillary Clinton in that state,<sup>20</sup> said Michael Traugott, committee chair. So when Clinton won, some people pointed to latent racism as the reason. But the data we have from a wide variety of New Hampshire pre-election and exit polls, we found no evidence that whites over-represented their support for Obama.<sup>20</sup>

Other factors that the committee discounted:<sup>20</sup>

The exclusion of cell phone only (CPO) individuals from samples did not seem to have an effect.<sup>20</sup> Use of a two-part question (intended to reduce the number of undecided responses) does not appear to have affected distributions of candidate preference.<sup>20</sup> There is little evidence that Independents made a late decision to vote in the New Hampshire Republican primary.<sup>20</sup>

A number of other possible explanations for the error in the New Hampshire

primary polls were considered, but insufficient information was available to evaluate them. These explanations include the order of names on the ballot and the short time frame for polling in New Hampshire following the

Iowa caucus.<sup>20</sup>

Traugott noted that the analysis also revealed wide variation in the most important question respondents are asked the so-called “trial heat” question about which candidate they prefer in the coming election. In



New=20

Hampshire, there were 11 different question wordings used in the=20 Democratic primary, and 10 different wordings used in the Republican=20 primary. =C2=A0 =C2=A0In some versions, the candidates=C3=A2?? names were n=ot mentioned=20 at=20 all. =C2=A0In others, only the =C3=A2??major=C3=A2?=EF=BF=BD candidates wer=e named. =C2=A0Some polls=20

randomized the candidates=C3=A2?? names, while others did not.=20

=C2=A0=C3=A2??We also learned that some polling firms are buying lists of=20

registered=20

voters with phone numbers, and then they are contacting people with=20 interactive voice response technology --basically computerized calls --=20 and that they=C3=A2??re taking information from the person who answers the=20

phone=20

which may or may not be the person identified in the sample, =C3=A2?=EF=BF=BD said=20

Traugott. =C2=A0=C3=A2??This should be a focus of further research.=C3=A2?=EF=BF=BD =C2=A0Another=20

firm=20

interviewed any registered voter in the household.=20

For the report, supported in part by a grant from the University of=20 Michigan Institute for Social Research (ISR), Traugott and colleagues=20 analyzed individual, household-level response data provided by seven=20 polling organizations. =C2=A0They also compared information on question=20 wording, weighting, interviewer characteristics, sampling frames, and=20 other methodological issues from up to 19 other firms, in many cases=20 relying on publicly available information gleaned from the Internet.=20

A special panel session concerning the findings of the committee will be=20 part of the Association=C3=A2??s annual conference, to be held in May. Deta=ils=20

concerning the conference can be found at=20

<http://www.aapor.org/2009aaporconference>=20

The full report is available on the AAPOR website at [www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org).=20

####=20

The American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) is the=20 leading professional organization of public opinion and survey research=20 professionals in the U.S., with members from academia, media, government,=20

the non-profit sector and private industry. =C2=A0AAPOR members embrace the=20

principle that public opinion research is essential to a healthy=20 democracy, providing information crucial to informed policymaking and=20

giving voice to the nation=C3=A2??s beliefs, attitudes and desires. =C2=A0I=  
t=20  
promotes=20  
a better public understanding of this role, as well as the sound and=20  
ethical conduct and use of public opinion research.=20

-----=20  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> . =20  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:=20  
signoff aapornet=20  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.=20

-----=20  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> . =20  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:=20  
signoff aapornet=20  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.=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, 30 Mar 2009 12:52:28 -0400  
Reply-To: "Traugott, Michael" <[mtrau@UMICH.EDU](mailto:mtrau@UMICH.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Traugott, Michael" <[mtrau@UMICH.EDU](mailto:mtrau@UMICH.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Report of the AAPOR Ad Hoc Committee on the 2008  
Presidential

PrimaryPolling  
Comments: To: "Doug.A.Strand@KP.ORG" <[Doug.A.Strand@KP.ORG](mailto:Doug.A.Strand@KP.ORG)>,  
"AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
In-Reply-To: <[OF5724FD4F.4873C5C1-ON88257589.005A7CD8-88257589.005BAB4F@kp.org](mailto:OF5724FD4F.4873C5C1-ON88257589.005A7CD8-88257589.005BAB4F@kp.org)>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

If I understand this question correctly, the committee contacted organizations that collected data for information about the polls but not those that reported on the data.

