

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 LOG1003"

Date: Mon, 1 Mar 2010 10:30:23 -0500
Reply-To: "J. Ann Selzer" <jannelselzer@AOL.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "J. Ann Selzer" <jannelselzer@AOL.COM>
Subject: Re: Polling on opinions about health care reform
X-To: jwerner@jwdp.com, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <4B8AC22D.4080200@jwdp.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Thanks for these links. The piece about what it costs NOT to do something= about health care basically sums up findings from our 2004 study of Iowa= businesses. They had been eating most of the premium increases and had= reached a point when that was not longer viable. They were going to have= to start shifting costs to their employees. We also looked at the genera= l population and documented a number of consequences to the rising cost of= health care, including how many forego tests, doctor visits, buying presc= ribed drugs, etc. because of cost. In addition, we looked at the drag on= the state's economy that could be traced to rising health care costs. Ev= ery dollar spent on health insurance is basically untaxed (there is a .5%= fee levied in Iowa). So, as those dollars increase, the dollars availabl= e to spend on employee salaries, goods and services and other business enh= ancements decline, resulting in lower revenues to state coffers. So, it= raises the cost of doing business, lowers the take-home pay of employees,= and results in decreased revenue for that state. Of course, there are wi= nners in all of this, too, which we did our best to account for. =20

JAS

=20

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D
Selzer & Company
Des Moines, Iowa 50309

For purposes of this list, use JAnnSelzer@aol.com
For other purposes, use JASelzer@SelzerCo.com

=20

=20

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

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Sent: Sun, Feb 28, 2010 1:21 pm
Subject: Polling on opinions about health care reform

Today's NY Times Week In Review section fills some unsold space with yet=
=20

another rehash about poll results differing because of question wording,=
=20

this time in the context of opinions on health care reform: =20

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/28/weekinreview/28sussman.html> =20
=20

At the same time, the front page of that same section has an article on =20
the expected costs of failure to enact some kind of health care reform: =20

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/28/weekinreview/28abelson.html> =20
=20

This brings up the issue of why the media polls keep asking the same =20
questions with slight variations of wording, instead of doing serious =20

digging into just what people know about health care reform and what =20
they want, or fear, from it. =20

Even the Kaiser Family Foundation tracking polls, while far superior on =20
health care topics to anything one gets from the usual media suspects =20

(NYT, ABC, Pew, etc.), mainly focus on the political affiliation of =20
respondents rather than whether they have health care coverage and, if =20

so, where it comes from and what it costs them. =20
=20

<http://www.kff.org/kaiserpolls/8051.cfm> =20
=20

Why don't we see questions about the source of respondents' health care =20
coverage, the percentage of their income it consumes, how that amount =20

has changed over time and how they expect it to change in the future, =20
how much they know about rising health care costs and why they are =20

rising. And why don't we see crosstabs by that kind of information =20
rather than just by the same Dem/Ind/Rep political breakdowns? =20

One answer comes from Bob Blendon of the Harvard School of Public =20
Health, via Trudy Lieberman, who writes on health care reporting in the =20

Columbia Journalism Review: =20
=20

http://www.cjr.org/campaign_desk/health_reform_lessons_from_mas_8.php =20
=20

Obviously, if only insurance companies are willing to sponsor serious =20
research into what drives opinions on health care reform, then they are =20

going to be the main beneficiaries of what that research reveals. =20
=20

Jan Werner =20
=20

----- =20
Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7> =20
<http://www.aapor.org> =20

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> =20

Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text: =20

set aapornet nomail=20

On your return send this: set aapornet mail=20

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.=20

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu=
=20

=20

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Mon, 1 Mar 2010 13:21:39 -0500

Reply-To: Cralley Marla <Marla.Cralley@ARBITRON.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Cralley Marla <Marla.Cralley@ARBITRON.COM>

Subject: Asking Age versus Birth Date

X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

In-Reply-To: A<C19C6A7632FC524D83A9C24332A953D334B991C25F@iu-mssg-mbx08.ads.iu.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

When enumerating household members we typically ask "What is the age of this person?" rather than "What is this person's birth date?" =20

=20

We have shied away from asking about birth dates for household members for several reasons. We surmise that, in this day of rampant identity theft, refusals to a birth date question will be higher than to a general age question and that respondents will be more likely to know the ages of their household members (especially in roommate situations), leading to more and increased accuracy using an age question.

=20

Does anyone have any data or articles that speak to whether age or a birth date question should be used to ascertain the exact age of respondents and/or their household members?

=20

Thanks,

=20

Marla Cralley

=20

=20

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Mon, 1 Mar 2010 14:00:43 -0500
Reply-To: colleen_porter@COX.NET
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Colleen Porter <colleen_porter@COX.NET>
Subject: Re: Polling on opinions about health care reform
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=utf-8
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

On Feb 28, 2010, at 2:21 PM, Jan Werner wrote:

> Why don't we see questions about the source of respondents' health care
> coverage, the percentage of their income it consumes, how that amount
> has changed over time and how they expect it to change in the future,
> how much they know about rising health care costs and why they are
> rising. And why don't we see crosstabs by that kind of information
> rather than just by the same Dem/Ind/Rep political breakdowns?

I agree that it would be much more interesting. But it is much more challenging to find out those things, for many reasons, including that sometimes people don't know.

I have some experience asking about health insurance premiums, and I think there is agreement that one needs to follow up that item with a question about how certain the respondent is of their answer. This extra step makes it more costly to ask on a survey. Plus, the average "think" time while people try to formulate a response to the cost item can be much longer than with other questions, which also drives up the survey elapsed time. People who write a check every month can often give you the figure to the penny, but a significant percentage of people with payroll deduction can't even make a guess.

It would be interesting to survey the employees of the same employers that Ann mentioned, to see if those employees even know the cost of their portion of premium. And very, very few people know the entire cost of premiums, both employer and employee shares, so when they are asked about "changes over time," these employees may not have the full picture (if the employer has been trying to absorb cost increases for a while).

One would think that identifying the source would be easy, but remember the kerfuffle last summer over those elders saying stuff like,

> "I got a letter the other day from a woman. She said, 'I don't want government-run health care. I don't want socialized medicine. And don't touch my Medicare.'"

Of course most seniors can at least name Medicare in a survey setting, but it may be less clear for parents of children covered by the State Children's Health Insurance Program, because in many states the same program name may encompass those who pay a premium as well as those who have their benefits covered entirely through Medicaid funding.

But at least everyone know whether or not they have some kind of coverage, right? Well, a significant proportion of Medicaid recipients don't know that they have Medicaid. They showed up at a hospital ER, and a social worker filled out the Medicaid application paperwork to protect the hospital and allow a mechanism for billing. But the patient may not understand that they are applying for Medicaid (which may not be approved until after discharge, with the person perhaps having no reliable contact information for followup). So the person keeps going to the ER when things are desperate, not realizing that they could be seeing a doctor in an outpatient setting and may even qualify for disease management programs for chronic illness.

Then too, in some parts of the country (e.g., South Florida), there are "discount programs" that give you a card that provides a significant discount on some routine and preventive care, through certain providers. But it may leave people with the false impression that they have insurance, which they do not--no hospital coverage is typically included. And the way some survey instruments define coverage, those plans are likely included by respondents.

And of course, that's all just premiums. The full cost of coverage includes co-pays and uncovered costs, including drugs. The catch is, people who don't use those services regularly don't know if they have certain kinds of coverage or how much it will cost. The Denzel Washington movie JOHN Q was a horrible film on many levels, but the situation it portrayed--a family that thought they had adequate coverage until their child needed surgery--was very real.

When one buys a new car, it is used it right away. But health coverage is one of those things that people might buy and not use much for years.

We have a scenario question we have used to try to get at such issues: "If you were faced with an unexpected \$500 medical bill that was not covered by insurance, how would you best describe your situation?"

1. Able to pay comfortably
2. Able to pay, but with difficulty
3. Not able to pay the bill"

Well, this all sounds whiny and apologetic, but it really is more complicated than it might seem. Which is part of why surveys sometimes settle for easier-to-ask things.

Colleen Porter
Gainesville, FL

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Mon, 1 Mar 2010 14:44:47 -0500

Reply-To: Eleni Delimpaltadaki <eleni@OPPORTUNITYAGENDA.ORG>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Eleni Delimpaltadaki <eleni@OPPORTUNITYAGENDA.ORG>

Subject: Summer research internship at The Opportunity Agenda

X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

In-Reply-To:

<EA2273607A10AC44B894E3B9FD37F52603444043@PIWMDPEXC.arbitron.com>

Mime-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Hello,=20

Please feel free to forward to interested parties.

Thank you,=20

Eleni Delimpaltadaki

Public Opinion and Media Research Coordinator

The Opportunity Agenda

568 Broadway, Suite 302

New York, NY 10012

Phone:212.334.5778

Fax:212.334.2656

Visit Public Opinion Monthly (http://opportunityagenda.org/public_opinion)

=B3Meta-analysis of opinion research monthly=B2

PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH AND COMMUNICATIONS

Summer Internship 2010

The Opportunity Agenda is dedicated to building the national will to expand opportunity for all in America through communications, research, and advocacy. We are seeking a student fall intern with a demonstrated commitment to social justice and equal opportunity, good research skills and understanding of communications, and the initiative to take on new and innovative assignments. A sense of humor and a dose of modesty are essential.

The internship is open to graduate students with a specific interest in public opinion research and media content analysis around social justice issues including immigration, health care, racial justice, poverty and human rights in general. The intern will work directly with the Public Opinion and Media Research Coordinator in the communications department of the organization. The precise nature of the work varies by project and is

based on the office's needs, but examples of work include:

- * Monitoring new public opinion research;
- * Assisting in coordinating logistics of public opinion research projects (polling and focus groups);
- * Assisting in analyzing existing public opinion research;
- * Creating visual presentations of data (charts, table, graphics)
- * Blogging on public opinion topics;
- * Assisting in media content analysis including using LexisNexis and other databases to identify appropriate articles;
- * Working with the communications team and highly acclaimed research consultants;
- * Creating power point presentations of public opinion data;
- * Assisting in communications projects based on the department's team;
- * Assorted administrative duties.

Qualifications: Candidates for this position should have a strong desire to work in public opinion research and public policy. The ideal candidate will

have some experience working in a professional environment and therefore bring to the position analytical, organizational, and general office skills along with strong verbal, written, and interpersonal skills. Strong Microsoft Office skills, especially Excel, are required. The candidate must be comfortable taking initiative and is a detail-oriented, energetic and quick learner possessing writing, editing and research skills. Applicants with previous policy or market research experience will be given preference.

The intern must be able to commit to it full-time for ten weeks. Some work may be completed off-site. The internship will begin in the first week of June. Applications accepted until March 31st.

The Opportunity Agenda, a project of the Tides Center, values a diverse workplace and encourages students with non-traditional experiences and from historically underrepresented groups to apply.

Location: New York City

Application Instructions: Please e-mail your resume and a cover letter (necessary to be considered) to eleni@opportunityagenda.org. Please no phone calls.

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Mon, 1 Mar 2010 15:20:18 -0500
Reply-To: "Murray, Patrick" <pdmurray@MONMOUTH.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Murray, Patrick" <pdmurray@MONMOUTH.EDU>
Subject: Snowbirds and the Census
X-To: "AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
In-Reply-To: <C7B1835F.D60F%eleni@opportunityagenda.org>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Does anyone know if "snowbirds" are tracked in the census? I'm referring to people who may be domiciled in a southern state on Census Day (April 1, 2010), but spend five months or so each year in their other home in a northern state. Thanks.

Patrick Murray
Monmouth University Polling Institute

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Mon, 1 Mar 2010 16:40:42 -0500
Reply-To: Rusty Parker <rusty@SCHAPIROGROUP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Rusty Parker <rusty@SCHAPIROGROUP.COM>
Subject: Job Announcement
X-To: aapornet@asu.edu
Mime-Version: 1.0 (Apple Message framework v936)
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=WINDOWS-1252; format=flowed; delsp=yes
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

POSITION INFORMATION

The Schapiro Group, Inc. has an immediate opening for a Strategist. A =20=

Strategist collaborates with colleagues, clients, and vendors in =20
various project roles. Strategists have responsibilities that include =20=

the following:

- Helping clients develop and clarify strategic goals
- Designing adequate yet cost-effective research solutions for client =20=

needs

- Developing quantitative and qualitative research instruments
- Analyzing quantitative and qualitative data
- Synthesizing results into meaningful analysis and strategic =20
recommendations
- Producing high-quality written work, including reports for clients

--Presenting project results to clients

This position requires experience with applied social research, =20
creativity, familiarity with statistical analysis, and strong thinking =20=

and writing skills. The successful candidate will be self-motivated, =20
but will also be able to work closely with team members.

COMPANY INFORMATION

The Schapiro Group is a data-driven strategic consulting firm located =20=

in downtown Atlanta that utilizes applied social research to answer =20
our clients=92 strategic questions. We serve a variety of public, =20
private and non-profit clients in communications, marketing, and =20
advocacy campaigns that contribute positively to the Atlanta community =20=

and beyond.

REQUIRED QUALIFICATIONS

--Masters in a social science or other field that uses applied social =20=

research or market research, or equivalent work experience

--Experience dealing with quantitative data collection, large data =20
sets, and statistical analysis

--Proficiency with statistical software such as SPSS or SAS

--Excellent verbal and written communication skills

PREFERRED QUALIFICATIONS

--Experience as a project leader

--Experience writing reports and presenting results to clients

--Experience writing proposals for new projects

--Experience communicating with clients and vendors

--Strong knowledge of SAS programming language

--Proficiency with Mac OS X and iWork

The Schapiro Group provides competitive salaries and benefits, and is =20=

an equal opportunity employer that does not discriminate on the basis =20=

of race, sex, age, religion, disability, sexual orientation or =20
nationality.

To be considered for this position, please send a resume, writing =20
sample, available start date, and any salary requirements to Rusty =20
Parker, Ph.D. at rusty@schapirogroup.com

Rusty Parker, Ph.D.

Senior Strategist

404.584.5215 x112

The Schapiro Group, Inc.

127 Peachtree St. NE, Ste. 1540

Atlanta, GA 30303

schapirogroup.com

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Mon, 1 Mar 2010 17:16:40 -0500
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Faux Census Surveys Follow Up
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Faux Census Surveys Follow Up
http://www.huffingtonpost.com/propublica/faux-census-surveys-follo_b_481260.html
or
<http://tinyurl.com/ybk277>

A few weeks ago we wrote about a faux "Census" survey being sent out by the Republican National Committee. We asked you to tell us if you've gotten similar mail. We've gotten about 40 responses pointing us to other examples of questionable invocations of the census and other official-sounding surveys that are actually fundraising requests.

SNIP

But any survey that asks for money draws the ire of the American Association of Public Opinion Research, says Peter Miller, the association's president and associate professor at Northwestern University.

"The Republican Census example is just a way-far-out-there example of a much broader problem," he said. "If you go back until about the time our organization was formed in the late 1940s, one of the major issues they mentioned at the first convention" was fake surveys that are really meant to raise money.

SNIP

--

Leo (We have ire?) Simonetta
Director of Research
Art & Science Group
6115 Falls Road, Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Tue, 2 Mar 2010 11:20:01 -0500
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: 1 in 4 Parents Buys Unproven Vaccine-Autism Link
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

1 in 4 Parents Buys Unproven Vaccine-Autism Link

http://www.nytimes.com/aponline/2010/03/01/health/AP-US-MED-Vaccine-Skeptics.html?_r=1&ref=aponline

or

<http://tinyurl.com/ylbckry>

By THE ASSOCIATED PRESS
Published: March 1, 2010
Filed at 6:24 a.m. ET

CHICAGO (AP) -- One in four U.S. parents believes some vaccines cause autism in healthy children, but even many of those worried about vaccine risks think their children should be vaccinated.

Most parents continue to follow the advice of their children's doctors, according to a study based on a survey of 1,552 parents. Extensive research has found no connection between autism and vaccines.

"Nine out of 10 parents believe that vaccination is a good way to prevent diseases for their children," said lead author Dr. Gary Freed of the University of Michigan. "Luckily their concerns don't outweigh their decision to get vaccines so their children can be protected from life-threatening illnesses."

SNIP

The new study is based on an online survey of parents with children 17 and younger. It used a sample from a randomly selected pool of nationally representative participants. Households were given Internet access if they didn't already have it to make sure families of all incomes were included. Vaccines weren't mentioned in the survey invitation and vaccine questions were among others on unrelated topics.

SNIP

--

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

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Tue, 2 Mar 2010 12:56:25 -0500
Reply-To: Michael Elasmr <elasmar@BU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Michael Elasmr <elasmar@BU.EDU>
Organization: Boston University
Subject: Call for manuscripts: How can we describe,
explain and predict the psychological processes involved in
public diplomacy?
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To:
<3248A9B21DD5574785FE5E2C8E521684F9EF2A@exchange.local.artscience.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Greetings! Just wanted to let you know about this call for manuscripts in case you know someone who is working in this domain of inquiry. Please feel free to forward to relevant researchers. I also would be happy to answer any questions you have about this call.

Thanks.

Michael

Michael Elasmr, Ph.D.
Associate Professor and Director
Communication Research Center
Boston University
http://www.bu.edu/com/crc/BU_Communication_Research_Center/News.html

Editor,
American Journal of Media Psychology
<http://www.marquettejournals.org/mediapsychology.html>

Call for Manuscripts: How can we describe, explain and predict the psychological processes of public diplomacy?

Media Psychology and Public Diplomacy
A Special Issue of the American Journal of Media Psychology

There was a time when much of public diplomacy occurred amongst diplomats and at times also targeted opinion leaders of various countries. Today, public diplomacy entails explicit and implicit messages sent by one country to members of a general public in another country for the purpose of shaping their attitudes toward some aspect of the sending country. What processes can best describe attitude formation and /or attitude change as it relates to public diplomacy in a global media environment? What role, if any, do the international media networks (news and entertainment, traditional and web-based) play in this context?

Researchers with interests in such areas as attitude formation and change, media-psychology, social psychology, cross-cultural communication, political communication, political psychology, public opinion, international communication, news exposure, international relations, media effects and related topics are invited to submit papers to the American Journal of Media Psychology for a special issue that focuses on explaining attitude formation and attitude change as related to international public diplomacy within a global media environment.

Submissions sought are ones that tackle this topic by either focusing exclusively on applying psychology and /or communication theories to this topic area, and/or conducting comprehensive literature reviews of studies that have findings that are applicable to this topic area, and/or carrying out theory-driven empirical investigations that focus on this topic.

The deadline for submissions is August 27, 2010.

The American Journal of Media Psychology is a peer-reviewed scientific journal that publishes theoretical and empirical papers and essays and book reviews that advance an understanding of media effects and processes on individuals in society. Submissions should have a psychological focus, which means the level of analysis should focus on individuals and their interaction with or relationship to mass media content and institutions. All theoretical and methodological perspectives are welcomed. For instructions on submitting a manuscript, please visit:
<http://www.marquettejournals.org/submissionguidelines.html>

To see a sample issue of AJMP, please point your browser to:
<http://www.marquettejournals.org/accessthejournals/amerjouofmediapsych.html>

Questions about this call for manuscripts can be directed to Dr. Michael

Elasmar, Editor, American Journal of Media Psychology at elasmar@bu.edu.

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Date: Tue, 2 Mar 2010 17:31:41 -0600

Reply-To: Mary.Losch@uni.edu

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Mary Losch <Mary.Losch@UNI.EDU>

Subject: Re: Experience with brief self-administered questionnaire in ABS?

X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Hello All,

We are about to launch an exploratory statewide ABS pilot project this spring and are

interested in learning about others' experiences with asking for limited information in a brief

(1-page) self-administered instrument to be included in the initial household mailing. This

would be in addition to the main/full interview that will be multi-mode (both telephone and an

online option available to eligible respondents).

If you have some experience with the ABS approach that included a brief self-administered

questionnaire as part of the mix and would be willing to provide the outcomes and your

assessment of the pros and cons of the approach, please respond to me offline and if there

are enough responses, I will post a summary to the listserve.

Thanks in advance. Best, Mary Losch

Mary E. Losch, Ph.D.

Professor and Assistant Director

Department of Psychology/Center for Social and Behavioral Research

2304 College Street

Cedar Falls, IA 50614-0402

(319) 273-2105

mary.losch@uni.edu

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Wed, 3 Mar 2010 17:35:44 -0500
Reply-To: "Featherston, Fran A." <ffeather@NSF.GOV>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Featherston, Fran A." <ffeather@NSF.GOV>
Subject: NSF Vacancy Announcement#: E20100041.
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

We have an open position in our division at the National Science =
Foundation. Please visit the web site below for a description of the =
duties and other details. =20

Position Title, Series, Grade: "Survey Statistician(Survey Manager)" =
AD-1530-04

Salary Range: \$105,211 - \$163,957

Vacancy Announcement: E20100041

Location: Arlington, Virginia=20

Opening Date: 03/04/2010

Closing Date: 03/25/2010

USAJOBS Link: =
<http://jobview.usajobs.gov/GetJob.aspx?OPMControl=3D1820662>

=20
Fran Featherston
National Science Foundation
703-292-4221
ffeather@nsf.gov
=20

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Thu, 4 Mar 2010 14:19:42 -0500
Reply-To: Joe Lenski <jlenski@EDISONRESEARCH.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Joe Lenski <jlenski@EDISONRESEARCH.COM>
Subject: NYAAPOR Event: "National Health Legislation: Politics and
Pollsters" on March 16th
X-To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

=20

New York Chapter - American Association for Public Opinion Research

=20

Presents

=20

National Health Legislation: Politics and Pollsters

=20

Tuesday, March 16, 2010

=20

6:00pm - 6:30pm Registration/Networking

6:30pm - 8:00pm Program

=20

at

=20

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY - Lincoln Center Campus

West 60th Street & Columbus Avenue

12th Floor Lounge

=20

=20

The speakers will discuss the history of public concerns and attitudes

toward major health care reform issues and how these attitudes relate to changes that may have taken place in national health care politics.

=20

Speakers:

Mollyann Brodie, Vice President, Director of Public Opinion and Media Research, Kaiser Family Foundation =20

=20

James Tallon, President, United Hospital Fund of New York City; Majority Leader, New York State Assembly, 1987 - 1993

=20

Moderator:

Raymond Fink, Councilor-at-Large, NYAAPOR

=20

=20

This event is free to NYAAPOR Members and Student members

Non-members - \$20.00

Refreshments will be served

=20

Please RSVP to: info@nyaapor.org or you can call (212) 684-0542.

=20

Visit our website, <<http://www.nyaapor.org/>> www.nyaapor.org to learn about upcoming events.

=20

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====

Date: Thu, 4 Mar 2010 13:47:58 -0700
Reply-To: Darrell Donakowski <dwdonako@UMICH.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Darrell Donakowski <dwdonako@UMICH.EDU>
Subject: ANES Announcement: The 2010-2012 Evaluations of Government and Society Study
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

As of March 5, 2010, the American National Election Studies will be accepting proposals for questions to include on a new series of studies

The 2010-2012 Evaluations of Government and Society. Proposals may be submitted through the ANES Online Commons. The following describes the goals of this study and the opportunity to include questions on it.

About The 2010-2012 Evaluations of Government and Society Study

The overarching theme of the surveys we propose for the period of 2010-2012 is citizen attitudes about government and society. These Internet surveys

represent the most cost-effective way for the ANES user community to gauge political perceptions during one of the most momentous periods in American history. Aside from the historic nature of the current administration and

the almost unprecedented economic crisis facing the country, we believe it is imperative that researchers assess attitudes about politics and society in the period leading up to the 2012 national elections. Specifically, we

have in mind here attitudes about the performance of the Obama administration on the major issues of the day, evaluations of Congress and the Supreme Court, identification with and attitudes about the major political parties, and levels of interest in and engagement with national

politics. This is primarily because these perceptions are unmistakably correlated with both presidential vote choice and levels of political participation. We intend to measure each of these topics at multiple points throughout the two-year period preceding the 2012 elections. However in addition to these subjects, we envision that each of these surveys would explore a particular aspect of these political perceptions.

This study will include five cross-section surveys conducted over the Internet with representative probability samples of American citizens.

These surveys will allow us the opportunity to pilot new items for possible

le inclusion on the 2012 times series. By offering multiple opportunities for the user community to place their items on one or more surveys, we will provide the capacity to survey on a diverse set of topics that are relevant to a wide set of research communities. Lastly, the flexibility of these surveys as to both content and timing will allow the ANES to respond promptly to emerging political issues in this volatile period in our country's history.

About the Online Commons

The design of the questionnaires for The 2010-2012 Evaluations of Government and Society Study will evolve from proposals and comments submitted to the Online Commons (OC). The OC is an online system designed to promote communication among scholars and to yield innovative proposals about the most effective ways to measure electorally-relevant concepts and relationships. The goal of the OC is to improve the quality and scientific value of ANES data collections, to encourage the submission of new ideas,

and to make such experiences more beneficial to and enjoyable for investigators. In the last study cycle, more than 700 scholars sent over 200 proposals through the Online Commons.

Proposals for the inclusion of questions must include clear theoretical and empirical rationales. All proposals must also clearly state how the questions will increase the value of the respective studies. In particular, proposed questions must have the potential to help scholars understand the causes and/or consequences of turnout or candidate choice. For more information about the criteria that will be used to evaluate proposals, please see:

http://www.electionstudies.org/studypages/2010_2012EGSS/2010_2012EGSScriteria.htm

or <http://tinyurl.com/ydp43ql>

The 2010-2012 Evaluations of Government and Society Study waves are currently scheduled to be in the field in late 2010, Spring 2011, late 2011, early 2012, and Summer 2012. The ANES Online Commons will begin accepting

proposals for The 2010-2012 Evaluations of Government and Society Study on March 5, 2010. The deadline for proposals for the first and second wave of

The 2010-2012 Evaluations of Government and Society Study is 3:00p.m. EDT

,

May 5, 2010. The deadline for members of the Online Commons community to comment on proposals will be May 12, 2010. The deadline for revisions to proposals will be end at 3:00p.m. EDT on May 19, 2010. The deadlines for later waves of the study will be announced on a future date. For additional information about how to submit a proposal, please visit: <http://www.electionstudies.org/> and click on the "Online Commons" button.

This opportunity is open to anyone who wants to make a constructive contribution to the development of ANES surveys. Feel free to pass this invitation along to anyone (e.g., your colleagues and students) who you think might be interested. We hope to hear from you.

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Thu, 4 Mar 2010 22:49:40 -0800
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>
Subject: how about them Cubs?
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

It's time to seriously think about the AAPOR annual meeting and that means baseball.

Cubs games:
Wed vs Florida, 1:20 PM
Fri vs Pitt, 1:20 PM
Sat vs Pitt, 12:05 PM
Sun vs Pitt, 1:20 PM.

The White Sox are away.

Of course, we all have our preferences for competing events. My vote I think is for Sunday since it has less conflict although means sticking around in Chicago longer. My other vote is Wed personally although I wanted to go to a short course then...

There are tickets available, but not in the best seats. It's time to decide.

-Leora

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

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Fri, 5 Mar 2010 10:09:49 -0500
Reply-To: Howard Fienberg <howard.fienberg@MRA-NET.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Howard Fienberg <howard.fienberg@MRA-NET.ORG>
Subject: MRA Volunteer Defends Exit Polling at Committee Hearing
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

March 04, 2010

A volunteer leader of the Marketing Research Association (MRA) testified this morning at a Minnesota committee hearing in defense of exit polling. Gayle Belkengren, President of the MRA Minnesota/Upper Midwest Chapter, spoke in the State House in support of legalizing exit pollsters' access to voting places.

The Minnesota House Committee on State and Local Government Operations Reform, Technology and Elections convened a hearing on H.F. 3108 today - companion legislation to S.F. 2388, which MRA endorsed last month.

Belkengren, testifying on behalf of MRA, commented, "Access to voters is essential to make this research work. The greater the distance between a researcher and the voting place, the more likely that voters will leave without ever having an opportunity to share their opinions."

Current Minnesota law doesn't allow anyone near a voting place "except an election official or an individual who is waiting to register or to vote". H.F. 3108 would add to that exception, "or an individual who is conducting exit polling" and define exit polling as "approaching voters in a predetermined pattern as they leave the polling place after they have voted and asking voters to fill out an anonymous, written questionnaire."

Exit polling, in addition to helping to create compelling election night

coverage, gathers important information, from people who actually voted, about their demographics, intentions, and attitudes toward candidates and issues.

Gayle Belkengren is a volunteer with the MRA State Capital Network and has been President of the MRA Minnesota/Upper Midwest Chapter since May of 2009. She has been in the marketing research business for 35 years starting at CJ Olson and Cook Research as a VP, and was most recently a senior account executive at Questar. Gayle specializes in business development and consultative selling.

MRA will be offering any assistance possible to pass H.F. 3108 and S.F. 2388.

Cheers,
HF

Howard Fienberg, PLC
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>

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Fri, 5 Mar 2010 10:21:10 -0500
Reply-To: Joe Lenski <jlenski@EDISONRESEARCH.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Joe Lenski <jlenski@EDISONRESEARCH.COM>
Subject: NYAAPOR announces the 2010 Warren J. Mitofsky Student Paper
Competition
X-To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

NYAAPOR

Announces

=20

2010

WARREN J. MITOFSKY=20

STUDENT PAPER COMPETITION

=20

The New York Chapter of the American Association for Public Opinion Research (NYAAPOR) has an annual student paper award to be given during our spring 2010 season. =20

=20

The award honors Warren J. Mitofsky, recognizing his extraordinary career in survey research and his contributions to the profession, its colleagues, and its students.

=20

Students in the tri-state area (New York, New Jersey and Connecticut) are invited to submit papers related to survey, public opinion, or market research. Specific topics sought include: substantive findings about public opinion, statistical techniques, methodological issues, new technologies or methodologies, or theoretical issues in the formation, change or measurement of public opinion.

=20

We encourage entries from any field that employ survey and opinion research, including political science, communication, psychology, sociology, marketing as well as survey methods.

=20

Coauthored papers are eligible as long as all the authors are students (graduate or undergraduate) at the time the paper is submitted. =20

=20

The winning paper will receive a cash award of \$250, and the author(s) will be invited to give a presentation of the paper at the June 22, 2010 NYAAPOR Evening meeting. Travel expenses will be reimbursed.

=20

Authors should submit papers electronically in WORD or PDF format by 5 p.m. on APRIL 30th, 2010, to:

=20

Joe Lenski

Edison Research

E-mail: jlenski@edisonresearch.com

=20

Submissions should include the author's (or authors') name(s), address, telephone number, e-mail address, and a description of the student status of the author(s). The paper should include an abstract of no more than 150 words. Papers should be double spaced and normally 15-25 pages in length. =20

=20

Receipt of the papers will be acknowledged by electronic mail.

=20

=20

-----=20

Joe Lenski

Executive Vice President

edison research

Tel: 908.707.4707 / Fax: 908.707.4740=20

www.edisonresearch.com

=20

Check out our newly redesigned web site @ www.edisonresearch.com
<<http://www.edisonresearch.com/>>=20

=20

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====
Date: Fri, 5 Mar 2010 18:56:26 -0500

Reply-To: Masahiko Aida <maida@GQRR.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Masahiko Aida <maida@GQRR.COM>

Subject: job opening

X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Hello=20

=20

We have another job opening;

=20

Please respond to jobs@gqrr.com

=20

Thank you

=20

=20

Senior Associate/Vice President

=20

GQR is an internationally recognized survey research firm specializing in public opinion polls and focus groups across the globe for political campaigns and parties, public interest organizations and foundations, as well as corporate crisis management and positioning. You can learn more about GQR at www.greenbergresearch.com.

=20

The Senior Associate or Vice President will act as lead analyst and manager for high-profile international political and corporate clients, working with company Principals or leading an independent project team in all aspects of survey research process including: drafting questionnaires and focus group guidelines, analyzing survey and focus group results, writing reports/memos, presenting findings and coordinating work for team members. The position will require much international travel.

=20

The ideal candidate is a problem solver with a career interest in public opinion research. A detail-oriented approach with excellent communications skills, ability to work fast, accurately and creatively under tight timelines and high pressure are essential. Position requires strong writing and management skills. Individual should be a team player and motivated, self-starter. Ideal candidate will have at least four years of quantitative/qualitative political/issue-driven research experience and political campaign experience.

=20

=20

Submit cover letter, resume and salary requirements to jobs@gqrr.com.

=20

GREENBERG QUINLAN ROSNER IS AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

=20

=20

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====
Date: Mon, 8 Mar 2010 08:48:24 -0500

Reply-To: "Fahrney, Kristine" <fahrney@RTI.ORG>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Fahrney, Kristine" <fahrney@RTI.ORG>

Subject: Save by registering early for the SAPOR Mid-Year Event in
Atlanta, Georgia

X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Dear APPOR members, there are still three days to take advantage of the reduced registration fee associated with early registration for the Southern Association for Public Opinion Research Mid-Year event on Thursday, March 25th in Atlanta, Georgia. This will be a great event for researchers and students who want to stay abreast of the latest developments in survey research! Mansour Fahimi, Ph.D, will lead a short course on address-based sampling from 2:00-5:00 p.m. A cocktail reception will follow from 5:00-6:00 p.m., featuring an open bar, hors d'oeuvres, and musical entertainment. Mario Callegero, Ph.D, will provide a keynote speech on the decade's most important methodological advances in survey research from 6:00-7:00 p.m. To see more details and to take advantage of the early registration free, visit the SAPOR website today at:

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

=20

=20

Kristine Fahrney=20

RTI INTERNATIONAL=20
3040 Cornwallis Road=20
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709=20
PHONE: 919-485-5531=20
FAX: 919-541-1261=20
EMAIL: fahrney@rti.org=20
www.rti.org=20

=20

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 8 Mar 2010 09:45:34 -0500
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: UW-Madison Faces Liberal Backlash In Polling Deal
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-7"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

UW-Madison Faces Liberal Backlash In Polling Deal

RYAN J. FOLEY, Associated Press Writer

<http://wbztv.com/wireapnewsnh/UW.Madison.professor.2.1543014.html>
or
<http://tinyurl.com/yzogcfd>

MADISON, Wis. (AP) — When the University of Wisconsin-Madison announced a partnership with a conservative think tank to conduct statewide polls last year, school officials envisioned only benefits.

The deal with the Wisconsin Policy Research Institute would give star political scientist Ken Goldstein a funding source and a platform to showcase his public opinion work. Graduate students and faculty would help and get to use the data. The university would build relationships with powerful conservatives - and perhaps boost fundraising as a result.

But months after the agreement was announced, it has turned into a fiasco.

SNIP

--

Leo G. Simonetta

Director of Research
Art & Science Group
6115 Falls Road, Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 8 Mar 2010 14:52:03 -0500
Reply-To: Matthias Kretschmer <m.e.kretschmer@GMAIL.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Matthias Kretschmer <m.e.kretschmer@GMAIL.COM>
Subject: GIS Software
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1

We are looking into GIS software packages, something that would allow us to create maps.

We would need a program that allows us to define areas relatively easy (for example DMAs by ZIP codes). Are there any programs that people use which allow us to do that without being too complex?

Thanks

Matthias

--
Matthias Kretschmer
<http://www.linkedin.com/in/kretschmermatthias>

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 8 Mar 2010 16:02:57 -0500
Reply-To: Steve Mockabee <Stephen.Mockabee@UC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Steve Mockabee <Stephen.Mockabee@UC.EDU>
Subject: Time reporting on Tea Party identification
X-To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
In-Reply-To: <AAPORNET%201003052100020738.8EB4@LISTS.ASU.EDU>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Dear colleagues,

Media reporting of poll results continues to be a point of much interest and concern among AAPORites. George Bishop, my colleague at Cincinnati, has written a letter to Time magazine pointing out their problematic reporting of a recent CBS News/New York Times poll about identification with the Tea Party movement. Here is the link:
<<http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1969734-2,00.html?artId=1969734?contType=article?chn=us>><http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1969734-2,00.html?artId=1969734?contType=article?chn=us>

Best,

Steve Mockabee

=====
Stephen T. Mockabee, Ph.D.
Associate Professor and Graduate Program Director
Department of Political Science
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, OH 45221-0375
phone: 513-556-3394
fax: 513-556-2314
email: Stephen.Mockabee@uc.edu

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Mon, 8 Mar 2010 18:59:41 -0500
Reply-To: Aneta Genova <genovaa@INTERMEDIA.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Aneta Genova <genovaa@INTERMEDIA.ORG>
Subject: Job posting: CEO
X-To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

InterMedia is the preeminent audience and opinion research organization dedicated to measuring and understanding the global reach and effectiveness of U.S. international broadcasting and other instruments of public diplomacy and strategic communications. Operating in 60 countries, InterMedia continues a six-decade legacy of trusted research in challenging environments for its U.S. and European clients.

=20

InterMedia now seeks a Chief Executive Officer to lead a highly =
qualified
staff of 40 dedicated men and women. Applications are invited from
individuals with strong, relevant management and representational =
experience,
familiarity with U.S. government contracting policies and procedures, an
innovative, entrepreneurial spirit and collaborative leadership style.

=20

Looking ahead, InterMedia aims to broaden its scope of research to =
support
the converging fields of public diplomacy, international development and
strategic communications.

=20

Inquiries should be directed to CEOsearch@intermedia.org

=20

For further information, including a detailed job description and
organizational overview, please visit www.intermedia.org

=20

NOTICE OF CONFIDENTIALITY:

This e-mail and attachments may contain information that is =
confidential, privileged or otherwise exempt from disclosure under =
applicable law. Dissemination, distribution, or copying of this e-mail =
or the information contained herein by anyone other than the intended =
recipient, or an employee or agent responsible for delivering the =
message to the intended recipient, is prohibited. If you are not the =
addressee or it appears from the context or otherwise that you have =
received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender of the e-mail =
immediately by reply e-mail, keep the contents confidential, and =
immediately delete the message and any attachments from your system. =
Thank you for your cooperation.

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Date: Tue, 9 Mar 2010 11:14:56 -0500
Reply-To: "Thee-Brenan, Megan" <thee@NYTIMES.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Thee-Brenan, Megan" <thee@NYTIMES.COM>
Subject: Re: Time reporting on Tea Party identification
X-To: Steve Mockabee <Stephen.Mockabee@UC.EDU> ,

"AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
In-Reply-To: <7.0.1.0.2.20100308155510.026f1ed0@uc.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I assume George Bishop is making his conclusions based on the trends and marginals that appear on nytimes.com/polls. Perhaps the trends and marginals aren't clear, but we percentaged the answers to the Tea Party questions off of the total. So, even though question 95 (Do you consider yourself to be a supporter of the Tea Party movement, or not?) was only asked of those who said they knew a lot, some or not much about the Tea Party, the percentages you see there are based on all respondents. If you add up the answers to question 95, you'll see that they only add to 66% which is the percentage of people who said they knew a lot, some or not much. TIME was correct - among all respondents, 18 percent considered themselves to be members of the Tea Party.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Steve Mockabee
Sent: Monday, March 08, 2010 4:03 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Time reporting on Tea Party identification

Dear colleagues,

Media reporting of poll results continues to be a point of much interest and concern among AAPORites. George Bishop, my colleague at Cincinnati, has written a letter to Time magazine pointing out their problematic reporting of a recent CBS News/New York Times poll about identification with the Tea Party movement. Here is the link:
<<http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1969734-2,00.html?artId=1969734?contType=article?chn=us>>
<http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1969734-2,00.html?artId=1969734?contType=article?chn=us>

Best,

Steve Mockabee

=====
Stephen T. Mockabee, Ph.D.
Associate Professor and Graduate Program Director
Department of Political Science
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, OH 45221-0375
phone: 513-556-3394
fax: 513-556-2314
email: Stephen.Mockabee@uc.edu

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .

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

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====
Date: Tue, 9 Mar 2010 13:16:41 EST

Reply-To: AmyRSimon@AOL.COM

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Amy Simon <AmyRSimon@AOL.COM>

Subject: Re: Personalized medicine

X-To: jsosin@krcresearch.com, lmanganello@krcresearch.com,

ABarlow@KRCresearch.com

X-cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

fabulous, thanks!=20

=20

Amy

=20

=20

In a message dated 3/9/2010 10:14:30 A.M. Pacific Standard Time, =20

jsosin@krcresearch.com writes:

=20

It=E2=80=99s a hot topic=E2=80=A6=20

[_http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/science/medicine/article7038239.ece=](http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/science/medicine/article7038239.ece)

[_](http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/science/medicine/article7038239.ece)=20

([http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/science/medicine/article7038239.ece=](http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/science/medicine/article7038239.ece)

)=20

=20

[_](http://www.independent.co.uk/opinion/commentators/steve-connor-most-drugs=)

-d

[ont-work-on-most-people-ndash-for-now-1913663.html_](http://www.independent.co.uk/opinion/commentators/steve-connor-most-drugs=)=20

(<http://www.independent.co.uk/opinion/commentators/steve-connor-most-drugs=>

-dont-work-on-most-people-

[ndash-for-now-1913663.html](http://www.independent.co.uk/opinion/commentators/steve-connor-most-drugs=)) =20

[_http://www.technologyreview.com/biomedicine/24703/](http://www.technologyreview.com/biomedicine/24703/) =20

(<http://www.technologyreview.com/biomedicine/24703/>) =20

[_http://www.businessweek.com/investor/content/mar2010/pi2010032_007178.htm=](http://www.businessweek.com/investor/content/mar2010/pi2010032_007178.htm)

[_](http://www.businessweek.com/investor/content/mar2010/pi2010032_007178.htm)=20

([http://www.businessweek.com/investor/content/mar2010/pi2010032_007178.htm=](http://www.businessweek.com/investor/content/mar2010/pi2010032_007178.htm)

)=20

=20

[_http://industry.bnet.com/healthcare/10001895/want-personalized-drugs-medc=](http://industry.bnet.com/healthcare/10001895/want-personalized-drugs-medc=)

o-
and-cvs-are-leading-the-way-with-your-genes/_ =20
(http://industry.bnet.com/healthcare/10001895/want-personalized-drugs-medc=
o-and-cvs-are-leading-the-way-wi
th-your-genes/) =20
http://www.pmwc2010.com/ (http://www.pmwc2010.com/) =20
=20
=20
=20

=20

Jennifer Sosin=20
President=20
T +44 207 067 0394 (direct)=20
T +44 7809 665 786 (mobile)=20
T +1 917 969 8354 (mobile)=20
KRC RESEARCH=20
Our insight. Your breakthrough.=20
CMGRP UK Limited | Registered office: Ground Floor, 84 Eccleston Square,=
=20
London SW1V 1PX, England | Registered number: 2442501=20
This message contains information which may be confidential and=20
privileged. Unless you are the intended recipient (or authorized to recei=
ve this=20
message for the intended recipient), you may not use, copy, disseminate=
or=20
disclose to anyone the message or any information contained in the messag=
e. If=20
you have received the message in error, please advise the sender by reply=
=20
e-mail, and delete the message.=20

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Tue, 9 Mar 2010 13:17:40 EST
Reply-To: AmyRSimon@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Amy Simon <AmyRSimon@AOL.COM>
Subject: PLEASE DISREGARD THAT EMAIL
X-To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

It was sent in error.

Amy

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Tue, 9 Mar 2010 15:53:34 -0600
Reply-To: "Reifman, Alan" <Alan.Reifman@TTU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Reifman, Alan" <Alan.Reifman@TTU.EDU>
Subject: compendium of summer stat/methods courses
X-To: "spsp-discuss-l@list.cornell.edu"
<spsp-discuss-l@list.cornell.edu>,
"DIV5@LISTS.APA.ORG" <DIV5@LISTS.APA.ORG>,
Family Science Network <FAMILYSCI@LSV.UKY.EDU>,
"SEMNET@BAMA.UA.EDU" <SEMNET@BAMA.UA.EDU>,
"aapornet@asu.edu" <aapornet@asu.edu>,
"Jdm-society@mail.sjdm.org" <Jdm-society@mail.sjdm.org>
X-cc: "McCarty, Michael" <michael.mccarty@ttu.edu>,
"jdw22@psu.edu" <jdw22@psu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

I am pleased to announce the posting of my fourth annual online compendium =
of summer statistics and methodology workshops, being held across the U.S. =
(and elsewhere) in the coming months (see link below). Please bring this t=
o the attention of any colleagues and students you think may be interested.=
Also, if you know of other programs, which I have not listed, please let =
me know.

<http://reifmanintrostats.blogspot.com/>

Thanks, Alan

Alan Reifman, Ph. D., Professor
Dept of Human Dev't and Family Studies
College of Human Sciences
Texas Tech University
Lubbock, TX 79409-1230
(806) 742-3000
<http://www.depts.ttu.edu/hdfs/reifman.php>

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Wed, 10 Mar 2010 14:52:43 -0500
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Whites in U.S. Edge Toward Minority Status
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Whites in U.S. Edge Toward Minority Status
Demographers say 48% of Kids Born in 2008 Were Minorities, and This Year
Could be the "Tipping Point"

<http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2010/03/10/national/main6284387.shtml?tag=cbsContent;cbsCarousel>
or
<http://tinyurl.com/yakm473>

(AP) Minorities make up nearly half the children born in the U.S., part of a historic trend in which minorities are expected to become the U.S. majority over the next 40 years.

In fact, demographers say this year could be the "tipping point" when the number of babies born to minorities outnumbers that of babies born to whites.

SNIP

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

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Wed, 10 Mar 2010 15:13:34 -0500
Reply-To: "Painter, John S." <PainterJS@VMI.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Painter, John S." <PainterJS@VMI.EDU>
Subject: Beginner question re: estimating MOE and samples size
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To:
A<3248A9B21DD5574785FE5E2C8E521684F9EF2A@exchange.local.artsience.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Colleagues,

Hopefully someone out there can help me understand some results that I cannot explain to my audience. I suspect the answer resides in the internal workings of one formula or the other. But algebra has never been my strong suit.....anyway here is the issue:

If I estimate sample size for a given margin of error (MOE) (e.g., +/- 3%) then turn around and plug that sample size into a formula used for estimating margin of error I get a quite different value for MOE.

I won't attempt to write the formulas out, but here is an example of the end result. If I go to this site <<http://www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html>> and estimate sample size for a population size of 1377, 95% CI, 3% MOE I get a recommended sample size of 602.

If I then use this site <<http://faculty.vassar.edu/lowry/polls/calcs.html>> to estimate MOE for my sample size of 602 (95% CI) I get an MOE of 4%.

Both of these sites produce output that agrees with what I calculate by hand.

Can anyone help me make sense of this? One apparent difference is the sample size estimate uses MOE and population size, while the MOE estimate relies only on sample (proportion for each is set to .5 for both). Or am I just making a stupid mistake somewhere???

Thanks,
John

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Wed, 10 Mar 2010 15:36:54 -0500
Reply-To: "Butterworth, Michael" <MXB@CBSNEWS.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Butterworth, Michael" <MXB@CBSNEWS.COM>
Subject: Re: Beginner question re: estimating MOE and samples size
X-To: "Painter, John S." <PainterJS@VMI.EDU>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <1A5D283567B2B847AF7F34E7B32F709F01979569@EMAIL.vmi.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Apparently the raosoft site is using the finite population correction, and the vasser site is not. The results from each site are what would be expected if this is true; and if the raosoft site asked for the total population size, and the vasser site did not, that would be supporting evidence.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Painter, John S.
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2010 3:14 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Beginner question re: estimating MOE and samples size

Colleagues,

Hopefully someone out there can help me understand some results that I cannot explain to my audience. I suspect the answer resides in the internal workings of one formula or the other. But algebra has never been my strong suit.....anyway here is the issue:

If I estimate sample size for a given margin of error (MOE) (e.g., +/- 3%) then turn around and plug that sample size into a formula used for estimating margin of error I get a quite different value for MOE.

I won't attempt to write the formulas out, but here is an example of the end result. If I go to this site <<http://www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html>> and estimate sample size for a population size of 1377, 95% CI, 3% MOE I get a recommended sample size of 602.

If I then use this site <<http://faculty.vassar.edu/lowry/polls/calcs.html>> to estimate MOE for my sample size of 602 (95% CI) I get an MOE of 4%.

Both of these sites produce output that agrees with what I calculate by hand.

Can anyone help me make sense of this? One apparent difference is the sample size estimate uses MOE and population size, while the MOE estimate relies only on sample (proportion for each is set to .5 for both). Or am I just making a stupid mistake somewhere???

Thanks,
John

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Wed, 10 Mar 2010 15:41:08 -0500
Reply-To: JAMES P MURPHY <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: JAMES P MURPHY <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Subject: Re: Beginner question re: estimating MOE and samples size
X-To: "Painter, John S." <PainterJS@VMI.EDU>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <1A5D283567B2B847AF7F34E7B32F709F01979569@EMAIL.vmi.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

One procedure is taking into consideration the (actually quite small) population (universe) size, while the other is not.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
J.P. MURPHY & COMPANY
www.jpmmurphy.com
600 921 2432 Princeton, N.J.
772 219 7671 Stuart, Fla.
610 408 8800 Mobile

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Painter, John S.
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2010 03:14 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Beginner question re: estimating MOE and samples size

Colleagues,

Hopefully someone out there can help me understand some results that I cannot explain to my audience. I suspect the answer resides in the internal workings of one formula or the other. But algebra has never been my strong suit.....anyway here is the issue:

If I estimate sample size for a given margin of error (MOE) (e.g., +/- 3%) then turn around and plug that sample size into a formula used for estimating margin of error I get a quite different value for MOE.

I won't attempt to write the formulas out, but here is an example of the end result. If I go to this site <http://www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html> and estimate sample size for a population size of 1377, 95% CI, 3% MOE I get a recommended sample size of 602.

If I then use this site <http://faculty.vassar.edu/lowry/polls/calcs.html> to estimate MOE for my sample size of 602 (95% CI) I get an MOE of 4%.

Both of these sites produce output that agrees with what I calculate by hand.

Can anyone help me make sense of this? One apparent difference is the sample size estimate uses MOE and population size, while the MOE estimate relies only on sample (proportion for each is set to .5 for both). Or am I just making a stupid mistake somewhere???

Thanks,
John

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Wed, 10 Mar 2010 15:47:53 -0500
Reply-To: "Painter, John S." <PainterJS@VMI.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Painter, John S." <PainterJS@VMI.EDU>
Subject: Re: Beginner question re: estimating MOE and samples size
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To:
<E08D38B65E01D840AB2A6FE5AE75F00418BBAAC9@NYCCNDX01.cbsnewsenps.cbsnews.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Thanks to those who responded so quickly to my question. Mystery solved: the finite correction is being applied for the sample size estimate.

Here is another question, which is what started things on my end. Does this 'short-cut' formula for estimating sample size also take into account the fpc?

$n = N / (1 + N(e^2))$ where n = sample, N is population, and e^2 is desired MOE squared

I do not get the exact results as the raosoft site, but it is close (615).

Thanks

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

From: Butterworth, Michael [mailto:MXB@cbsnews.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2010 3:37 PM
To: Painter, John S.; AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: RE: Beginner question re: estimating MOE and samples size

Apparently the raosoft site is using the finite population correction, and the vasser site is not. The results from each site are what would be expected if this is true; and if the raosoft site asked for the total population size, and the vasser site did not, that would be supporting evidence.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Painter, John S.
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2010 3:14 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Beginner question re: estimating MOE and samples size

Colleagues,

Hopefully someone out there can help me understand some results that I cannot explain to my audience. I suspect the answer resides in the internal workings of one formula or the other. But algebra has never been my strong suit.....anyway here is the issue:

If I estimate sample size for a given margin of error (MOE) (e.g., +/- 3%) then turn around and plug that sample size into a formula used for estimating margin of error I get a quite different value for MOE.

I won't attempt to write the formulas out, but here is an example of the end result. If I go to this site <http://www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html> and estimate sample size for a population size of 1377, 95% CI, 3% MOE I get a recommended sample size of 602.

If I then use this site <http://faculty.vassar.edu/lowry/polls/calcs.html> to estimate MOE for

my sample size of 602 (95% CI) I get an MOE of 4%.

Both of these sites produce output that agrees with what I calculate by hand.

Can anyone help me make sense of this? One apparent difference is the sample size estimate uses MOE and population size, while the MOE estimate relies only on sample (proportion for each is set to .5 for both). Or am I just making a stupid mistake somewhere???

Thanks,
John

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Wed, 10 Mar 2010 15:57:10 -0500
Reply-To: "Jonathan E. Brill" <jonathan.brill.wh82@WHARTON.UPENN.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Jonathan E. Brill" <jonathan.brill.wh82@WHARTON.UPENN.EDU>
Subject: Re: Beginner question re: estimating MOE and samples size
X-To: "Painter, John S." <PainterJS@VMI.EDU>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <1A5D283567B2B847AF7F34E7B32F709F01979569@EMAIL.vmi.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; format=flowed; charset="iso-8859-1";
reply-type=original
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

John,

The reason for the disconnect does not appear to be your algebra skills, but rather that the vassar.edu site appears to assume a population that is relatively quite large relative to the sample to be drawn from it. That is, the Roasoft site includes a factor for the finite population correction term while the vassar.edu site does not provide an input field for you to indicate the presence of a relatively finite sample population from which the sample will be drawn.

Several years ago, I created an Excel spreadsheet that made all of these calculations transparent and allowed the specification of a finite population. If it is truly important to you, I will see if I can find the

file and, if I can, I will send it to you.

But basically here is the calculation model (attributable to the statistician Quentin McNemar) that you can use to quickly build your own Excel spreadsheet (if mine cannot be found):

$MOE = z * (p * q / n)^{0.5} * FPCF$ where FPCF, the finite population correction factor, is represented by $((N-n)/(N-1))^{0.5}$

where

z = the z score for the area under the standard normal curve corresponding to the confidence interval of interest (e.g., 1.96 for the 95% CI)

p = the observed sample proportion of interest (expressed in decimal form)

$q = 1 - p$

N = sample population size

n = sample size

A couple of things of note:

1. MOE varies considerably for any given sample size but is consistently maximized where $p = q = 0.5$.
2. The limit of FPCF as N approaches infinity = 1. That is, when N is much larger than n , FPCF is very nearly 1. Generally speaking, when $N \geq 10n$, the FPCF is approximately 1 and this term can be (and typically is) ignored/dropped in the calculations.

Regards,
Jonathan

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
Intelligence - Research - Strategy
3 Oak Ridge Court
Voorhees, New Jersey 08043
Office: 856.772.9030
e-Mail: jonathan.brill.wh82@wharton.upenn.edu

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

From: "Painter, John S." <PainterJS@VMI.EDU>

To: <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2010 3:13 PM

Subject: Beginner question re: estimating MOE and samples size

> Colleagues,

>

> Hopefully someone out there can help me understand some results that I
> cannot explain to my audience. I suspect the answer resides in the
> internal workings of one formula or the other. But algebra has never
> been my strong suit.....anyway here is the issue:

>
> If I estimate sample size for a given margin of error (MOE) (e.g., +/-
> 3%) then turn around and plug that sample size into a formula used for
> estimating margin of error I get a quite different value for MOE.
>
> I won't attempt to write the formulas out, but here is an example of the
> end result. If I go to this site
> <<http://www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html>> and estimate sample size for a
> population size of 1377, 95% CI, 3% MOE I get a recommended sample size
> of 602.
>
>
> If I then use this site
> <<http://faculty.vassar.edu/lowry/polls/calcs.html>> to estimate MOE for
> my sample size of 602 (95% CI) I get an MOE of 4%.
>
> Both of these sites produce output that agrees with what I calculate by
> hand.
>
> Can anyone help me make sense of this? One apparent difference is the
> sample size estimate uses MOE and population size, while the MOE
> estimate relies only on sample (proportion for each is set to .5 for
> both). Or am I just making a stupid mistake somewhere???

> Thanks,
> John

> -----
> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
> <http://www.aapor.org>
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> signoff aapornet
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Wed, 10 Mar 2010 13:34:47 -0800
Reply-To: Hank Zucker <hank@SURVEYSYSTEM.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Hank Zucker <hank@SURVEYSYSTEM.COM>
Subject: Re: Beginner question re: estimating MOE and samples size
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; format=flowed; charset="iso-8859-1";
reply-type=response
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

We offer sample size and confidence interval (MOE) calculators on the <http://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm> page of our site. They both allow you to enter a finite population and do indeed produce complementary results.

Best regards,
Hank

Hank Zucker
Creative Research Systems
(707) 765-1001
hank@surveysystem.com

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

From: "Jonathan E. Brill" <jonathan.brill.wh82@WHARTON.UPENN.EDU>
To: <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2010 12:57 PM
Subject: Re: Beginner question re: estimating MOE and samples size

> John,
>
> The reason for the disconnect does not appear to be your algebra skills,
> but
> rather that the vassar.edu site appears to assume a population that is
> relatively quite large relative to the sample to be drawn from it. That
> is,
> the Roasoft site includes a factor for the finite population correction
> term
> while the vassar.edu site does not provide an input field for you to
> indicate the presence of a relatively finite sample population from which
> the sample will be drawn.
>
> Several years ago, I created an Excel spreadsheet that made all of these
> calculations transparent and allowed the specification of a finite
> population. If it is truly important to you, I will see if I can find the
> file and, if I can, I will send it to you.
>
> But basically here is the calculation model (attributable to the
> statistician Quentin McNemar) that you can use to quickly build your own
> Excel spreadsheet (if mine cannot be found):
>
> $MOE = z * (p * q / n)^{0.5} * FPCF$ where FPCF, the finite population
> correction factor, is represented by $((N-n)/(N-1))^{0.5}$
>
> where
>
> z = the z score for the area under the standard normal curve corresponding
> to the confidence interval of interest (e.g., 1.96 for the 95% CI)
>
> p = the observed sample proportion of interest (expressed in decimal form)
>
> $q = 1 - p$
>

> N = sample population size
>
> n = sample size
>
> A couple of things of note:
>
> 1. MOE varies considerably for any given sample size but is consistently
> maximized where $p = q = 0.5$.
>
> 2. The limit of FPCF as N approaches infinity = 1. That is, when N is
> much
> larger than n, FPCF is very nearly 1. Generally speaking, when $N \geq 10n$,
> the FPCF is approximately 1 and this term can be (and typically is)
> ignored/dropped in the calculations.
>
> Regards,
> Jonathan
>
> Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
> Intelligence - Research - Strategy
> 3 Oak Ridge Court
> Voorhees, New Jersey 08043
> Office: 856.772.9030
> e-Mail: jonathan.brill.wh82@wharton.upenn.edu
> ----- Original Message -----
> From: "Painter, John S." <PainterJS@VMI.EDU>
> To: <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
> Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2010 3:13 PM
> Subject: Beginner question re: estimating MOE and samples size
>
>
>> Colleagues,
>>
>> Hopefully someone out there can help me understand some results that I
>> cannot explain to my audience. I suspect the answer resides in the
>> internal workings of one formula or the other. But algebra has never
>> been my strong suit.....anyway here is the issue:
>>
>> If I estimate sample size for a given margin of error (MOE) (e.g., +/-
>> 3%) then turn around and plug that sample size into a formula used for
>> estimating margin of error I get a quite different value for MOE.
>>
>> I won't attempt to write the formulas out, but here is an example of the
>> end result. If I go to this site
>> <<http://www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html>> and estimate sample size for a
>> population size of 1377, 95% CI, 3% MOE I get a recommended sample size
>> of 602.
>>
>>
>> If I then use this site
>> <<http://faculty.vassar.edu/lowry/polls/calcs.html>> to estimate MOE for
>> my sample size of 602 (95% CI) I get an MOE of 4%.
>>
>> Both of these sites produce output that agrees with what I calculate by

>> hand.
>>
>> Can anyone help me make sense of this? One apparent difference is the
>> sample size estimate uses MOE and population size, while the MOE
>> estimate relies only on sample (proportion for each is set to .5 for
>> both). Or am I just making a stupid mistake somewhere???