---

From: AAPORNET [[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)] On Behalf Of Douglas Strand  
[[Doug.A.Strand@KP.ORG](mailto:Doug.A.Strand@KP.ORG)]  
Sent: Monday, March 30, 2009 12:41 PM  
To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Subject: Re: Report of the AAPOR Ad Hoc Committee on the 2008 Presidential  
PrimaryPolling

Many thanks and kudos to Michael Traugott and the committee members for a very helpful report.

However, I had heard that the study members (at least one of them) wanted the report to identify those organizations that did not cooperate at all or that only partially cooperated. I don't see that kind of listing in the report. I do see a table that shows what information they were able to get on survey administration from various organizations, including the many (alas!) appearances of "NA" in the response rate column.

Are we to infer that if any major organization (e.g., TV networks) published or broadcasted poll results on the primary states studied but did not appear in this AAPOR report, then that organization did not cooperate at all or at least not fully with the AAPOR investigation? It would be somewhat disappointing if we had to read between the lines to try to figure that out.

But maybe I am missing some such listing of cooperation/noncooperation in the report?

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.

Monica Evans Lombe <mevanslombe@GOAMP.COM>  
Sent by: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
03/30/2009 08:56 AM  
Please respond to  
Monica Evans Lombe <mevanslombe@GOAMP.COM>

To  
AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
cc

Subject  
Report of the AAPOR Ad Hoc Committee on the 2008 Presidential Primary  
Polling

Dear AAPORites:

The report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the 2008 Presidential Primary Polling is now available on our web site ([www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org)). A press release

(text included and shown below) will be circulated later this morning.

The report is a fascinating read -- not just for those interested in presidential election polling -- but for all our members. Beyond providing insights with respect to the 2008 presidential primary polling, the report brings together (for the first time) information illustrating the variety of methodologies currently being used for political polling.

The Executive Council wishes to recognize and commend the efforts of the members of the ad hoc committee, most notably the work of the chair of the committee, Michael Traugott.

We would also like to recognize and commend the polling organizations who promptly supplied micro-level data (well beyond what is required by the AAPOR Code) so that the committee could pursue its work: CBS News, Field Research Corporation, Gallup, Opinion Dynamics, Public Policy Institute, SurveyUSA, and the University of New Hampshire.

The findings of the committee will be the topic of a special panel session at the annual conference. The session is scheduled for Sunday, May 17th. Details concerning the conference can be found at <http://www.aapor.org/2009aaporconference>.

In addition, the report's findings will be the subject of an AAPOR-organized special invited session at the Joint Statistical Meetings -- Factors Affecting the Accuracy of the 2008 Presidential Election Polling -- will be held on August 3, 2009 at 10:30 a.m. at the JSM in Washington, D.C.

I look forward to seeing you at the Annual Meetings in May.

Dick Kulka  
President

Text of press release:

Investigating the 2008 Presidential Primary Polls

LENEXA, Kansas ----- After an extensive investigation, a committee of

the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) has identified several factors that contributed to inaccuracies in 2008 Presidential Primary polls, most notably the miscalling of the New Hampshire Democratic primary.

“This analysis suggests some important explanations for the errors in the 2008 New Hampshire Presidential Primary and raises significant questions for research on pre-election polling methods,” said AAPOR President Richard Kulka.