>> Thanks,
>> John

>> -----
>> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
>> <http://www.aapor.org>
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>> Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
>> signoff aapornet
>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>
> -----
> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
> <http://www.aapor.org>
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> signoff aapornet
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Wed, 10 Mar 2010 17:09:18 -0500
Reply-To: Masahiko Aida <maida@GQRR.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Masahiko Aida <maida@GQRR.COM>
Subject: more job opening, Washington DC area, multiple
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Hello

We have another job openings (sorry for the multiple postings..) All positions are available immediately in our Washington, DC office.

To apply please submit a cover letter and resume to jobs@gqrr.com.

Please see <http://www.greenbergresearch.com/index.php?ID=399> for more detail.

(1) FIELD ASSOCIATE

The Field Department is a support function that coordinates and monitors quantitative and qualitative research. Field Associates assist analysts with determining sampling method and quota design, research and calculate turnout models, communicate with vendors, both domestically and abroad (calling houses and focus group facilities) and monitor the quality of their work daily, oversee recruitment and logistics for focus groups, inform analysts and programming of progress of research, gather population demographics to assist with weighting and projections, control costs, maintain ever changing master research schedule and occasionally provide face-to-face training of vendors on methodology, execution of survey instruments and needs for data delivery.

(2) Analyst

Responsibilities: Act as analyst and project manager for international political and corporate clients, assist company principals in all aspects of the survey research process including drafting questionnaires and focus group guidelines, coordinating internal research needs with field and programming departments, candidate and issue research, writing reports/ memos, presentation of findings, and proofing of documents and graphic presentations. International travel required.

(3) Senior Associate or Vice President

The Senior Associate or Vice President will act as lead analyst and manager for high-profile international political and corporate clients, working with company Principals or leading an independent project team in all aspects of survey research process including: drafting questionnaires and focus group guidelines, analyzing survey and focus group results, writing reports/memos, presenting findings and coordinating work for team members. The position will require much international travel.

(4) Director of Marketing and Communications

Greenberg Quinlan Rosner is the world's premium strategic political consulting and public opinion research firm, working with companies, issue organizations, and political office holders and campaigns in the United States and around the world. Reporting to the company COO and working closely with company principals, the Director of Marketing and Communications is responsible for overseeing and coordinating the company's public profile and facilitating marketing efforts.

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Wed, 10 Mar 2010 19:24:24 -0500
Reply-To: Linda Fisher <lffisher@COMCAST.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Linda Fisher <lffisher@COMCAST.NET>
Subject: AARP seeking senior research professional for new product
development research
X-To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Senior Research Advisor-New Product Development
AARP
Location: Washington, DC

AARP is seeking a senior marketing/new product development research professional, who demonstrates both creativity in research design and strong methodological skills, to help us change the market and the world as we work together to build and serve AARP's membership with innovative and market leading new products. With more than \$1 billion in revenue and more than 40 million members, we use our social entrepreneurship model to directly touch people's lives by pursuing our mission to improve the quality of life of all as we age. Business goals with a social mission - few market research professionals have the opportunity to help change industries and markets and influence the course of change on issues that will drive financial, economic, and political realities for the next 50 years.

As a member of AARP's Member Value Research Department, you will collaborate with AARP's marketing, membership, and new product development staff to design, implement, and report on research to identify the products and services that are needed to recruit and retain members, especially in the boomer age cohort.

Qualified applications will have a Ph.D. or the equivalent in a behavioral science field and at least ten years experience in marketing and market research, with recent demonstrated success in new product development research, preferably in the for-profit sector. He or she will have demonstrated competency in working with clients to draw out their research needs, and in following through to the translation of research results into actionable insights. The successful applicant will also have strong research design and analysis skills, including experience with a wide range of innovative as well as traditional research methodologies for both qualitative and quantitative research, plus strong statistical skills, including multivariate analysis.

The incumbent will be required to interact on a regular basis with internal clients and stakeholders across various units of AARP, as well as junior project staff, and vendors; and on an occasional basis with external stakeholders, including the media.

Qualified candidates are invited to apply on-line at: www.aarpjobs.com

(see
Mbr-KM-Senior Research Advisor-MVR). We are an Equal Opportunity
Employer that
values workplace diversity.
AARP offers competitive benefits with a 401K, 100% company funded
pension plan, health, dental, vision, and life insurance, STD/LTD, paid
vacation and sick, and other benefits.
Linda Fisher, Research Director, AARP

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Wed, 10 Mar 2010 22:12:53 -0500
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing
Subject: House votes to ban phony Census mailings
X-To: AAPORNET <aapornet@asu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The House passed legislation Wednesday that would ban misleading
mailings designed to appear they're from the Census Bureau, following
criticism that Republican groups were sending fundraising letters using
the census name.

.....

The legislation passed 416-0, after two Republicans who sit on the House
panel overseeing the census, Rep. Darrell Issa of California and Jason
Chaffetz of Utah, agreed to co-sponsor the measure. Sen. Tom Carper,
D-Del., has said he intends to move forward with legislation in the Senate.

Full AP report at:

http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20100310/ap_on_go_co/us_phony_census

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Wed, 10 Mar 2010 22:25:42 -0500
Reply-To: "Hargraves, Lee" <Lee.Hargraves@UMASSMED.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Hargraves, Lee" <Lee.Hargraves@UMASSMED.EDU>
Subject: Re: House votes to ban phony Census mailings
X-To: "AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
In-Reply-To: <4B985FB5.6010301@jwdp.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I got a Census mailing autographed by someone named Groves. It looks real, like a survey pre-notification letter. Says I should look for something in a week. It didn't ask for a donation.

From: AAPORNET [AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jan Werner [jwerner@JWDP.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2010 10:12 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: House votes to ban phony Census mailings

The House passed legislation Wednesday that would ban misleading mailings designed to appear they're from the Census Bureau, following criticism that Republican groups were sending fundraising letters using the census name.

.....

The legislation passed 416-0, after two Republicans who sit on the House panel overseeing the census, Rep. Darrell Issa of California and Jason Chaffetz of Utah, agreed to co-sponsor the measure. Sen. Tom Carper, D-Del., has said he intends to move forward with legislation in the Senate.

Full AP report at:

http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20100310/ap_on_go_co/us_phony_census

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Wed, 10 Mar 2010 19:29:53 -0800

Reply-To: Lynn Stalone <Lynn.Stalone@IHR-RESEARCH.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Lynn Stalone <Lynn.Stalone@IHR-RESEARCH.COM>
Subject: Re: House votes to ban phony Census mailings
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <4B985FB5.6010301@jwdp.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Nice - about time!!

LYNN STALONE, PRC | PARTNER | IHR RESEARCH GROUP | 14772 PLAZA DRIVE | SUITE
201 | TUSTIN | CA 92780 | DIRECT: 714-368-1885 | OFFICE MAIN: 714-368-1884
| MOBILE: 714-315-9453 | Lynn.Stalone@ihr-research.com

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jan Werner
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2010 7:13 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: House votes to ban phony Census mailings

The House passed legislation Wednesday that would ban misleading mailings designed to appear they're from the Census Bureau, following criticism that Republican groups were sending fundraising letters using the census name.

.....

The legislation passed 416-0, after two Republicans who sit on the House panel overseeing the census, Rep. Darrell Issa of California and Jason Chaffetz of Utah, agreed to co-sponsor the measure. Sen. Tom Carper, D-Del., has said he intends to move forward with legislation in the Senate.

Full AP report at:

http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20100310/ap_on_go_co/us_phony_census

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Thu, 11 Mar 2010 10:55:16 -0500
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims
By SEAN HIGGINS, INVESTOR'S BUSINESS DAILY

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=526858>

It's one thing to predict an election correctly.

It's another to predict how a rival will call an election and just how
and why he will get it wrong.

Pollster George Gallup did just that in 1936.

SNIP

--

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

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Thu, 11 Mar 2010 09:17:51 -0800
Reply-To: Dominic Lusinchi <dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Dominic Lusinchi <dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM>
Organization: Far West Research
Subject: Re: George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims
X-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To:
<3248A9B21DD5574785FE5E2C8E521684F9F4DE@exchange.local.artscience.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Thank you, Leo, for sharing this. I am always on the look out for stories on the Literary Digest's 1936 poll.

This story perpetuates two myths:

- 1) That Gallup "predicted" that the Digest poll would forecast a Landon victory and
- 2) That the Digest failed because its sampling frame was "skewed ... to the wealthy".

Myth 1: In a July 12, 1936 syndicated column "America Speak", Gallup wrote: "If the Literary Digest were conducting its poll ****at the present time**** [my emphasis], following its usual procedure, Landon would be shown in the lead." (Wash. Post, Section III, p.2, col. 7, Sunday, July 12, 1936) It's one thing to say "at the present time" and another to say "when the Digest presents its final results".... It is only after the Digest poll debacle that this story morphed into a "prediction". What Gallup really predicted, at that time (7/12/1936), was that the election was going to be a close one: the title of his column "1936 Election Seen As Closest in Years".

Myth 2: The Digest poll failed because its original sample, composed mainly of telephone and/or car owners, was irretrievably skewed against Roosevelt. A close analysis of a May 1937 Gallup (yes, Gallup!) poll, which asked its respondents if they had received and returned a Digest ballot card, shows that the ****principal**** cause of the Digest poll's failure was non-response bias. As Peverill Squire wrote in POQ (vol. 52, 1988, p.125), "if all those

who were polled had responded, the magazine would have, at least, correctly predicted Roosevelt the winner." In fact, its prediction (my analysis) would have been as good if not better than Gallup's - he was off by nearly 7 points of the two-party vote.

Why Gallup never referred to this May 1937 poll done by his organization when he commented (many many times) on the failure of the Digest poll...? Well that would take too long... got to get back to work.

Best,
Dominic

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

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta
Sent: Thursday, March 11, 2010 7:55 AM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims

George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims
By SEAN HIGGINS, INVESTOR'S BUSINESS DAILY

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=526858>

It's one thing to predict an election correctly.

It's another to predict how a rival will call an election and just how and why he will get it wrong.

Pollster George Gallup did just that in 1936.

SNIP

--

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

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Date: Thu, 11 Mar 2010 18:47:30 -0600

Reply-To: Julie Paasche <jpaasche@NUSTATS.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Julie Paasche <jpaasche@NUSTATS.COM>

Subject: Several Positions Open in Austin, TX

X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

We have several open positions at NuStats in Austin, TX or nearby San Marcos, TX. Click on the following link for more information:

http://www.nustats.com/nustats_dot_com/index.php?option=com_content
<http://www.nustats.com/nustats_dot_com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=87&Itemid=97> &task=view&id=87&Itemid=97

Senior Research Manager

A key role for maintaining and extending NuStats reputation as a leading edge, social science research consultancy. This position serves as an in-house expert in developing research designs, creating questionnaires, performing statistical analysis, and drafting reports. Senior research manager acts as project director of large-scale survey research projects. This position requires management skills and experience in setting and meeting research objectives, and in determining the best use of resources and staff time to meet those objectives. The ideal candidate would have a Ph.D. or equivalent work experience in an area with direct association with NuStats mission. He or she should have clearly demonstrated a minimum of 10 years social science research consulting experience, including management of large-scale and complex research projects and research teams, the development of project proposals, the preparation and oversight of project and program budgets.

Salary Range: \$68,500 to \$97,500

Click

<http://www.nustats.com/nustats_dot_com/templates/yet_again_new-menu/docs/senior_research_manager.doc> here for a full job description

Manager, Transport Survey Technology and Programming

NuStats, LLC is currently seeking an individual experienced in software development, systems design, and database design to join a leading survey science consultancy in the transport research industry. This position is new for the company. It will be housed in a new division that is responsible for technology strategy, programming services, and IT support services. The right candidate will have the experience, expertise, and drive to provide leadership and vision for a small but growing team of technical research staff. Corporate activities include the execution of survey consulting projects (primarily for governmental clients) and the operation of telephone research facilities. Our software and systems solutions cover a broad range of survey data collection, passive data capture, and communication applications -- all designed to deliver quality and timely data to our clients. Qualified candidates for this position must possess:

- * Master's Degree from an accredited college or university in computer science/engineering or MIS (equivalent work experience in a similar position may be substituted for educational requirements).
- * Five years of increasingly responsible experience in information service or product platform development.
- * Four+ years of project management experience.
- * Strong project management, communication, and organizational skills with demonstrated ability to initiate and coordinate detailed tasks and timelines while maintaining project budgets.

Salary: \$84,000 - \$112,000

Click

<http://www.nustats.com/nustats_dot_com/templates/et_again_new-menu/docs/programming_manager.doc> here for a full job description

Manager, Survey Data Collection

The manager of survey data collection will assist the Survey Operations VP in ensuring that survey data collection projects are implemented on time and on budget. At any given time, there are 10-20 survey projects under contract. Day-to-day responsibilities include: design of survey production schedules, monitoring and tracking of data collection execution relative to schedules and budgets, technical support for and mentoring of data collection project coordinators and supervisors, and delivering reports of production progress as well as drafting the reports of data collection outcomes.

In this position, the manager of survey data collection will be involved

in all modes of data collection, including CATI, mail, intercept, and internet, for NuStats, LLC, a 25-year old survey science consultancy, specializing in complex and large-scale social research studies of transportation and urban mobility. The role includes serving as in-house data collection expert in business development and establishing and overseeing best operational practices across various modes and types of collection. This position requires management skills and experience in setting and meeting data collection-based research objectives and in determining the best use of resources to meet those objectives.

Salary: \$42,000 - \$80,000

Application Instructions

NuStats requires that all resumes be accompanied by a completed application in order for you to be considered for employment. If you're interested in one of the job openings below, it's important to follow these steps:

1. Send a cover letter and resume (including salary requirements) to Sue Foster, Human Resources Manager, sfoster@nustats.com, 512-306-9065 or fax to (512) 306-9077.
2. Print out and complete NuStats application. You can fax your completed application to (512) 306-9077 or email to Sue Foster, Human Resources Manager, sfoster@nustats.com.
3. Print out and complete the Equal Employment Opportunity form. For purposes of reporting to federal and equal opportunity agencies, NuStats requests that all applicants fill out an EEO Data Form and submit it to our Human Resource Coordinator. This form will not be considered part of the application for employment and will be separated from the application. NuStats is an equal opportunity employer. You can fax the completed application to our Human Resource Coordinator at (512) 306-9077.

NuStats is an Equal Opportunity Employer

Julie Paasche

Senior Research Associate

NuStats

512-279-4141

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Thu, 11 Mar 2010 20:41:06 -0800
Reply-To: "Brown, Julie" <Julie_Brown@RAND.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Brown, Julie" <Julie_Brown@RAND.ORG>
Subject: Position Open - RAND Survey Research Group
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Mime-version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

The RAND Survey Research Group seeks a Survey Coordinator II, for our Santa Monica, California Office.

Overview of RAND Survey Research Group

Dedicated to high-quality survey operations, RAND Survey Research Group (SRG) was established in 1972 to ensure that the quality of RAND survey data would be as high as the quality of RAND's research analyses. Over the past thirty-eight years, SRG has become known for innovative survey planning, data collection, and methodological research.

Position Description

The main responsibilities of a Survey Coordinator are management of small data collection projects and assisting senior staff with management of medium to large data collection projects. Some travel may be required.

Specific tasks include:

- * Participating in research design discussions
- * Project management
- * Recruiting and training staff
- * Supervision of data collection staff
- * Some budget monitoring
- * Proposal support tasks
- * Authoring reports and client summaries
- * Interactions with clients

Education Requirements

Master's degree is preferred, Bachelor's degree is minimum acceptable.
Degree must be in a field of study related to social science or policy

research.

Experience

This position requires a minimum of 3 years experience with data collection management and familiarity with best practices in social science or policy research methods.

Security Clearance

Must be able to obtain a U.S. government security clearance.

How To Apply

Visit <http://www.rand.org/jobs/>

--

Julie Brown

RAND Corporation

1776 Main Street

PO Box 2138

Santa Monica, CA 90407-2138

Voice: 310-393-0411, ext. 6212

Assistant: Belinda Gonzalez

Voice: 310-393-0411, ext. 7121

Email: bxx@rand.org

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====

Date: Fri, 12 Mar 2010 08:17:14 -0600

Reply-To: Smith-Tom <smitht@NORC.UCHICAGO.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Smith-Tom <smitht@NORC.UCHICAGO.EDU>

Subject: General Social Survey

X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

In-Reply-To: <7BDB5A8BA3DA0B4F8EE786830BE58CA23E0485@NORCEX1.norc.org>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

=20

=20

****Final call****

=20

CALL FOR PROPOSALS TO ADD QUESTIONS TO THE 2012 GSS

Summary. The General Social Survey invites scholars to submit proposals to add questions to its 2012 survey. Proposals will be accepted on the basis of scientific quality and scholarly interest. Outside funding is not necessary. The deadline for submissions is April 2, 2010.

=20

The General Social Survey (GSS) project expects to include some user-designed, project-funded items or topical modules when it collects data in its 2012 survey, and invites proposals for such items or modules from users. Proposals submitted in response to this call need not be accompanied by funding to support costs of data collection and data processing. They will be judged with their scientific merit as a primary consideration.

The GSS is a nationally representative survey of non-institutionalized adults in the United States, conducted primarily via face-to-face interviews. A National Science Foundation (NSF) grant provides foundational support for the GSS, and for inclusion of items submitted in response to this call; other sources provide supplementary support, typically for the inclusion of topical modules. GSS data are collected every two years, and made available to the research community and the public as soon as possible after data collection is complete. Until 2004, the GSS was designed as a repeated cross-sectional survey. Beginning in 2006, a panel component was added to the GSS design. Through the use of appropriate sampling weights, each biennial GSS will provide nationally representative estimates of distributions of survey items measuring a wide variety of social and political attitudes, opinions, and behaviors of U.S. adults. For additional information about the GSS and its study design, please consult the official NORC/GSS website at <http://www.norc.org/GSS+Website/>
<<http://www.norc.org/GSS+Website/>> . =20

Beginning in 2010, the NSF grant that funds the core GSS survey provides support for costs of collecting data for some user-contributed survey items. (This represents a departure from GSS practice for the 1998-2006 period, during which proposals to add topical modules could be considered only if they were accompanied by funding from other sources. Such outside-funded proposals remain welcome, and investigators interested in initiating proposals for outside-funded items should

contact Tom W. Smith, the Principal Investigator and Director of the GSS at NORC (smitht@norc.uchicago.edu; phone 773-256-6288.) This call describes the criteria for user-contributed proposals and the process through which decisions will be reached concerning them.

Proposals for New Content=20

Proposals submitted in response to this call may advocate inclusion of supplementary GSS content that varies in length, from as little as a single survey question to as much as a topical module of interrelated questions that might require 5 minutes of interview time. Proposals should articulate the scientific objectives that would be met if the proposed items were to be added to the GSS and the specific research issues that the proposer would seek to address using them. Ideally, proposals will include the specific wording of survey items, documentation of their past use and performance in other surveys, and evidence bearing on the quality of data (validity, reliability, item nonresponse, etc.) they elicit. Demonstrating that items have proved fruitful in past published work, or that their inclusion would contribute to better understanding in key social science domains, can strengthen all proposals. In some cases, however, users may be able only to suggest a general topic area and examples of the topics and types of items that are of interest. Items that have synergies with existing GSS content, or that promise to be of interest to a large number of GSS users, will be of interest.

Users are encouraged to think broadly and flexibly when considering what kinds of items to propose. They may, for example, propose to collect data from some subset of GSS respondents (e.g. employed persons, currently married persons, or persons who have attended religious services in the past year). Proposals for survey experiments that administer alternative question wordings to randomly designated subsets of respondents are also welcome; such experiments may address substantive social science questions, issues of survey methodology, or both. Statistical power considerations are relevant, in that items could be administered to all GSS respondents or to some randomly drawn subsample of a given size. Proposals therefore should consider how large a sample an investigator requires in order to draw conclusions from the survey.

Proposals may suggest that items be added to the 2012 GSS as a one-time topical module administered to a nationally representative cross-section of US adults, as most GSS topical modules have been. Note, however, that the 2012 GSS will collect baseline data for a three-wave panel study (with anticipated follow-up interviews in the 2014 and 2016 GSSs), so proposals for adding repeated content will also be entertained. Investigators proposing panel content should address the value of having data on within-individual change on the proposed items. Because such proposals would involve interview time on three successive GSSs, it is anticipated that successful proposals for repeated/panel content will be shorter (i.e., will involve fewer survey items) than those for one-time inclusion of items. Moreover, proposers should be aware that NSF funding for the GSS project currently extends only through the 2012 GSS, so that any proposal involving repeated

content would be accepted pending renewal funding of the project beyond 2012.=20

=20

The rotating panel design of the GSS initiated in 2006 means that each GSS round now collects data for a freshly-sampled cross-section while simultaneously reinterviewing respondents from the two previous cross-sections. The reinterviews contain much of the interview time available for accommodating new content. For this logistical reason, much new content in 2012 will be administered to GSS respondents first interviewed in the previous two rounds (2008 and 2010), rather than to those newly sampled in 2012. Items in successful proposals received in response to this call therefore may be administered as part of a 2012 reinterview with respondents to the 2008 or 2010 GSSs. Investigators may need to make use of weights that adjust for between-wave attrition in order to obtain appropriate estimates based on their items.

=20

Generally, questions on the GSS are fixed choice survey items that are asked in a face-to-face context. Other formats are also possible (e.g., self-administered items, open-ended items, card sort tasks, or stimulus materials provided via audio or video) but such variations often increase time, complexity and cost (coding costs are substantial for open-ended items, for example). Hence, items with such formats must serve an important scientific purpose to justify the additional effort required; proposals to add such items should address this consideration.

Criteria for Choosing Content=20

The GSS attempts to provide high quality data in a timely manner to a large social science user community. Proposals to add content will be evaluated with this objective in mind by the GSS Board of Overseers and the principal investigators of the GSS.

The Board and PIs will refer to the following criteria in developing and encouraging new content for the GSS:

1. Above all, new content must be of high scientific quality, appropriate to the GSS, and justified on substantive, theoretical or methodological grounds. =20

2. New content must be useful to a wide range of users (e.g., researchers, teachers, policymakers, etc.) that extends beyond the investigator(s) setting forth a proposal. New content ideally will enhance the understanding and/or usefulness of GSS items in the replicating core

(http://publicdata.norc.org:41000/gss/Documents/Codebook/Replicating%20Core_0707.pdf

<http://publicdata.norc.org:41000/gss/Documents/Codebook/Replicating%20Core_0707.pdf>), GSS data previously collected as part of a topical module, or data from other sources (e.g., to be used for comparisons).

3. A primary mission of the GSS is to monitor social change in the United States over time through replication of survey items. Items that contribute to this mission because they have previously been administered in nationally representative studies of US adults (including past GSSs) will be of interest.

4. Similarly, the GSS seeks to understand the US by comparison with other world societies. Proposals to compare and contrast the US with other societies through including items that have been administered in recent nationally representative studies conducted in other societies will be of interest.

5. New content must meet human subjects protections, in compliance with the GSS project's IRB approval, NSF and NORC policies. Investigators should determine whether they must also obtain IRB approval at their own institutions.

6. New content must fit within the overall time framework of the survey and must not interfere with respondent cooperation and the integrity of responses to questions later in the survey.=20

=20

Time Line for Proposals and Development of Items=20

Significant lead time is required before new material can be included on a GSS survey. To be considered for inclusion in the 2012 GSS, investigators should submit proposals to Tom W. Smith, the Principal Investigator and Director of the GSS at NORC (smitht@norc.uchicago.edu; phone 773-256-6288) no later than April 2, 2010.

Proposals submitted in response to this call will be considered by the GSS Board at its spring, 2010 meeting. At that meeting, some proposals will be selected for subsequent development, which will entail the exchange of advice and ideas between the Board, the GSS PIs, and the proposer(s), informed by both cognitive and conventional pretesting of items by NORC; such development may extend over the following year, with interim review at the Board's fall, 2010 meeting. The Board will review the status of the selected proposals at its spring, 2011 meeting; by then it will be essential that proposals specify the provisional question wording for all prospective items (if one was not available in the first instance). The Board and PIs will select some sets of items for inclusion in a conventional pretest that will be conducted in the summer of 2011, which will establish (among many other things) the actual interview time requirements of the proposed items. At its fall, 2011 meeting, the Board will make a final determination as to the sets of items that will be included in the 2012 GSS.

It is important that investigators understand that inclusion of items cannot be assured until they have undergone the full cycle of development described above, and until the GSS Board has selected them for inclusion in the GSS at the fall, 2011 meeting. Space on GSS interview schedules is always limited. The Board and PIs may require

that the wording of proposed survey items be changed, based on pretest evidence or other considerations, though such changes will be made in consultation with proposers. Likewise, due to the scarcity of interview time, the Board and PIs may elect to include only a subset of the items proposed about a given topic. Data collected will be made publicly available to all GSS users along with the rest of the 2012 GSS, roughly six months after 2012 data collection is complete: proposers will not have exclusive access to data collected using their items for any period of time.

At this point the GSS is unable to specify precisely how much 2012 interview time will be available to accommodate items proposed in response to this call. It can say that numerous proposals for items and modules of the kind described here were successful in adding content to the 2010 GSS.

[Investigators who have obtained, or might wish to seek, outside funding for their items should consult the document "Guidelines for Prospective GSS Module Proposals" available on the GSS website: see <http://publicdata.norc.org:41000/gss/Documents/Codebook/gssguidelines.pdf>). Such proposals will be considered as part of a separate, but parallel, process.]

=20

Proposal Length and Format=20

Proposals submitted in response to this call should be roughly 2-5 pages in length, and should address the following points:=20

1. The background and the scientific, theoretical, or methodological motivation for inclusion of the topic in the GSS. Proposals for repeated/panel content should address the gains to be realized by obtaining data on within-individual change on the subject;
2. The specific topics, and ideally the specific items or questions, that would be included in the GSS, together with any evidence of the quality of the data they elicit;=20
3. Previous knowledge about the inclusion and use of the items, or items on similar topics, in the GSS or other surveys;=20
4. The appropriateness of the GSS for the proposed items, and any synergies they may involve with GSS project objectives or existing GSS items; and
5. If questions about multiple topics are proposed, a proposal should indicate the priority assigned to measuring the different topics in the GSS; likewise, if a proposal advocates using multiple items to measure a given topic, it should indicate which of those items are of higher and lower priority for inclusion on the GSS.

=20

Proposals from groups of investigators as well as individual investigators are welcome.

=20

The Board and PIs will review and discuss proposals, and notify investigators as to whether or not their proposals were selected for further development. At that point, the Board and PIs may request that investigators provide additional information, and may suggest that separate groups of proposers with interest in similar topics collaborate as part of working groups to develop a topical module. The Board regrets that it can not provide detailed critiques of unsuccessful proposals.

To reiterate, proposals responding to this call should be submitted to Tom W. Smith at NORC (smitht@norc.uchicago.edu <<mailto:smitht@norc.uchicago.edu>>) no later than April 2, 2010.

=20

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Fri, 12 Mar 2010 08:24:25 -0700
Reply-To: Michael Larsen <mlarsen@BSC.GWU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Michael Larsen <mlarsen@BSC.GWU.EDU>
Subject: ASA SRMS/AAPOR joint webinar, April 6, 2010, 1-3pm Eastern
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

The Survey Research Methods Section of American Statistical Association and AAPOR are proud to announce the next webinar in their new web-based training program.=20

Human Resources in Science and Technology=20=20
Surveys, Data, and Indicators from the National Science Foundation

Nirmala Kannankutty, PhD,=20
National Science Foundation, Science Resources Statistics,
<http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/>=20

Tuesday, April 6, 2010, 1-3pm EST,=20

<http://www.amstat.org/sections/SRMS/webinar.cfm>

Abstract:=20

The Division of Science Resources Statistics (SRS) is a federal statistical agency housed at the National Science Foundation (NSF). SRS=E2=80=99s role within NSF is to =E2=80=9Cprovide a central clearinghouse for the collection, interpretation, and analysis of data on scientific and engineering resources, and to provide a source of information for policy formulation = by other agencies of the Federal Government...=E2=80=9D Within this mandate= SRS is involved in collecting and disseminating information on R&D expenditures = and activities and on human capital issues. The United States is unique among major industrialized nations in that it has directly invested in collecting detailed data from a variety of sources on the entire science and engineering pipeline. Each of the data sources came about from U.S. federal administrative needs. The sources have evolved into important elements for the study of higher education and the scientific workforce. In this webinar, these surveys and data sources are described. Key indicators regarding trends in U.S. science and engineering degree production, enrollments, and workforce are defined and described. The Science and Engineering Indicators: 2010 and Women, Minorities and Persons with Disabilities in Science and Engineering reports will be used as examples = for these indicators. At the end of the webinar participants should be aware= of data sources and how data are collected, indicators and reports from the NSF, and where to find more information from the NSF.=20=20=20

Registration will be opened soon

For each webinar, participants register for a modest fee. Fees may vary from webinar to webinar depending on the length of the presentation and expected audience. Each registration is allowed one web connection and one audio connection. The section encourages multiple persons to view each registered connection.

=20
If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Rick Peterson at the ASA office using the below information.

=20
Rick Peterson
Education Programs Associate
American Statistical Association

732 North Washington Street
Alexandria, VA 22153
(703) 684-1221 ext. 1864
FAX: (703) 684-3768
rick@amstat.org
www.amstat.org=20

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Fri, 12 Mar 2010 12:46:58 -0500
Reply-To: colleen_porter@COX.NET
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Colleen Porter <colleen_porter@COX.NET>
Subject: Presentation Zen: book review
X-To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=UTF-8; format=flowed; delpsp=no
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Disposition: inline

I mentioned the book Presentation Zen by Garr Reynolds in my report of last year's AAPOR conference. With conference coming up again, I thought this might be a good time for a reminder. (That, and the book just became available at my public library; I had put it on hold last summer, but in a college town there was a long wait.)

I enjoyed the book a lot more than I expected. It was rich with lots of examples of how to improve graphics for presentations. And I particularly appreciated how it offered multiple alternatives of how to make a slide more comprehensible. Like many of you, we give presentations to various groups and what works at AAPOR may not be as effective with a community meeting, so understanding the audience and tailoring to each is important.

This philosophy is based on cognitive load theory, and the notion that "it is more difficult to process information if it is coming at you verbally and in written form at the same time." So the idea is to use slides that support rather than repeat what is said, slides that are more visual and with much less text than is common. He also stresses optimizing signal-to-noise ratio by removing all the nonessential elements (frames, 3-D effects) that are little more than "visual clutter" on the screen. He also talks about designing for clarity, not being seduced by decoration or ornamentation that looks amazing but may actually detract from the message itself (student assistants eager to display their skill seem particularly susceptible, in my experience). There are a fair number of examples of displaying data. He does some

amazing things with white space and placement on the slide. And his notion of contrast and repetition just blows me away.

One thing that clicked with me was the observation that, "a good oral presentation is different than a well-written document, and attempts to merge them result in poor presentations and poor documents." For a handout, we already do a 1-page summary with contact information and the most critical table or figure, rather than merely printing out the slides from the talk or poster.

Some of his comments,

"Images are powerful, efficient, and direct."

"Use bullet points rarely and only after you have considered other options for displaying the information in a way that best supports your point...."

"Have only 1 main idea per slide. Insert only 7 lines of text maximum. Use only 7 words per line maximum."

"No more excuses. It just takes a different way of looking at presentations."

Reynolds does approve of using "quote" slides. Here is one quote that stood out to me, that applied to giving an AAPOR presentation as well as a lot of other settings:

"This is the moment--this is the most important moment right now. Which is: We are about contribution. That's what our job is. It's not about impressing people. It's not about getting the next job. It's about contributing something." --Benjamin Zander

And for those of you interested in this topic, but waiting for the book on hold at your library, some of these principles are on the author's website

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

Also, I might add that recently we had a guest speaker (Bob Croyle from NCI) who gave an amazing 45-minute seminar talk without powerpoint. To be fair, that extreme might not work for AAPOR since most of our presentations are data driven. But a lot of us commented how rare it is to have a talk without powerpoint, and how engaging it was. "Being treated like a grown-up," was how one person described the experience.

Colleen Porter
Gainesville, FL

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====
Date: Fri, 12 Mar 2010 13:13:13 -0500
Reply-To: Keith Neuman <Keith.Neuman@ENVIRONICS.CA>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Keith Neuman <Keith.Neuman@ENVIRONICS.CA>
Subject: Re: Presentation Zen: book review
X-To: "colleen_porter@COX.NET" <colleen_porter@COX.NET>,
"AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
In-Reply-To: <26689675.21152.1268416018150.JavaMail.colleen_porter@127.0.0.1>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="utf-8"
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Colleen,

Thanks for posting this. I discovered Presentation Zen last year (perhaps from your previous posting), read the book carefully, and have been gradually incorporating these principles into my research presentations. With great results. It's not an "all or nothing" approach, which helps.

Keith Neuman
Environics Research Group
Ottawa, Ontario

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Colleen Porter
Sent: Friday, March 12, 2010 12:47 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Presentation Zen: book review

I mentioned the book Presentation Zen by Garr Reynolds in my report of last year's AAPOR conference. With conference coming up again, I thought this might be a good time for a reminder. (That, and the book just became available at my public library; I had put it on hold last summer, but in a college town there was a long wait.)

I enjoyed the book a lot more than I expected. It was rich with lots of examples of how to improve graphics for presentations. And I particularly appreciated how it offered multiple alternatives of how to make a slide more comprehensible. Like many of you, we give presentations to various groups and what works at AAPOR may not be as effective with a community meeting, so understanding the audience and tailoring to each is important.

This philosophy is based on cognitive load theory, and the notion that "it is more difficult to process information if it is coming at you verbally and in written form at the same time." So the idea is to use slides that support rather than repeat what is said, slides that are more visual and with much less text than is common. He also stresses optimizing signal-to-noise ratio by removing all the nonessential elements (frames, 3-D effects) that are little more than "visual clutter" on the screen. He also talks about designing for clarity, not being seduced by decoration or ornamentation that looks amazing but may actually detract from the message itself (student assistants eager to

display their skill seem particularly susceptible, in my experience). There are a fair number of examples of displaying data. He does some amazing things with white space and placement on the slide. And his notion of contrast and repetition just blows me away.

One thing that clicked with me was the observation that, "a good oral presentation is different than a well-written document, and attempts to merge them result in poor presentations and poor documents." For a handout, we already do a 1-page summary with contact information and the most critical table or figure, rather than merely printing out the slides from the talk or poster.

Some of his comments,

"Images are powerful, efficient, and direct."

"Use bullet points rarely and only after you have considered other options for displaying the information in a way that best supports your point...."

"Have only 1 main idea per slide. Insert only 7 lines of text maximum. Use only 7 words per line maximum."

"No more excuses. It just takes a different way of looking at presentations."

Reynolds does approve of using "quote" slides. Here is one quote that stood out to me, that applied to giving an AAPOR presentation as well as a lot of other settings:

"This is the moment--this is the most important moment right now. Which is: We are about contribution. That's what our job is. It's not about impressing people. It's not about getting the next job. It's about contributing something." --Benjamin Zander

And for those of you interested in this topic, but waiting for the book on hold at your library, some of these principles are on the author's website

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

Also, I might add that recently we had a guest speaker (Bob Croyle from NCI) who gave an amazing 45-minute seminar talk without powerpoint. To be fair, that extreme might not work for AAPOR since most of our presentations are data driven. But a lot of us commented how rare it is to have a talk without powerpoint, and how engaging it was. "Being treated like a grown-up," was how one person described the experience.

Colleen Porter
Gainesville, FL

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Date: Fri, 12 Mar 2010 23:25:55 -0500

Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>

Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing

Subject: Re: George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims

X-To: Dominic Lusinchi <dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM>

X-cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

In-Reply-To: <9552736208FA4CE29E5A90E35148F477@acer14219167c5>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

It's one thing to debunk a myth, it's something quite different to replace one myth with another.

Myth 1

What Gallup wrote in the July 12 1936 article was: "...if The Literary Digest were conducting a poll at the present time...the actual figures would be in the neighborhood of 44 per cent for Roosevelt and 56 per cent for Landon." Although it was presented as a throw-away comment, Gallup did not come up with those numbers lightly. As he explained to a journalist a few years later, he "was able to call [The Literary Digest's] shot by making a separate survey of telephone subscribers and automobile owners -- the class which would mail back most of the Digest's ballots." (Williston Rich, Jr., "The Human Yardstick," Saturday Evening Post, January 21, 1939)

The statement was clearly intended to provoke a response from The Literary Digest and thus generate publicity for Gallup's fledgling organization. In that regard, he succeeded. On July 19, 1936, the New York Times quoted an open letter from Wilfred J. Funk, editor of The Literary Digest, as follows: "I am beginning to wish ... that the esteemed Dr. Gallup would confine his political crystal-gazing to the offices of the American Institute of Public Opinion and leave our Literary Digest and its figures politely and completely alone...We've been through many poll battles...We've been buffeted by the gales of claims and counter-claims. But never before has any one foretold what our poll was going to show before it was even started."

Thus, even if Gallup's claim might not technically be described today as a prediction, it was certainly taken as such at the time by his target, and was probably meant to be.

Myth 2

Pevevill Squire did indeed write in POQ (vol. 52, 1988, p.125), "if all those who were polled had responded, the magazine would have, at least, correctly predicted Roosevelt the winner." However, he then goes on to say: "But more importantly, the initial sample was flawed; when compounded with the response bias, it produced the wildly erroneous forecast of the vote percentages." and then states that "a rough calculation of the bias produced by the sample is around 11%, with another 7% accounted for by problems with the responses."