The special AAPOR committee composed of leading academic and private sector experts in public opinion and survey research conducted the analysis. The results show that several methodological factors combined to undermine the accuracy of predictions in New Hampshire, South Carolina,

Wisconsin and California. Although the limited data available made it impossible to conduct definitive tests of all likely sources of different poll performance, the following factors were identified as likely reasons for polling errors in New Hampshire, where many polls mistakenly predicted an Obama victory:

i. The New Hampshire primaries occurred only five days after the Iowa caucuses, truncating the polling period in New Hampshire.

ii. Most commercial polling firms conducted interviews on the first or second call, but respondents who required more effort to contact were more likely to support Senator Clinton. Instead of re-working their initial samples to reach these hard-to-contact people, pollsters typically added new households to the sample, skewing the results toward the opinions of those who were easy to reach on the phone, and who typically supported Senator Obama.

iii. Non-response patterns, identified by comparing characteristics of the pre-election samples with the exit poll samples, suggest that some groups who supported Senator Clinton—such as union members and those with less education—were under-represented in pre-election polls, possibly because they were more difficult to reach.

iv. Variations in likely voter models could explain some of the estimation problems in individual polls. Application of the Gallup likely voter model, for example, produced a larger error than was present in the unadjusted data. The influx of first-time voters may have had adverse effects on likely voter models.

The committee also concluded that several factors were unlikely to have contributed to estimation errors in the New Hampshire pre-primary polls. Among these factors was the so-called "Bradley effect" in which it is hypothesized that poll respondents say they support a Black candidate in order to appear unbiased, but then cast their ballots for a white candidate in the privacy of the voting booth.

"Many New Hampshire polls predicted Barack Obama would beat Hillary Clinton in that state," said Michael Traugott, committee chair. "So when Clinton won, some people pointed to latent racism as the reason. But in the data we have from a wide variety of New Hampshire pre-election and exit polls, we found no evidence that whites over-represented their support for Obama."

Other factors that the committee discounted:

• The exclusion of cell phone only (CPO) individuals from samples did not seem to have an effect.

• Use of a two-part "trial heat" question (intended to reduce the number of "undecided" responses) does not appear to have affected distributions of candidate preference.

• There is little evidence that Independents made a late decision to vote in the New Hampshire Republican primary.

A number of other possible explanations for the error in the New Hampshire primary polls were considered, but insufficient information was available to evaluate them. These explanations include the order of names on the ballot and the short time frame for polling in New Hampshire following the Iowa caucus.

Traugott noted that the analysis also revealed wide variation in the most important question respondents are asked -- the so-called "trial heat" question about which candidate they prefer in the coming election. In New

Hampshire, there were 11 different question wordings used in the Democratic primary, and 10 different wordings used in the Republican primary. In some versions, the candidates' names were not mentioned at all. In others, only the "major" candidates were named. Some polls randomized the candidates' names, while others did not.

"We also learned that some polling firms are buying lists of registered voters with phone numbers, and then they are contacting people with interactive voice response technology -- basically computerized calls --

and that they're taking information from the person who answers the phone which may or may not be the person identified in the sample," said Traugott. "This should be a focus of further research." Another firm interviewed any registered voter in the household.

For the report, supported in part by a grant from the University of Michigan Institute for Social Research (ISR), Traugott and colleagues analyzed individual, household-level response data provided by seven polling organizations. They also compared information on question wording, weighting, interviewer characteristics, sampling frames, and other methodological issues from up to 19 other firms, in many cases relying on publicly available information gleaned from the Internet.

A special panel session concerning the findings of the committee will be part of the Association's annual conference, to be held in May. Details

concerning the conference can be found at <http://www.aapor.org/2009aaporconference>

The full report is available on the AAPOR website at [www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org).

#####

The American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) is the leading professional organization of public opinion and survey research professionals in the U.S., with members from academia, media, government, the non-profit sector and private industry. AAPOR members embrace 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 and desires. It promotes a better public understanding of this role, as well as the sound and ethical conduct and use of public opinion research.

-----  
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.

-----  
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, 30 Mar 2009 12:54:01 -0400  
Reply-To: "Traugott, Michael" <mtrau@UMICH.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Traugott, Michael" <mtrau@UMICH.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Report of the AAPOR Ad Hoc Committee on the 2008  
Presidential  
PrimaryPolling  
Comments: To: "Doug.A.Strand@KP.ORG" <Doug.A.Strand@KP.ORG>,  
"AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
In-Reply-To: <OF5724FD4F.4873C5C1-ON88257589.005A7CD8-  
88257589.005BAB4F@kp.org>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Actually, to be more specific, Nancy Mathiowetz made these contacts to obtain information that the committee could work with. You will find the solicitation materials in the appendix to the report.

---

From: AAPORNET [AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Douglas Strand  
[Doug.A.Strand@KP.ORG]  
Sent: Monday, March 30, 2009 12:41 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Report of the AAPOR Ad Hoc Committee on the 2008 Presidential  
PrimaryPolling

Many thanks and kudos to Michael Traugott and the committee members for a very helpful report.

However, I had heard that the study members (at least one of them) wanted the report to identify those organizations that did not cooperate at all or that only partially cooperated. I don't see that kind of listing in the report. I do see a table that shows what information they were able to get on survey administration from various organizations, including the many (alas!) appearances of "NA" in the response rate column.

Are we to infer that if any major organization (e.g., TV networks) published or broadcasted poll results on the primary states studied but did not appear in this AAPOR report, then that organization did not cooperate at all or at least not fully with the AAPOR investigation? It would be somewhat disappointing if we had to read between the lines to try to figure that out.

But maybe I am missing some such listing of cooperation/noncooperation in the report?

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.

Monica Evans Lombe <mevanslombe@GOAMP.COM>  
Sent by: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
03/30/2009 08:56 AM  
Please respond to  
Monica Evans Lombe <mevanslombe@GOAMP.COM>

To  
AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
cc

Subject  
Report of the AAPOR Ad Hoc Committee on the 2008 Presidential Primary  
Polling

Dear AAPORites:

The report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the 2008 Presidential Primary  
Polling is now available on our web site ([www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org)). A press release

(text included and shown below) will be circulated later this morning.

The report is a fascinating read -- not just for those interested in  
presidential election polling -- but for all our members. Beyond  
providing insights with respect to the 2008 presidential primary polling,  
the report brings together (for the first time) information illustrating  
the variety of methodologies currently being used for political polling.

The Executive Council wishes to recognize and commend the efforts of the  
members of the ad hoc committee, most notably the work of the chair of the  
committee, Michael Traugott.

We would also like to recognize and commend the polling organizations who  
promptly supplied micro-level data (well beyond what is required by the  
AAPOR Code) so that the committee could pursue its work: CBS News,

Field Research Corporation, Gallup, Opinion Dynamics, Public Policy Institute, SurveyUSA, and the University of New Hampshire.

The findings of the committee will be the topic of a special panel session

at the annual conference. The session is scheduled for Sunday, May 17th.

Details concerning the conference can be found at

<http://www.aapor.org/2009aaporconference>.

In addition, the report's findings will be the subject of an AAPOR-organized special invited session at the Joint Statistical Meetings "Factors Affecting the Accuracy of the 2008 Presidential Election

Polling" will be held on August 3, 2009 at 10:30 a.m. at the JSM in Washington, D.C.

I look forward to seeing you at the Annual Meetings in May.

Dick Kulka  
President

Text of press release:

### Investigating the 2008 Presidential Primary Polls

LENEXA, Kansas ----- After an extensive investigation, a committee of

the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) has identified several factors that contributed to inaccuracies in 2008 Presidential Primary polls, most notably the miscalling of the New Hampshire Democratic primary.

"This analysis suggests some important explanations for the errors in the 2008 New Hampshire Presidential Primary and raises significant questions for research on pre-election polling methods," said AAPOR President Richard Kulka.