Unfortunately, there is no reason to trust the data from the May 1937 Gallup poll used to estimate the nonresponse rate (as Squire himself admits, before going on to do so). There certainly is nothing to justify this kind of precision in divvying up error among specific causes.

The fact is that The Literary Digest did not define a sampling frame and did not conduct anything resembling a representative sample, random or otherwise, of the voting population, nor did they make much of an effort to keep track of what was sent out and what was returned. It's convenient to use the spectacular failure of their straw poll as a cautionary tale, but without any real documentation of what they did, or data to analyze, any attribution of specific causality is little more than speculation.

Jan Werner

Dominic Lusinchi wrote:

> Thank you, Leo, for sharing this. I am always on the look out for stories on
> the Literary Digest's 1936 poll.

>

> This story perpetuates two myths:

>

> 1) That Gallup "predicted" that the Digest poll would forecast a Landon
> victory and

> 2) That the Digest failed because its sampling frame was "skewed ... to the
> wealthy".

>

> Myth 1: In a July 12, 1936 syndicated column "America Speak", Gallup wrote:

> "If the Literary Digest were conducting its poll **at the present time** [my

> emphasis], following its usual procedure, Landon would be shown in the

> lead." (Wash. Post, Section III, p.2, col. 7, Sunday, July 12, 1936) It's

> one thing to say "at the present time" and another to say "when the Digest

> presents its final results".... It is only after the Digest poll debacle

> that this story morphed into a "prediction". What Gallup really predicted,

> at that time (7/12/1936), was that the election was going to be a close one:

> the title of his column "1936 Election Seen As Closest in Years".

>

> Myth 2: The Digest poll failed because its original sample, composed mainly

> of telephone and/or car owners, was irretrievably skewed against Roosevelt.
> A close analysis of a May 1937 Gallup (yes, Gallup!) poll, which asked its
> respondents if they had received and returned a Digest ballot card, shows
> that the ****principal**** cause of the Digest poll's failure was non-response
> bias. As Peverill Squire wrote in POQ (vol. 52, 1988, p.125), "if all those
> who were polled had responded, the magazine would have, at least, correctly
> predicted Roosevelt the winner." In fact, its prediction (my analysis) would
> have been as good if not better than Gallup's - he was off by nearly 7
> points of the two-party vote.

>
> Why Gallup never referred to this May 1937 poll done by his organization
> when he commented (many many times) on the failure of the Digest poll...?
> Well that would take too long... got to get back to work.

>
> Best,
> Dominic

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

>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta
> Sent: Thursday, March 11, 2010 7:55 AM
> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
> Subject: George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims

>
> George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims
> By SEAN HIGGINS, INVESTOR'S BUSINESS DAILY
>
> <http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=526858>

>
> It's one thing to predict an election correctly.
>
> It's another to predict how a rival will call an election and just how
> and why he will get it wrong.

>
> Pollster George Gallup did just that in 1936.

>
> SNIP

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

>
> -----
> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
> <http://www.aapor.org>

> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>
> -----
> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
> <http://www.aapor.org>
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>
>

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Sat, 13 Mar 2010 00:07:42 -0500
Reply-To: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>
Subject: Re: George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims
X-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <4B9B13D3.7060806@jwdp.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

All of us refrain from calling our pre-election polls predictions, but that needn't stop us from claiming validation when they turn out to correspond with the election results.

Early in 1968, I attended a seminar that Gallup held in Princeton for journalists, to prepare us for that year's presidential campaign. He recalled his Literary Digest stunt as "the most accurate prediction we ever made." And it was. He had the Literary Digest at 56 percent for Landon, and its final report was 57 percent.

What really killed the Digest was the high expectation set up by the 1932 election. It got that one within less than 3/4 of a percentage point, and everybody thought it was infallible.

But 1936 was a realigning election. Roosevelt had pivoted to the populist left and built his New Deal coalition of northern labor and southern farmers. A biased sample matters only if the bias is correlated with the thing you are trying to measure. The Digest's upscale bias did not hurt it in 1932 because the parties did not divide neatly along

economic lines. In 1936, they did.

I like David Moore's account in "The Superpollsters," second edition, 1995.

BTW, Alf Landon was a friend of mine. He used to visit the newsroom of the Topeka Capital when I was on the state desk, 1954-1956. And I still have the tape of my interview with him made while I was passing through Kansas covering the 1968 campaign.

Phil

Jan Werner wrote:

> It's one thing to debunk a myth, it's something quite different to
> replace one myth with another.

>

> Myth 1

>

> What Gallup wrote in the July 12 1936 article was: "...if The Literary
> Digest were conducting a poll at the present time...the actual figures
> would be in the neighborhood of 44 per cent for Roosevelt and 56 per
> cent for Landon." Although it was presented as a throw-away comment,
> Gallup did not come up with those numbers lightly. As he explained to a
> journalist a few years later, he "was able to call [The Literary
> Digest's] shot by making a separate survey of telephone subscribers and
> automobile owners -- the class which would mail back most of the
> Digest's ballots." (Williston Rich, Jr., "The Human Yardstick," Saturday
> Evening Post, January 21, 1939)

>

> The statement was clearly intended to provoke a response from The
> Literary Digest and thus generate publicity for Gallup's fledgling
> organization. In that regard, he succeeded. On July 19, 1936, the New
> York Times quoted an open letter from Wilfred J. Funk, editor of The
> Literary Digest, as follows: "I am beginning to wish ... that the
> esteemed Dr. Gallup would confine his political crystal-gazing to the
> offices of the American Institute of Public Opinion and leave our
> Literary Digest and its figures politely and completely alone...We've
> been through many poll battles...We've been buffeted by the gales of
> claims and counter-claims. But never before has any one foretold what
> our poll was going to show before it was even started."

>

> Thus, even if Gallup's claim might not technically be described today as
> a prediction, it was certainly taken as such at the time by his target,
> and was probably meant to be.

>

>

> Myth 2

>

> Peverill Squire did indeed write in POQ (vol. 52, 1988, p.125), "if all
> those who were polled had responded, the magazine would have, at least,
> correctly predicted Roosevelt the winner." However, he then goes on to
> say: "But more importantly, the initial sample was flawed; when

> compounded with the response bias, it produced the wildly erroneous
> forecast of the vote percentages." and then states that "a rough
> calculation of the bias produced by the sample is around 11%, with
> another 7% accounted for by problems with the responses."
> Unfortunately, there is no reason to trust the data from the May 1937
> Gallup poll used to estimate the nonresponse rate (as Squire himself
> admits, before going on to do so). There certainly is nothing to justify
> this kind of precision in divvying up error among specific causes.

>
> The fact is that The Literary Digest did not define a sampling frame and
> did not conduct anything resembling a representative sample, random or
> otherwise, of the voting population, nor did they make much of an effort
> to keep track of what was sent out and what was returned. It's
> convenient to use the spectacular failure of their straw poll as a
> cautionary tale, but without any real documentation of what they did, or
> data to analyze, any attribution of specific causality is little more
> than speculation.

>
> Jan Werner

> _____
>

> Dominic Lusinchi wrote:

>> Thank you, Leo, for sharing this. I am always on the look out for
>> stories on
>> the Literary Digest's 1936 poll.

>>
>> This story perpetuates two myths:

>>
>> 1) That Gallup "predicted" that the Digest poll would forecast a Landon
>> victory and
>> 2) That the Digest failed because its sampling frame was "skewed ...
>> to the
>> wealthy".

>>
>> Myth 1: In a July 12, 1936 syndicated column "America Speak", Gallup
>> wrote:
>> "If the Literary Digest were conducting its poll **at the present
>> time** [my
>> emphasis], following its usual procedure, Landon would be shown in the
>> lead." (Wash. Post, Section III, p.2, col. 7, Sunday, July 12, 1936)
>> It's
>> one thing to say "at the present time" and another to say "when the
>> Digest
>> presents its final results".... It is only after the Digest poll debacle
>> that this story morphed into a "prediction". What Gallup really
>> predicted,
>> at that time (7/12/1936), was that the election was going to be a
>> close one:
>> the title of his column "1936 Election Seen As Closest in Years".

>>
>> Myth 2: The Digest poll failed because its original sample, composed
>> mainly
>> of telephone and/or car owners, was irretrievably skewed against
>> Roosevelt.

>> A close analysis of a May 1937 Gallup (yes, Gallup!) poll, which
>> asked its
>> respondents if they had received and returned a Digest ballot card,
>> shows
>> that the ****principal**** cause of the Digest poll's failure was
>> non-response
>> bias. As Peverill Squire wrote in POQ (vol. 52, 1988, p.125), "if all
>> those
>> who were polled had responded, the magazine would have, at least,
>> correctly
>> predicted Roosevelt the winner." In fact, its prediction (my
>> analysis) would
>> have been as good if not better than Gallup's - he was off by nearly 7
>> points of the two-party vote.
>>
>> Why Gallup never referred to this May 1937 poll done by his organization
>> when he commented (many many times) on the failure of the Digest
>> poll...?
>> Well that would take too long... got to get back to work.

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

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

>> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta
>> Sent: Thursday, March 11, 2010 7:55 AM
>> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
>> Subject: George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims

>>
>> George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims
>> By SEAN HIGGINS, INVESTOR'S BUSINESS DAILY
>>
>> <http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=526858>
>>

>> It's one thing to predict an election correctly.

>>
>> It's another to predict how a rival will call an election and just how
>> and why he will get it wrong.

>>
>> Pollster George Gallup did just that in 1936.

>>
>> SNIP

>>
>> --

>> Leo G. Simonetta
>> Director of Research
>> Art& Science Group

>> 6115 Falls Road, Suite 101
>> Baltimore, MD 21209

>> -----
>> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
>> <http://www.aapor.org>
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:
>> aapornet-request@asu.edu

>> -----
>> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
>> <http://www.aapor.org>
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:
>> aapornet-request@asu.edu

>>
>>
>
> -----
> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
> <http://www.aapor.org>
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> set aapornet nomail
> On your return send this: set aapornet mail
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Sun, 14 Mar 2010 14:33:54 -0700
Reply-To: Dominic Lusinchi <dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Dominic Lusinchi <dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM>
Organization: Far West Research
Subject: Re: George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims
X-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <4B9B13D3.7060806@jwdp.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Jan,

Thanks for your response. Here are my comments.

Your statement to the effect that "It's one thing to debunk a myth, it's something quite different to replace one myth with another" is an inaccurate characterization of what I am saying. I am not replacing one myth by another as you seem to suggest - if I am: what myth is it that I am promoting?

Myth 1

The fact that the protagonists (Funk and Gallup) believe that what Gallup said in his July 12 column is a prediction does not make it a prediction. I repeat that what Gallup was ****really**** predicting was a close race: so says the title of his column (which I hope you received). The Digest editors came to believe, and were encouraged to do so by all the praise they received regarding its "uncanny accuracy" (10/31/1936, 6), that their poll was a "forecasting machine" (8/22/1936, 3), when in reality they had no idea how their poll results were produced - in other words, the belief does not make it so.

In any case, this (the so-called "prediction") was used as a great promotional story after the Digest fiasco to show and tell: show that the new "scientific" polling was the wave of the future and tell that the Digest "straw" polling was a thing of the past. For example, Crossley wrote: "The Institute [Gallup] even went so far as to forecast the DIGEST vote, which it did with remarkable accuracy by the simple means of tabulating separately that part of its ballots which followed the DIGEST's general basis." ("Straw Polls in 1936", Archibald M. Crossley, *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 1, No. 1. (Jan., 1937), p.29) The moral of the story: the "scientific" polls are superior because not only can they predict correctly the election but they can also predict what the Digest would forecast.

I agree with you when you say it was ****presented**** as a "throw-away comment"; but it really was a very cleverly worded statement. I also agree when you say that it was meant to "generate publicity for Gallup's fledgling organization." Think about it: if I (Gallup) am wrong, I can always say (plausible deniability) that's how things (the presidential race) were at that time (July); if I'm right, I can present it as a prediction (of the results the Digest will publish right before the election) and thereby trumpet the superiority of my "scientific" polling methods. The statement has to be analyzed within an overall strategy to dominate the opinion polling domain.

Gallup and his fellow "scientific" pollsters were not disinterested parties searching for the cause of the failure of the DIGEST poll out of some academic interest. They wanted to be top dogs and knock the Digest off its pedestal. They used the Digest incident, especially in the early years, to promote what they considered to be a superior "product": their "scientific" polling. Of course, they were to receive a nasty shock in 1948 - although not fatal to them, as 1936 was for the Digest.

Myth 2

I had the opportunity, thanks to the Roper Center, to have access to the raw data from the May 1937 AIPO (Gallup) poll. First the data in its raw form requires some editing because the file contains some anomalies. For example, you might have noticed that in Squire's table 2 (p.130) there are 780 respondents that claim to have received the Digest ballot, while in table 3 (p.131), which reports what they did with the ballot (returned or not or don't know), there are 829 respondents! Squire analyzed the data at face value.

Second, Squire did not weight the data despite the fact that we have information that allows us to do so: each candidate's share of the actual vote, the response rate to the Digest (~24%), and the percent each candidate received from respondents to the poll. This takes care of anomalies, pointed out by Squire, such as over-report of support for FDR, over-sampling of Digest poll respondents, and over-report of support for FDR among respondents.

The weighted results confirm much of Squire's conclusions: had the Digest relied solely on telephone and car owners it would have forecast a Roosevelt victory; Digest non-respondents were strongly in favor of FDR; and, last but not least, had all those who were polled by the Digest responded, the magazine would have pointed to the correct candidate. In other words, yes the Digest original sample of 10M was biased but not sufficiently to have prevented it from calling a Roosevelt victory. In fact, a less "rough calculation" (Squire, p.131) shows that non-response bias was the main culprit.

Ironically, the samples Gallup used throughout the 30s and 40s were also biased - in favor of Republicans. And he was called on that (e.g. Special House Committee Investigating Campaign Expenditures, 1944).

The conclusions based on the May 1937 poll (e.g. non-response as the main cause of the 1936 Digest poll failure) are consistent with other available data. I have re-analyzed the data provided by Cahalan in his Cedar Rapids study in 1936-7 reported in his 1989 POQ (vol. 53 pp.129-133) and in 1939 Psychological Record (vol.1, no.1, pp.3-11) papers. The results show that the Digest list used for that city was not biased and that respondents and non-respondents were very different in their candidate preference. Add to that the results from Allentown, Scranton and Chicago where only registered voters were polled (Digest, 14 November, 1936, p.7) and I would say we have some pretty solid "real documentation".

Does this amount to a definitive answer? No, absolutely not. The only way we could have resolved the question would have been to conduct, on the original sample of 10M, the same type of study that Cahalan performed in Cedar Rapids: select a random sample from the Digest list and ask respondents whether or not they sent in their Digest ballot and which candidate they favored at that time.

Short of that the May 1937 AIPO survey, the Cahalan study and the results from Allentown, Scranton and Chicago is the best we have. Speculation you say? Well, yes, I suppose you're right, but a lot less than simply repeating the old refrain repeated by so many: "The failure of the Literary Digest's

polling approach can be explained simply. The Digest's sample of voters was drawn from lists of automobile and telephones owners." (Gallup, 1972, "Opinion Polling in a Democracy", in Statistics: A Guide to the Unknown, Judith M. Tanur et al. (eds.), San Francisco, Holden-Day, p.147.)

Best regards,
Dominic

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

From: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com]
Sent: Friday, March 12, 2010 8:26 PM
To: Dominic Lusinchi
Cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims

It's one thing to debunk a myth, it's something quite different to replace one myth with another.

Myth 1

What Gallup wrote in the July 12 1936 article was: "...if The Literary Digest were conducting a poll at the present time...the actual figures would be in the neighborhood of 44 per cent for Roosevelt and 56 per cent for Landon." Although it was presented as a throw-away comment, Gallup did not come up with those numbers lightly. As he explained to a journalist a few years later, he "was able to call [The Literary Digest's] shot by making a separate survey of telephone subscribers and automobile owners -- the class which would mail back most of the Digest's ballots." (Williston Rich, Jr., "The Human Yardstick," Saturday Evening Post, January 21, 1939)

The statement was clearly intended to provoke a response from The Literary Digest and thus generate publicity for Gallup's fledgling organization. In that regard, he succeeded. On July 19, 1936, the New York Times quoted an open letter from Wilfred J. Funk, editor of The Literary Digest, as follows: "I am beginning to wish ... that the esteemed Dr. Gallup would confine his political crystal-gazing to the offices of the American Institute of Public Opinion and leave our Literary Digest and its figures politely and completely alone...We've been through many poll battles...We've been buffeted by the gales of claims and counter-claims. But never before has any one foretold what our poll was going to show before it was even started."

Thus, even if Gallup's claim might not technically be described today as a prediction, it was certainly taken as such at the time by his target, and was probably meant to be.

Myth 2

Peveerill Squire did indeed write in POQ (vol. 52, 1988, p.125), "if all those who were polled had responded, the magazine would have, at least, correctly predicted Roosevelt the winner." However, he then goes on to

say: "But more importantly, the initial sample was flawed; when compounded with the response bias, it produced the wildly erroneous forecast of the vote percentages." and then states that "a rough calculation of the bias produced by the sample is around 11%, with another 7% accounted for by problems with the responses." Unfortunately, there is no reason to trust the data from the May 1937 Gallup poll used to estimate the nonresponse rate (as Squire himself admits, before going on to do so). There certainly is nothing to justify this kind of precision in divvying up error among specific causes.

The fact is that The Literary Digest did not define a sampling frame and did not conduct anything resembling a representative sample, random or otherwise, of the voting population, nor did they make much of an effort to keep track of what was sent out and what was returned. It's convenient to use the spectacular failure of their straw poll as a cautionary tale, but without any real documentation of what they did, or data to analyze, any attribution of specific causality is little more than speculation.

Jan Werner

Dominic Lusinchi wrote:

- > Thank you, Leo, for sharing this. I am always on the look out for stories on
- > the Literary Digest's 1936 poll.
- >
- > This story perpetuates two myths:
- >
- > 1) That Gallup "predicted" that the Digest poll would forecast a Landon
- > victory and
- > 2) That the Digest failed because its sampling frame was "skewed ... to
- > the
- > wealthy".
- >
- > Myth 1: In a July 12, 1936 syndicated column "America Speak", Gallup
- > wrote:
- > "If the Literary Digest were conducting its poll **at the present time**
- > [my
- > emphasis], following its usual procedure, Landon would be shown in the
- > lead." (Wash. Post, Section III, p.2, col. 7, Sunday, July 12, 1936) It's
- > one thing to say "at the present time" and another to say "when the Digest
- > presents its final results".... It is only after the Digest poll debacle
- > that this story morphed into a "prediction". What Gallup really predicted,
- > at that time (7/12/1936), was that the election was going to be a close
- > one:
- > the title of his column "1936 Election Seen As Closest in Years".
- >
- > Myth 2: The Digest poll failed because its original sample, composed
- > mainly
- > of telephone and/or car owners, was irretrievably skewed against
- > Roosevelt.
- > A close analysis of a May 1937 Gallup (yes, Gallup!) poll, which asked its
- > respondents if they had received and returned a Digest ballot card, shows

> that the ****principal**** cause of the Digest poll's failure was non-response
> bias. As Peverill Squire wrote in POQ (vol. 52, 1988, p.125), "if all
those
> who were polled had responded, the magazine would have, at least,
correctly
> predicted Roosevelt the winner." In fact, its prediction (my analysis)
would
> have been as good if not better than Gallup's - he was off by nearly 7
> points of the two-party vote.
>
> Why Gallup never referred to this May 1937 poll done by his organization
> when he commented (many many times) on the failure of the Digest poll...?
> Well that would take too long... got to get back to work.