The special AAPOR committee composed of leading academic and private sector experts in public opinion and survey research conducted the analysis. The results show that several methodological factors combined to undermine the accuracy of predictions in New Hampshire, South Carolina,

Wisconsin and California. Although the limited data available made it impossible to conduct definitive tests of all likely sources of different poll performance, the following factors were identified as likely reasons for polling errors in New Hampshire, where many polls mistakenly predicted an Obama victory:

i ® The New Hampshire primaries occurred only five days after the Iowa caucuses, truncating the polling period in New Hampshire.

i ® Most commercial polling firms conducted interviews on the first or second call, but respondents who required more effort to contact were more

likely to support Senator Clinton. Instead of re-working their initial samples to reach these hard-to-contact people, pollsters typically added new households to the sample, skewing the results toward the opinions of those who were easy to reach on the phone, and who typically supported Senator Obama.

i ® Non-response patterns, identified by comparing characteristics of the pre-election samples with the exit poll samples, suggest that some groups who supported Senator Clinton—such as union members and those with less education—were under-represented in pre-election polls, possibly because they were more difficult to reach.

i ® Variations in likely voter models could explain some of the estimation problems in individual polls. Application of the Gallup likely

voter model, for example, produced a larger error than was present in the unadjusted data. The influx of first-time voters may have had adverse effects on likely voter models.

The committee also concluded that several factors were unlikely to have contributed to estimation errors in the New Hampshire pre-primary polls. Among these factors was the so-called “Bradley effect” in which it is hypothesized that poll respondents say they support a Black candidate in order to appear unbiased, but then cast their ballots for a white candidate in the privacy of the voting booth.

“Many New Hampshire polls predicted Barack Obama would beat Hillary Clinton in that state,” said Michael Traugott, committee chair. “So when Clinton won, some people pointed to latent racism as the reason. But in the data we have from a wide variety of New Hampshire pre-election and exit polls, we found no evidence that whites over-represented their support for Obama.”

Other factors that the committee discounted:

i ® The exclusion of cell phone only (CPO) individuals from samples did not seem to have an effect.

i ® Use of a two-part “trial heat” question (intended to reduce the number of “undecided” responses) does not appear to have affected

distributions of candidate preference.

i ® There is little evidence that Independents made a late decision to vote in the New Hampshire Republican primary.

A number of other possible explanations for the error in the New Hampshire primary polls were considered, but insufficient information was available to evaluate them. These explanations include the order of names on the ballot and the short time frame for polling in New Hampshire following the Iowa caucus.

Traugott noted that the analysis also revealed wide variation in the most important question respondents are asked â?? the so-called â??trial heatâ? question about which candidate they prefer in the coming election. In New

Hampshire, there were 11 different question wordings used in the Democratic primary, and 10 different wordings used in the Republican primary. In some versions, the candidatesâ?? names were not mentioned at all. In others, only the â??majorâ? candidates were named. Some polls randomized the candidatesâ?? names, while others did not.

â??We also learned that some polling firms are buying lists of registered voters with phone numbers, and then they are contacting people with interactive voice response technology -- basically computerized calls -- and that theyâ??re taking information from the person who answers the phone which may or may not be the person identified in the sample, â? said Traugott. â??This should be a focus of further research.â? Another firm interviewed any registered voter in the household.

For the report, supported in part by a grant from the University of Michigan Institute for Social Research (ISR), Traugott and colleagues analyzed individual, household-level response data provided by seven polling organizations. They also compared information on question wording, weighting, interviewer characteristics, sampling frames, and other methodological issues from up to 19 other firms, in many cases relying on publicly available information gleaned from the Internet.

A special panel session concerning the findings of the committee will be part of the Associationâ??s annual conference, to be held in May. Details

concerning the conference can be found at <http://www.aapor.org/2009aaporconference>

The full report is available on the AAPOR website at [www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org).

#####

The American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) is the leading professional organization of public opinion and survey research professionals in the U.S., with members from academia, media, government, the non-profit sector and private industry. AAPOR members embrace 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 and desires. It promotes a better public understanding of this role, as well as the sound and ethical conduct and use of public opinion research.

---

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.

---

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, 30 Mar 2009 10:08:13 -0700  
Reply-To: [Doug.A.Strand@KP.ORG](mailto:Doug.A.Strand@KP.ORG)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Douglas Strand <[Doug.A.Strand@KP.ORG](mailto:Doug.A.Strand@KP.ORG)>  
Subject: Re: Report of the AAPOR Ad Hoc Committee on the 2008  
PresidentialPrimaryPolling  
Comments: To: [nancym2@uwm.edu](mailto:nancym2@uwm.edu)  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To:  
<[545639442.10636871238432363831.JavaMail.root@mail04.pantherlink.uwm.edu](mailto:545639442.10636871238432363831.JavaMail.root@mail04.pantherlink.uwm.edu)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="ISO-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Thanks, Nancy! Sorry, my misunderstanding!=20

I was looking through the report for some major organizations that I=20  
thought surveyed during the period in question -- e.g., ABC/Washington=20  
Post and NBC/WSJ -- and did not find them listed, but I guess they did=20  
not do surveying in these primary states during the window of the study=20  
(10-14 days prior to the primary election), so they would not have been=20  
solicited for data.=20

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.

Nancy A Mathiowetz <nancym2@uwm.edu>  
03/30/2009 09:59 AM

To  
Doug A Strand/PO/KAIPERM@KAIPERM  
cc  
AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject  
Re: Report of the AAPOR Ad Hoc Committee on the 2008 Presidential Primary Polling

Hi Doug,  
If you look at Table 4 of the report, it lists all of the organizations from whom data were requested and the states in which the organization conducted polls of interest to the committee.  
The request for information was limited to organizations that conducted a poll within a limited time frame (10-14 days) prior to the primary election.  
So there is nothing to read between the lines --only organizations listed in Table 4 were sent requests for information.  
Regards,  
Nancy

=5F=



Monica Evans Lombe <mevanslombe@GOAMP.COM>=20  
Sent by: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
03/30/2009 08:56 AM  
Please respond to  
Monica Evans Lombe <mevanslombe@GOAMP.COM>

To  
AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
cc

Subject  
Report of the AAPOR Ad Hoc Committee on the 2008 Presidential Primary=20  
Polling

Dear AAPORites:

The report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the 2008 Presidential Primary=20  
Polling is now available on our web site ([www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org)). A press release =

(text included and shown below) will be circulated later this morning.=20

The report is a fascinating read =E2??not just for those interested in=20  
presidential election polling -- but for all our members. Beyond=20  
providing insights with respect to the 2008 presidential primary polling,=20  
the report brings together (for the first time) information illustrating=20  
the variety of methodologies currently being used for political polling.=20

The Executive Council wishes to recognize and commend the efforts of the=20  
members of the ad hoc committee, most notably the work of the chair of the =

committee, Michael Traugott.=20

We would also like to recognize and commend the polling organizations who=20  
promptly supplied micro-level data (well beyond what is required by the=20  
AAPOR Code) so that the committee could pursue its work: CBS News,=20  
Field Research Corporation, Gallup, Opinion Dynamics, Public Policy=20  
Institute, SurveyUSA, and the University of New Hampshire.

The findings of the committee will be the topic of a special panel session =



at the annual conference. The session is scheduled for Sunday, May 17th.  
Details concerning the conference can be found at  
<http://www.aapor.org/2009aaporconference>.

In addition, the report's findings will be the subject of an AAPOR-organized special invited session at the Joint Statistical Meetings Factors Affecting the Accuracy of the 2008 Presidential Election will be held on August 3, 2009 at 10:30 a.m. at the JSM in Washington, D.C.