> Best,
> Dominic

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

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta
> Sent: Thursday, March 11, 2010 7:55 AM
> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
> Subject: George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims

> George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims
> By SEAN HIGGINS, INVESTOR'S BUSINESS DAILY

> <http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=526858>

> It's one thing to predict an election correctly.

> It's another to predict how a rival will call an election and just how
> and why he will get it wrong.

> Pollster George Gallup did just that in 1936.

> SNIP

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

> -----
> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
> <http://www.aapor.org>

> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu
>
> -----
> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
> <http://www.aapor.org>
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu
>
>

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Sun, 14 Mar 2010 19:46:35 -0400
Reply-To: rfunk787@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "G. Ray Funkhouser" <rfunk787@AOL.COM>
Subject: Re: George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims
X-To: dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <F21719741A6144AE9CF8DBF1636BDE2B@acer14219167c5>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

On the occasions when this sort of thoughtful and informative discussion= appears, I am grateful that AAPORNET provides it a forum. Thank you, Le= o, Jan and Dominic.

Ray Funkhouser

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

From: Dominic Lusinchi <dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM>
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Sent: Sun, Mar 14, 2010 5:33 pm
Subject: Re: George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims

Jan,

Thanks for your response. Here are my comments.

Your statement to the effect that "It's one thing to debunk a myth, it's something quite different to replace one myth with another" is an inaccurate characterization of what I am saying. I am not replacing one myth by another as you seem to suggest - if I am: what myth is it that I am promoting?

Myth 1

The fact that the protagonists (Funk and Gallup) believe that what Gallup said in his July 12 column is a prediction does not make it a prediction. I repeat that what Gallup was ****really**** predicting was a close race: so says the title of his column (which I hope you received). The Digest editors came to believe, and were encouraged to do so by all the praise they received regarding its "uncanny accuracy" (10/31/1936, 6), that their poll was a "forecasting machine" (8/22/1936, 3), when in reality they had no idea how their poll results were produced - in other words, the belief does not make it so.

In any case, this (the so-called "prediction") was used as a great promotional story after the Digest fiasco to show and tell: show that the new "scientific" polling was the wave of the future and tell that the Digest "straw" polling was a thing of the past. For example, Crossley wrote: "The Institute [Gallup] even went so far as to forecast the DIGEST vote, which it did with remarkable accuracy by the simple means of tabulating separately that part of its ballots which followed the DIGEST's general basis." ("Straw Polls in 1936", Archibald M. Crossley, *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 1, No. 1. (Jan., 1937), p.29) The moral of the story: the "scientific" polls are superior because not only can they predict correctly the election but they can also predict what the Digest would forecast.

I agree with you when you say it was ****"presented**** as a "throw-away comment"; but it really was a very cleverly worded statement. I also agree when you say that it was meant to "generate publicity for Gallup's fledgling organization." Think about it: if I (Gallup) am wrong, I can always say (plausible deniability) that's how things (the presidential race) were at that time (July); if I'm right, I can present it as a prediction (of the results the Digest will publish right before the election) and thereby trumpet the superiority of my "scientific" polling methods. The statement has to be analyzed within an overall strategy to dominate the opinion polling domain.

Gallup and his fellow "scientific" pollsters were not disinterested parties

searching for the cause of the failure of the DIGEST poll out of some academic interest. They wanted to be top dogs and knock the Digest off its pedestal. They used the Digest incident, especially in the early years, to promote what they considered to be a superior "product": their "scientific=" polling. Of course, they were to receive a nasty shock in 1948 - although not fatal to them, as 1936 was for the Digest.

Myth 2

I had the opportunity, thanks to the Roper Center, to have access to the raw data from the May 1937 AIPO (Gallup) poll. First the data in its raw form requires some editing because the file contains some anomalies. For example, you might have noticed that in Squire's table 2 (p.130) there are 780 respondents that claim to have received the Digest ballot, while in table 3 (p.131), which reports what they did with the ballot (returned or not or don't know), there are 829 respondents! Squire analyzed the data at face value.

Second, Squire did not weight the data despite the fact that we have information that allows us to do so: each candidate's share of the actual vote, the response rate to the Digest (~24%), and the percent each candidate received from respondents to the poll. This takes care of anomalies, pointed out by Squire, such as over-report of support for FDR, over-sampling of Digest poll respondents, and over-report of support for FDR among respondents.

The weighted results confirm much of Squire's conclusions: had the Digest relied solely on telephone and car owners it would have forecast a Roosevelt victory; Digest non-respondents were strongly in favor of FDR; and, last but not least, had all those who were polled by the Digest responded, the magazine would have pointed to the correct candidate. In other words, yes the Digest original sample of 10M was biased but not sufficiently to have prevented it from calling a Roosevelt victory. In fact, a less "rough calculation" (Squire, p.131) shows that non-response bias was the main culprit.

Ironically, the samples Gallup used throughout the 30s and 40s were also biased - in favor of Republicans. And he was called on that (e.g. Special House Committee Investigating Campaign Expenditures, 1944).

The conclusions based on the May 1937 poll (e.g. non-response as the main cause of the 1936 Digest poll failure) are consistent with other available data. I have re-analyzed the data provided by Cahalan in his Cedar Rapids study in 1936-7 reported in his 1989 POQ (vol. 53 pp.129-133) and in 1939 Psychological Record (vol.1, no.1, pp.3-11) papers. The results show that the Digest list used for that city was not biased and that respondents and

non-respondents were very different in their candidate preference. Add to that the results from Allentown, Scranton and Chicago where only registered voters were polled (Digest, 14 November, 1936, p.7) and I would say we have some pretty solid "real documentation".

Does this amount to a definitive answer? No, absolutely not. The only way we could have resolved the question would have been to conduct, on the original sample of 10M, the same type of study that Cahalan performed in Cedar Rapids: select a random sample from the Digest list and ask respondents whether or not they sent in their Digest ballot and which candidate they favored at that time.

Short of that the May 1937 AIPO survey, the Cahalan study and the results from Allentown, Scranton and Chicago is the best we have. Speculation you say? Well, yes, I suppose you're right, but a lot less than simply repeating the old refrain repeated by so many: "The failure of the Literary Digest's polling approach can be explained simply. The Digest's sample of voters was drawn from lists of automobile and telephone owners." (Gallup, 1972, "Opinion Polling in a Democracy", in Statistics: A Guide to the Unknown, Judith M. Tanur et al. (eds.), San Francisco, Holden-Day, p.147.)

Best regards,
Dominic

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

From: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com]
Sent: Friday, March 12, 2010 8:26 PM
To: Dominic Lusinchi
Cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims

It's one thing to debunk a myth, it's something quite different to replace one myth with another.

Myth 1

What Gallup wrote in the July 12 1936 article was: "...if The Literary Digest were conducting a poll at the present time...the actual figures would be in the neighborhood of 44 per cent for Roosevelt and 56 per cent for Landon." Although it was presented as a throw-away comment, Gallup did not come up with those numbers lightly. As he explained to a journalist a few years later, he "was able to call [The Literary Digest's] shot by making a separate survey of telephone subscribers and automobile owners -- the class which would mail back most of the Digest's ballots." (Williston Rich, Jr., "The Human Yardstick," Saturday Evening Post, January 21, 1939)

The statement was clearly intended to provoke a response from The Literary Digest and thus generate publicity for Gallup's fledgling organization. In that regard, he succeeded. On July 19, 1936, the New York Times quoted an open letter from Wilfred J. Funk, editor of The Literary Digest, as follows: "I am beginning to wish ... that the esteemed Dr. Gallup would confine his political crystal-gazing to the offices of the American Institute of Public Opinion and leave our Literary Digest and its figures politely and completely alone...We've been through many poll battles...We've been buffeted by the gales of claims and counter-claims. But never before has any one foretold what our poll was going to show before it was even started."

Thus, even if Gallup's claim might not technically be described today as a prediction, it was certainly taken as such at the time by his target, and was probably meant to be.

Myth 2

Peeverill Squire did indeed write in POQ (vol. 52, 1988, p.125), "if all those who were polled had responded, the magazine would have, at least, correctly predicted Roosevelt the winner." However, he then goes on to say: "But more importantly, the initial sample was flawed; when compounded with the response bias, it produced the wildly erroneous forecast of the vote percentages." and then states that "a rough calculation of the bias produced by the sample is around 11%, with another 7% accounted for by problems with the responses." Unfortunately, there is no reason to trust the data from the May 1937 Gallup poll used to estimate the nonresponse rate (as Squire himself admits, before going on to do so). There certainly is nothing to justify this kind of precision in divvying up error among specific causes.

The fact is that The Literary Digest did not define a sampling frame and did not conduct anything resembling a representative sample, random or otherwise, of the voting population, nor did they make much of an effort to keep track of what was sent out and what was returned. It's convenient to use the spectacular failure of their straw poll as a cautionary tale, but without any real documentation of what they did, or data to analyze, any attribution of specific causality is little more than speculation.

Jan Werner

Dominic Lusinchi wrote:

- > Thank you, Leo, for sharing this. I am always on the look out for stories
- > on
- > the Literary Digest's 1936 poll.
- >
- > This story perpetuates two myths:
- >
- > 1) That Gallup "predicted" that the Digest poll would forecast a Landon
- > victory and

> 2) That the Digest failed because its sampling frame was "skewed ... to the
> wealthy".
>
> Myth 1: In a July 12, 1936 syndicated column "America Speak", Gallup wrote:
> "If the Literary Digest were conducting its poll **at the present time** [my
> emphasis], following its usual procedure, Landon would be shown in the
> lead." (Wash. Post, Section III, p.2, col. 7, Sunday, July 12, 1936) It'=s
> one thing to say "at the present time" and another to say "when the Dige=st
> presents its final results".... It is only after the Digest poll debacle
> that this story morphed into a "prediction". What Gallup really predicte=st
> d,
> at that time (7/12/1936), was that the election was going to be a close
> one:
> the title of his column "1936 Election Seen As Closest in Years".
>
> Myth 2: The Digest poll failed because its original sample, composed
> mainly
> of telephone and/or car owners, was irretrievably skewed against
> Roosevelt.
> A close analysis of a May 1937 Gallup (yes, Gallup!) poll, which asked=
> its
> respondents if they had received and returned a Digest ballot card, show=
> s
> that the **principal** cause of the Digest poll's failure was non-respon=
> se
> bias. As Peverill Squire wrote in POQ (vol. 52, 1988, p.125), "if all
> those
> who were polled had responded, the magazine would have, at least,
> correctly
> predicted Roosevelt the winner." In fact, its prediction (my analysis)
> would
> have been as good if not better than Gallup's - he was off by nearly 7
> points of the two-party vote.
>
> Why Gallup never referred to this May 1937 poll done by his organization
> when he commented (many many times) on the failure of the Digest poll...=
> ?
> Well that would take too long... got to get back to work.
>
> Best,
> Dominic
>
> Dominic Lusinchi
> Far West Research
> Statistical Consulting
> San Francisco, California
> T/F 415-664-3032
> www.farwestresearch.com
>

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta

> Sent: Thursday, March 11, 2010 7:55 AM

> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

> Subject: George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims

>

> George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims

> By SEAN HIGGINS, INVESTOR'S BUSINESS DAILY

>

> <http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=3D526858>

>

> It's one thing to predict an election correctly.

>

> It's another to predict how a rival will call an election and just how

> and why he will get it wrong.

>

> Pollster George Gallup did just that in 1936.

>

> SNIP

>

> --

> Leo G. Simonetta

> Director of Research

> Art& Science Group

> 6115 Falls Road, Suite 101

> Baltimore, MD 21209

>

> -----

> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

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

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

> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

aapor.net-request@asu.edu

>

> -----

> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

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

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

> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

aapor.net-request@asu.edu

>

>

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapor.net-request@asu.e=](mailto:aapor.net-request@asu.edu)

du

=20

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Sun, 14 Mar 2010 17:34:00 -0700
Reply-To: Jerold Pearson <jpearson@STANFORD.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jerold Pearson <jpearson@STANFORD.EDU>
Subject: Re: George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims
X-To: rfunk787@AOL.COM, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <8CC91E7B7ADB8A2-19A4-3440@webmail-m005.sysops.aol.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

>On the occasions when this sort of thoughtful and informative discussion
>appears, I am grateful that AAPORNET provides it a forum.

On the other hand, isn't that what Twitter is for?

Jerold Pearson, '75
Director of Market Research
Stanford Alumni Association
650-723-9186
www.stanford.edu/~jpearson

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Mon, 15 Mar 2010 11:39:03 -0400
Reply-To: Jim Ellis <jme2ce@VIRGINIA.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jim Ellis <jme2ce@VIRGINIA.EDU>
Subject: advice for self-administered "lobby surveys"
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I have a small amount of experience with the practical issues that come into play when you work with multiple locations to place surveys in their waiting areas for their clients to fill out (e.g., patient satisfaction surveys placed in doctors' waiting rooms, client satisfaction with a food stamps program, etc.). I am looking for practical, operational "do's and don'ts" for this type of survey that AAPOR folks would suggest.

The background is, we are working with a county department of human services and their network of other human service providers in the county to do some needs assessment work. We need to flesh out aspects of human service needs in the county with residents that our general population random sample survey is unlikely to cover well enough, and to tap into some service evaluation measures. As a compromise to address these needs, we are adding a "lobby survey" that will involve coordinating with several agencies to place surveys in their offices for clients to fill out as self-administered surveys. Perhaps there will be six to as many as 20 or more agencies, it depends. Our support will be minimized because this is an addition to the scope of work without additional budget.

My limited experience says we would want to pay attention to the reading level of the surveys and the relationships we have with the designated contact person at each site. We would also want to have a way of logging the materials we send to and receive back from each site, without compromising respondent anonymity. Our client questionnaire should have enough overlap with the general population questionnaire to talk about similarities and differences across them. And overall, I know the performances at the sites stack up like a normal curve - a few are great and basically make your project better and better, a few you essentially never really hear from again, and most give it a decent shot.

Beyond that (or in counterpoint to those notions), are there words of wisdom about how to do this sort of thing well? Thanks in advance,

Jim

Jim Ellis

Director of Research

Center for Survey Research

University of Virginia

434-243-5224

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Date: Mon, 15 Mar 2010 11:52:01 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: US census forms arrive in the mail: What to expect
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

US census forms arrive in the mail: What to expect

<http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5gEoTQb3c7ewKKKNz5aAT8lL1PVmgD9EF4KBO1>

or

<http://tinyurl.com/y9no9rm>

More than 120 million U.S. census forms begin arriving Monday in mailboxes around the country, in the government's once-a-decade population count that will be used to divvy up congressional seats and more than \$400 billion in federal aid. Fast-growing states in the South and the West could stand to lose the most because of lower-than-average mail participation rates in 2000 and higher shares of Hispanics and young adults, who are among the least likely to mail in their forms.

Did those \$2.5 million Super Bowl ads work? Stay tuned.

"When you receive your 2010 census, please fill it out and mail it back," said Census Bureau director Robert Groves, who was set to kick off the national mail-in campaign Monday in Phoenix, Ariz., a state which could gain up to two U.S. House seats because of rapid immigrant growth in the last decade.

SNIP

(Includes a photo of Bob Groves on a dog sled)

--

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

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 15 Mar 2010 14:09:04 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: A POLITICO survey <koff>: The tea party's least favorite
Republicans
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

A POLITICO survey: The tea party's least favorite Republicans
http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0310/34363_Page3.html#ixzz0iGnHScVd
or
<http://tinyurl.com/ykhoxf6>

The tea party movement exploded onto the political scene in 2009 as a backlash to the agenda pushed by President Barack Obama and congressional Democrats, but a little more than a year later, a POLITICO survey found tea party activists unhappy with many of the biggest names in the Republican Party.

And that could complicate GOP plans to harness the energy of the tea parties as they head into the November midterm elections with hopes of rearranging the balance of power in Washington.

In a survey of more than three dozen grass-roots tea party leaders from 29 states, the party's 2008 presidential nominee, Sen. John McCain, was the Republican most cited as a disappointment. Asked which three national Republicans they were most unhappy with, McCain was named by 18 respondents

SNIP

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

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

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

Date: Mon, 15 Mar 2010 14:21:36 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Embattled pollster wades back in
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Embattled pollster wades back in
<http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0310/34433.html#ixzz0iGqPNniq>
or
<http://tinyurl.com/ye6753f>

By JOSH KRAUSHAAR | 3/15/10 1:59 PM EDT

The polling firm Strategic Vision is out with its first public poll since facing a barrage of allegations last September that it had extensively falsified data in its political surveys.

In a just-released poll of the Georgia governor's race, the firm shows former Democratic Gov. Roy Barnes and Republican state Insurance Commissioner John Oxendine leading for their respective parties' nominations. It also shows Republican Gov. Sonny Perdue with a solid, 50-percent approval rating - a finding at odds with a recent Public Policy Polling survey that had Perdue's approval number at just 29 percent.

Despite Strategic Vision's reputation, Perdue spokesman Chris Schrimpf emailed the poll to POLITICO in order to push back on the grim numbers in PPP's survey. A local Fox affiliate in Georgia also picked up the results.

SNIP

(A busy Monday)

--

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

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Date: Mon, 15 Mar 2010 14:48:08 -0400

Reply-To: Barry Hollander <barry@UGA.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Barry Hollander <barry@UGA.EDU>

Subject: Re: Embattled pollster wades back in

X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I obviously (see below) live in Georgia, and while I buy the numbers for Barnes on the Dem side (he has good name recognition), and maybe even the Oxendine numbers on the GOP side, there's no way in hell I buy into the governor's approval ratings. Those don't make sense at all given the tough year or so he and the state have suffered through. Fifty percent approval? Just doesn't sound right.

Barry Hollander
Grady College of Journalism
and Mass Communication
University of Georgia
barry@uga.edu
www.barryhollander.com
www.whatpeopleknow.com

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Date: Mon, 15 Mar 2010 14:57:24 -0400

Reply-To: Aneta Genova <genovaa@INTERMEDIA.ORG>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Aneta Genova <genovaa@INTERMEDIA.ORG>

Subject: Job posting: Project Manager, Asia/China focus

X-To: aapornet@asu.edu

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Research Analyst/Project Manager: Asia/China Focus

=20

InterMedia Survey Institute-a global research, evaluation and consulting =
firm

specializing in media and communication-is seeking an experienced =
Research

Analyst/Project Manager who will be responsible for the management of
quantitative and qualitative research and evaluation projects in Asia, =

with a
special focus on China. This is a highly multifaceted position with =
duties

including client interface, research design, project management,
subcontractor oversight, fieldwork observation, research analysis, =

report
writing, presentations and proposal preparation.=20

=20

Key Requirements

Knowledge, Skills & Experience:

* A minimum of a Master's Degree in political or social science,
market research, international affairs, Asian studies, or related field

* A minimum of 5 years of relevant professional experience in =
applied
social or market research, analysis and reporting with an emphasis on =
insight
generation

* Solid knowledge of quantitative and qualitative research =
methods

* Strong ability to analyze, synthesize and present quantitative =
and
qualitative data

* High proficiency with statistical analysis (e.g., SPSS), word
processing and presentation software

* Deep interest in and knowledge of media, communication and
development trends and issues in Asia and China in particular, and =
ideally
with first-hand on-the-ground experience

* Strong oral and written communication skills

* Ability to work with colleagues and clients of diverse =
professional

and cultural backgrounds

- * Proven supervisory, organizational, and project and time = management skills=20

- * Ability to work to multiple and tight deadlines

- * Strong proficiency in Mandarin

- * Ability to travel (approximately 25%)

=20

Personal Characteristics:

- * Innate curiosity; passion for research, analysis and = delivering insights to clients

- * Commitment to quality and accuracy

- * Team player; self-starter; shows initiative; works = independently

- * First-rate interpersonal skills

=20

The position is based in Washington, D.C. InterMedia provides a = friendly work environment and a generous benefits package and salary commensurate = with experience. Qualified candidates should send a cover letter and resume = to asiapm-hr@intermedia.org or via fax# 866-500-4095.=20

=20

Due to the volume of responses to our ads, we kindly ask for no phone = calls as only qualified candidates who are selected for interviews will be contacted.