I look forward to seeing you at the Annual Meetings in May.

Dick Kulka  
President

Text of press release:

### Investigating the 2008 Presidential Primary Polls

LENEXA, Kansas ----- After an extensive investigation, a committee of

the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) has identified several factors that contributed to inaccuracies in 2008 Presidential Primary polls, most notably the miscalling of the New Hampshire Democratic primary.

This analysis suggests some important explanations for the errors in the 2008 New Hampshire Presidential Primary and raises significant questions for research on pre-election polling methods, said AAPOR President Richard Kulka.

The special AAPOR committee composed of leading academic and private sector experts in public opinion and survey research conducted the analysis. The results show that several methodological factors combined to undermine the accuracy of predictions in New Hampshire, South Carolina,

Wisconsin and California. Although the limited data available made it impossible to conduct definitive tests of all likely sources of different poll performance, the following factors were identified as likely reasons for polling errors in New Hampshire, where many polls mistakenly predicted an Obama victory:

=20  
=EF?=AE            The New Hampshire primaries occurred only five days af=  
ter=20

the Iowa=20  
caucuses, truncating the polling period in New Hampshire.=20

=EF?=AE            Most commercial polling firms conducted interviews on =  
the=20

first or=20  
second call, but respondents who required more effort to contact were more =

likely to support Senator Clinton. Instead of re-working their initial=20  
samples to reach these hard-to-contact people, pollsters typically added=20  
new households to the sample, skewing the results toward the opinions of=20  
those who were easy to reach on the phone, and who typically supported=20  
Senator Obama.

=EF?=AE            Non-response patterns, identified by comparing=20  
characteristics of=20  
the pre-election samples with the exit poll samples, suggest that some=20  
groups who supported Senator Clinton=E2??such as union members and those=20  
with=20  
less education=E2??were under-represented in pre-election polls, possibly=20  
because they were more difficult to reach.

=EF?=AE            Variations in likely voter models could explain some o=  
f=20  
the=20  
estimation problems in individual polls. Application of the Gallup likely =

voter model, for example, produced a larger error than was present in the=20  
unadjusted data. The influx of first-time voters may have had adverse=20  
effects on likely voter models.

The committee also concluded that several factors were unlikely to have=20  
contributed to estimation errors in the New Hampshire pre-primary polls.=20  
Among these factors was the so-called =E2??Bradley effect=E2?? in which it =

is=20  
hypothesized that poll respondents say they support a Black candidate in=20  
order to appear unbiased, but then cast their ballots for a white=20  
candidate in the privacy of the voting booth.=20

=E2??Many New Hampshire polls predicted Barack Obama would beat Hillary=20  
Clinton in that state,=E2?? said Michael Traugott, committee chair. =E2??S=  
o=20  
when=20  
Clinton won, some people pointed to latent racism as the reason. But in=20

the data we have from a wide variety of New Hampshire pre-election and exit polls, we found no evidence that whites over-represented their support for Obama.

Other factors that the committee discounted:

The exclusion of cell phone only (CPO) individuals from samples did not seem to have an effect.

Use of a two-part question (intended to reduce the number of undecided responses) does not appear to have affected distributions of candidate preference.

There is little evidence that Independents made a late decision to vote in the New Hampshire Republican primary.

A number of other possible explanations for the error in the New Hampshire

primary polls were considered, but insufficient information was available to evaluate them. These explanations include the order of names on the ballot and the short time frame for polling in New Hampshire following the

Iowa caucus.

Traugott noted that the analysis also revealed wide variation in the most important question respondents are asked the so-called "trial heat" question about which candidate they prefer in the coming election. In New

Hampshire, there were 11 different question wordings used in the Democratic primary, and 10 different wordings used in the Republican primary. In some versions, the candidates' names were not mentioned

at all. In others, only the "major" candidates were named. Some polls

randomized the candidates' names, while others did not.

We also learned that some polling firms are buying lists of registered voters with phone numbers, and then they are contacting people with interactive voice response technology -- basically computerized calls -- and that they're taking information from the person who answers the

phone=20  
which may or may not be the person identified in the sample, =E2?? said=20  
Traugott. =E2??This should be a focus of further research.=E2?? Another=20  
firm=20  
interviewed any registered voter in the household.=20

For the report, supported in part by a grant from the University of=20  
Michigan Institute for Social Research (ISR), Traugott and colleagues=20  
analyzed individual, household-level response data provided by seven=20  
polling organizations. They also compared information on question=20  
wording, weighting, interviewer characteristics, sampling frames, and=20  
other methodological issues from up to 19 other firms, in many cases=20  
relying on publicly available information gleaned from the Internet.

A special panel session concerning the findings of the committee will be=20  
part of the Association=E2??s annual conference, to be held in May. Details=  
=20

concerning the conference can be found at=20  
<http://www.aapor.org/2009aaporconference>

The full report is available on the AAPOR website at [www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org).=20

#####

The American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) is the=20  
leading professional organization of public opinion and survey research=20  
professionals in the U.S., with members from academia, media, government,=20  
the non-profit sector and private industry. AAPOR members embrace the=20  
principle that public opinion research is essential to a healthy=20  
democracy, providing information crucial to informed policymaking and=20  
giving voice to the nation=E2??s beliefs, attitudes and desires. It=20  
promotes=20  
a better public understanding of this role, as well as the sound and=20  
ethical conduct and use of public opinion research.=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.

-----  
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: Mon, 30 Mar 2009 20:37:49 -0400  
Reply-To: "Traugott, Michael" <mtrau@UMICH.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Traugott, Michael" <mtrau@UMICH.EDU>  
Subject: Update on the Pre-Primary Polls Report  
Comments: To: "AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

As pollsters and AAPOR members review our committee's report, we are receiving questions and comments about some specific elements of editorial content. We will wait a short period of time before producing an updated version that incorporates these. But I do want to note that SurveyUSA did provide information on its weighting scheme for its surveys, and a copy of a PowerPoint from an AAPOR annual conference presentation in 2005 on this topic will soon be posted at the Roper Center site for the report and associated information.

-----  
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, 31 Mar 2009 13:10:47 -0400  
Reply-To: Ward R Kay <wkay1@GMU.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Ward R Kay <wkay1@GMU.EDU>  
Subject: International Opinion on US  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT  
Content-disposition: inline

I am looking for historical data of world opinion on the US and/or the President. I have several sources for 21st century data but I'm struggling to find data before 2000.

What I'm hoping to find is annual data (to track changes over time). I will take data from a single country or multiple countries.

I am searching through Roper and ICPSR. If anyone has access to such data, please let me know.

Thanks,  
Ward

-----  
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, 31 Mar 2009 14:18:09 EDT

Reply-To: AmyRSimon@AOL.COM  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Amy Simon <AmyRSimon@AOL.COM>  
Subject: Re: A question about companies that tabulate paper surveys  
automatically  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Dear AAPOR-ites,

I have a government client who would like to offer all of their 1 million+ annual customers a 5-question survey with closed-end responses, that respondents could respond to by filling in a balloon (a la a pre-college SAT test) or some other similar format that allows for automatic tabulation. All of these customers come in person to a government office to conduct their business.

The client would like to have an outside vendor automatically tabulate the results each month and send them a data report showing responses to each of the 5 questions on a monthly basis.

Does anyone have experience setting up this type of project, and could you recommend companies that do the data tabulation at an affordable rate with good quality control?

We considered as an alternative offering all customers a web-based survey, but as the client is prohibited from offering any type of participation incentive, we feel that might generate far fewer responses than a simple comment card that can be filled out at the moment and left in a box.

Any other advice on establishing this type of on-going customer feedback study is welcome, too.

Thank you very much.

Amy Simon

---

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)