=20

=20

EOE/M/F/V/D

=20

NOTICE OF CONFIDENTIALITY:

This e-mail and attachments may contain information that is =
confidential, privileged or otherwise exempt from disclosure under =
applicable law. Dissemination, distribution, or copying of this e-mail =
or the information contained herein by anyone other than the intended =
recipient, or an employee or agent responsible for delivering the =
message to the intended recipient, is prohibited. If you are not the =
addressee or it appears from the context or otherwise that you have =
received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender of the e-mail =
immediately by reply e-mail, keep the contents confidential, and =
immediately delete the message and any attachments from your system. =
Thank you for your cooperation.

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 15 Mar 2010 15:33:41 -0400
Reply-To: David Moore <dmoore62@COMCAST.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: David Moore <dmoore62@COMCAST.NET>
Subject: Re: Embattled pollster wades back in
X-To: Barry Hollander <barry@UGA.EDU>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <32D24EDB98554FEFA9264FAC2FFEA39D@barry>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

What about those crosstabs that Strategic Vision kept promising but never
produced on its earlier suspect polls?

David

David W. Moore, Ph.D.
Senior Fellow, The Carsey Institute
University of New Hampshire
Huddleston Hall
Durham, NH 03824

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Barry Hollander
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2010 2:48 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: Embattled pollster wades back in

I obviously (see below) live in Georgia, and while I buy the numbers for Barnes on the Dem side (he has good name recognition), and maybe even the Oxendine numbers on the GOP side, there's no way in hell I buy into the governor's approval ratings. Those don't make sense at all given the tough year or so he and the state have suffered through. Fifty percent approval? Just doesn't sound right.

Barry Hollander
Grady College of Journalism
and Mass Communication
University of Georgia
barry@uga.edu
www.barryhollander.com
www.whatpeopleknow.com

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Mon, 15 Mar 2010 15:40:11 -0700
Reply-To: Jane Gould <jtgould@UCLA.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jane Gould <jtgould@UCLA.EDU>
Subject: are there surveys archives for journals?
X-To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Disposition: inline
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

A question here to ask if others know whether there are "survey instrument archives" that are linked to published articles:

Specifically, do some academic journals require authors to submit an archival copy of their survey instrument along with the editorial content, once a

research paper is accepted? Think of an archive that is kept (probably online), so that readers of the editorial content can access the survey itself. The advantages are that the reader can see how questions were asked, study the scales, and repeat the exact question wording in future studies that build on the same topic.

This concept may work in a time when online storage is cheap, survey wording is important, and the goal is "transparency". Have survey archives- linked to published articles- been required in some journals?

Also, any editorial policies or papers (pro and con) written on this?

Jane Gould
jtgould@ucla.edu[1]

Links:

[1] /imp/message.php?mailbox=Sent&index=997#

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Date: Mon, 15 Mar 2010 16:21:45 -0700
Reply-To: Janet Brigham Rands <jzbrands@EARTHLINK.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Janet Brigham Rands <jzbrands@EARTHLINK.NET>
Subject: Re: are there surveys archives for journals?
X-To: Jane Gould <jtgould@UCLA.EDU>
X-cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <20100315154011.206719d7nj8ooehw@mail.ucla.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Some scientific journals require a copy of new or previously unpublished instruments used in a study, some do not. The standard approach is to include them, if appropriate, as an appendix in the first publication about an instrument, then for any future articles to cite that first article. Materials too lengthy for ready inclusion in print or so can be included as online-only supplemental materials for those journals whose publishers provide that option. It's not standard to keep publishing an instrument that's already in print somewhere. Also, some instruments are proprietary.

Our research group has published several articles based our lengthy web-based q'aire about tobacco use and risk/protective factors, which is far too long to publish but fairly short to complete, because of the programming logic. We list specific questions in tables within the

papers or in online supplementary materials.

Maintaining an archive of such surveys would be difficult partly because some instruments have copyright restrictions. Also, with ongoing research, some instruments change from study to study.

Janet Brigham, Ph.D.
Senior research psychologist
SRI International
Menlo Park, CA
former managing editor of the journal /Nicotine & Tobacco Research/ (Oxford)

Jane Gould wrote:

> A question here to ask if others know whether there are "survey instrument archives" that are linked to published articles:

>

> Specifically, do some academic journals require authors to submit an archival copy of their survey instrument along with the editorial content, once a research paper is accepted? Think of an archive that is kept (probably online), so that readers of the editorial content can access the survey itself. The advantages are that the reader can see how questions were asked, study the scales, and repeat the exact question wording in future studies that build on the same topic.

>

> This concept may work in a time when online storage is cheap, survey wording is important, and the goal is "transparency". Have survey archives- linked to published articles- been required in some journals?

> Also, any editorial policies or papers (pro and con) written on this?

>

> Jane Gould

> jtgould@ucla.edu[1]

>

> Links:

> -----

> [1] [/imp/message.php?mailbox=Sent&index=997#](#)

>

> -----

> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

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

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

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

> set aapornet nomail

> On your return send this: set aapornet mail

> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

>

>

>

> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

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

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Date: Mon, 15 Mar 2010 20:06:47 -0500

Reply-To: Nancy A Mathiowetz <nancym2@UWM.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Nancy A Mathiowetz <nancym2@UWM.EDU>

Subject: Re: are there surveys archives for journals?

X-To: Jane Gould <jtgould@UCLA.EDU>

X-cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

In-Reply-To:

<365428950.5056001268701420579.JavaMail.root@mail04.pantherlink.uwm.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Public Opinion Quarterly requires authors to include question wording and response options for all questions central to the analysis presented in the paper. These items are included either in the body of the paper or as an appendix (hard copy) that is part of the pdf record for the article. POQ does allow, but does not require, authors to archive the entire questionnaire as part of an online appendix. If you download papers published in POQ, you have two options (when downloading from the Oxford University Press site)--the pdf version or the full text version. When you request the full text version, any online appendix provided by the author will also be downloaded.

Most of the data archives include the full questionnaire as part of the documentation for data files deposited with the archive. For example, many of the datasets available at ICPSR include the full questionnaire as part of the documentation as well as a list of publications based on the archived data (thus allowing you to examine the full questionnaire related to an article--although via a circuitous route!).

Certainly, online archives are expanding and POQ is thinking about ways in which to best use these resources for depositing material for journal readers and future scholars. Any suggestions from the AAPOR membership is always welcomed!

Best,

Nancy Mathiowetz

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

From: "Jane Gould" <jtgould@UCLA.EDU>=20

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU=20

Sent: Monday, March 15, 2010 5:40:11 PM GMT -06:00 US/Canada Central=20

Subject: are there surveys archives for journals?=20

A question here to ask if others know whether there are "survey instrument archives" that are linked to published articles=20

Specifically, do some academic journals require authors to submit an archival copy of their survey instrument along with the editorial content, once a research paper is accepted? Think of an archive that is kept (probably online), so that readers of the editorial content can access the survey itself. The advantages are that the reader can see how questions were asked, study the scales, and repeat the exact question wording in future studies that build on the same topic.=20

This concept may work in a time when online storage is cheap, survey wording is important, and the goal is "transparency". Have survey archives linked to published articles- been required in some journals?=20

Also, any editorial policies or papers (pro and con) written on this?=20

Jane Gould=20

jtgould@ucla.edu[1]=20

Links:=20

-----=20

[1] /imp/message.php?mailbox=3DSent&index=3D997#=20

-----=20

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>=20

<http://www.aapor.org>=20

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>=20

Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:=20

set aapornet nomail=20

On your return send this: set aapornet mail=20

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.=20

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

=20

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Date: Mon, 15 Mar 2010 23:36:27 -0400
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing
Subject: Re: George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims
X-To: Dominic Lusinchi <dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM>
X-cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <F21719741A6144AE9CF8DBF1636BDE2B@acer14219167c5>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Some really good stuff here, but, as you suggested in an earlier (off-list) message, we are probably going to have to agree to disagree -- My reaction is that, if anything, your additional material supports my previously expressed opinions.

So, let me clarify what I mean by replacing one set of myths with another.

Myth 1:

Original myth: Gallup predicted the Literary Digest straw poll results.
Revised myth: Gallup did not predict anything.

My take: Gallup presented what he knew full well would be interpreted as a prediction, although he worded it so as to provide him with an escape if he were wrong. Given what we know now (see Myth 2) he was very lucky to come as close as he did. Whether or not that constitutes a prediction is a semantic judgment.

Myth 2:

Original myth: The Literary Digest poll failed because it did not use a representative sample.
Revised myth: It failed because of nonresponse bias (as shown by the May 1937 Gallup data, and other sources).

My take: The Literary Digest polling procedures were a complete mess. Evidence from other sources does show that an unrepresentative sample was not the sole cause, but is not strong enough to prove anything beyond that. In particular, I don't see the May 1937 Gallup data as being reliable enough to justify giving either bad sampling or nonresponse bias pride of place, so to speak, in assigning blame.

None of this addresses what I consider to be the worst myth about the Literary Digest straw poll failure, namely that it was the reason pollsters began using probability samples.

Jan Werner

Dominic Lusinchi wrote:

> Jan,
>
> Thanks for your response. Here are my comments.
>
> Your statement to the effect that "It's one thing to debunk a myth, it's
> something quite different to replace one myth with another" is an inaccurate
> characterization of what I am saying. I am not replacing one myth by another
> as you seem to suggest - if I am: what myth is it that I am promoting?

> Myth 1

>
> The fact that the protagonists (Funk and Gallup) believe that what Gallup
> said in his July 12 column is a prediction does not make it a prediction. I
> repeat that what Gallup was ****really**** predicting was a close race: so says
> the title of his column (which I hope you received). The Digest editors came
> to believe, and were encouraged to do so by all the praise they received
> regarding its "uncanny accuracy" (10/31/1936, 6), that their poll was a
> "forecasting machine" (8/22/1936, 3), when in reality they had no idea how
> their poll results were produced - in other words, the belief does not make
> it so.

>
> In any case, this (the so-called "prediction") was used as a great
> promotional story after the Digest fiasco to show and tell: show that the
> new "scientific" polling was the wave of the future and tell that the Digest
> "straw" polling was a thing of the past. For example, Crossley wrote: "The
> Institute [Gallup] even went so far as to forecast the DIGEST vote, which it
> did with remarkable accuracy by the simple means of tabulating separately
> that part of its ballots which followed the DIGEST's general basis." ("Straw
> Polls in 1936", Archibald M. Crossley, The Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 1,
> No. 1. (Jan., 1937), p.29) The moral of the story: the "scientific" polls
> are superior because not only can they predict correctly the election but
> they can also predict what the Digest would forecast.

>
> I agree with you when you say it was ****"presented"***** as a "throw-away
> comment"; but it really was a very cleverly worded statement. I also agree
> when you say that it was meant to "generate publicity for Gallup's fledgling
> organization." Think about it: if I (Gallup) am wrong, I can always say
> (plausible deniability) that's how things (the presidential race) were at
> that time (July); if I'm right, I can present it as a prediction (of the
> results the Digest will publish right before the election) and thereby
> trumpet the superiority of my "scientific" polling methods. The statement
> has to be analyzed within an overall strategy to dominate the opinion
> polling domain.

>
> Gallup and his fellow "scientific" pollsters were not disinterested parties
> searching for the cause of the failure of the DIGEST poll out of some
> academic interest. They wanted to be top dogs and knock the Digest off its
> pedestal. They used the Digest incident, especially in the early years, to
> promote what they considered to be a superior "product": their "scientific"
> polling. Of course, they were to receive a nasty shock in 1948 - although
> not fatal to them, as 1936 was for the Digest.

> Myth 2

>

> I had the opportunity, thanks to the Roper Center, to have access to the raw
> data from the May 1937 AIPO (Gallup) poll. First the data in its raw form
> requires some editing because the file contains some anomalies. For example,
> you might have noticed that in Squire's table 2 (p.130) there are 780
> respondents that claim to have received the Digest ballot, while in table 3
> (p.131), which reports what they did with the ballot (returned or not or
> don't know), there are 829 respondents! Squire analyzed the data at face
> value.

>

> Second, Squire did not weight the data despite the fact that we have
> information that allows us to do so: each candidate's share of the actual
> vote, the response rate to the Digest (~24%), and the percent each candidate
> received from respondents to the poll. This takes care of anomalies, pointed
> out by Squire, such as over-report of support for FDR, over-sampling of
> Digest poll respondents, and over-report of support for FDR among
> respondents.

>

> The weighted results confirm much of Squire's conclusions: had the Digest
> relied solely on telephone and car owners it would have forecast a Roosevelt
> victory; Digest non-respondents were strongly in favor of FDR; and, last but
> not least, had all those who were polled by the Digest responded, the
> magazine would have pointed to the correct candidate. In other words, yes
> the Digest original sample of 10M was biased but not sufficiently to have
> prevented it from calling a Roosevelt victory. In fact, a less "rough
> calculation" (Squire, p.131) shows that non-response bias was the main
> culprit.

>

> Ironically, the samples Gallup used throughout the 30s and 40s were also
> biased - in favor of Republicans. And he was called on that (e.g. Special
> House Committee Investigating Campaign Expenditures, 1944).

>

> The conclusions based on the May 1937 poll (e.g. non-response as the main
> cause of the 1936 Digest poll failure) are consistent with other available
> data. I have re-analyzed the data provided by Cahalan in his Cedar Rapids
> study in 1936-7 reported in his 1989 POQ (vol. 53 pp.129-133) and in 1939
> Psychological Record (vol.1, no.1, pp.3-11) papers. The results show that
> the Digest list used for that city was not biased and that respondents and
> non-respondents were very different in their candidate preference. Add to
> that the results from Allentown, Scranton and Chicago where only registered
> voters were polled (Digest, 14 November, 1936, p.7) and I would say we have
> some pretty solid "real documentation".

>

> Does this amount to a definitive answer? No, absolutely not. The only way we
> could have resolved the question would have been to conduct, on the original
> sample of 10M, the same type of study that Cahalan performed in Cedar
> Rapids: select a random sample from the Digest list and ask respondents
> whether or not they sent in their Digest ballot and which candidate they
> favored at that time.

>

> Short of that the May 1937 AIPO survey, the Cahalan study and the results
> from Allentown, Scranton and Chicago is the best we have. Speculation you
> say? Well, yes, I suppose you're right, but a lot less than simply repeating
> the old refrain repeated by so many: "The failure of the Literary Digest's
> polling approach can be explained simply. The Digest's sample of voters was

> drawn from lists of automobile and telephones owners." (Gallup, 1972,
> "Opinion Polling in a Democracy", in Statistics: A Guide to the Unknown,
> Judith M. Tanur et al. (eds.), San Francisco, Holden-Day, p.147.)

>
> Best regards,
> Dominic

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

> From: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com]
> Sent: Friday, March 12, 2010 8:26 PM
> To: Dominic Lusinchi
> Cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
> Subject: Re: George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims

>
> It's one thing to debunk a myth, it's something quite different to
> replace one myth with another.

>
> Myth 1

>
> What Gallup wrote in the July 12 1936 article was: "...if The Literary
> Digest were conducting a poll at the present time...the actual figures
> would be in the neighborhood of 44 per cent for Roosevelt and 56 per
> cent for Landon." Although it was presented as a throw-away comment,
> Gallup did not come up with those numbers lightly. As he explained to a
> journalist a few years later, he "was able to call [The Literary
> Digest's] shot by making a separate survey of telephone subscribers and
> automobile owners -- the class which would mail back most of the
> Digest's ballots." (Williston Rich, Jr., "The Human Yardstick," Saturday
> Evening Post, January 21, 1939)

>
> The statement was clearly intended to provoke a response from The
> Literary Digest and thus generate publicity for Gallup's fledgling
> organization. In that regard, he succeeded. On July 19, 1936, the New
> York Times quoted an open letter from Wilfred J. Funk, editor of The
> Literary Digest, as follows: "I am beginning to wish ... that the
> esteemed Dr. Gallup would confine his political crystal-gazing to the
> offices of the American Institute of Public Opinion and leave our
> Literary Digest and its figures politely and completely alone...We've
> been through many poll battles...We've been buffeted by the gales of
> claims and counter-claims. But never before has any one foretold what
> our poll was going to show before it was even started."

>
> Thus, even if Gallup's claim might not technically be described today as
> a prediction, it was certainly taken as such at the time by his target,
> and was probably meant to be.

>
>
> Myth 2

>
> Peverill Squire did indeed write in POQ (vol. 52, 1988, p.125), "if all
> those who were polled had responded, the magazine would have, at least,
> correctly predicted Roosevelt the winner." However, he then goes on to
> say: "But more importantly, the initial sample was flawed; when

> compounded with the response bias, it produced the wildly erroneous
> forecast of the vote percentages." and then states that "a rough
> calculation of the bias produced by the sample is around 11%, with
> another 7% accounted for by problems with the responses."
> Unfortunately, there is no reason to trust the data from the May 1937
> Gallup poll used to estimate the nonresponse rate (as Squire himself
> admits, before going on to do so). There certainly is nothing to justify
> this kind of precision in divvying up error among specific causes.

>
> The fact is that The Literary Digest did not define a sampling frame and
> did not conduct anything resembling a representative sample, random or
> otherwise, of the voting population, nor did they make much of an effort
> to keep track of what was sent out and what was returned. It's
> convenient to use the spectacular failure of their straw poll as a
> cautionary tale, but without any real documentation of what they did, or
> data to analyze, any attribution of specific causality is little more
> than speculation.

>
> Jan Werner

> _____
>

> Dominic Lusinchi wrote:

>> Thank you, Leo, for sharing this. I am always on the look out for stories
> on

>> the Literary Digest's 1936 poll.

>>

>> This story perpetuates two myths:

>>

>> 1) That Gallup "predicted" that the Digest poll would forecast a Landon
>> victory and

>> 2) That the Digest failed because its sampling frame was "skewed ... to
> the

>> wealthy".

>>

>> Myth 1: In a July 12, 1936 syndicated column "America Speak", Gallup
> wrote:

>> "If the Literary Digest were conducting its poll ****at the present time****

> [my

>> emphasis], following its usual procedure, Landon would be shown in the
>> lead." (Wash. Post, Section III, p.2, col. 7, Sunday, July 12, 1936) It's

>> one thing to say "at the present time" and another to say "when the Digest
>> presents its final results".... It is only after the Digest poll debacle

>> that this story morphed into a "prediction". What Gallup really predicted,
>> at that time (7/12/1936), was that the election was going to be a close

> one:

>> the title of his column "1936 Election Seen As Closest in Years".

>>

>> Myth 2: The Digest poll failed because its original sample, composed
> mainly

>> of telephone and/or car owners, was irretrievably skewed against
> Roosevelt.

>> A close analysis of a May 1937 Gallup (yes, Gallup!) poll, which asked its
>> respondents if they had received and returned a Digest ballot card, shows

>> that the ****principal**** cause of the Digest poll's failure was non-response

>> bias. As Peverill Squire wrote in POQ (vol. 52, 1988, p.125), "if all
> those
>> who were polled had responded, the magazine would have, at least,
> correctly
>> predicted Roosevelt the winner." In fact, its prediction (my analysis)
> would
>> have been as good if not better than Gallup's - he was off by nearly 7
>> points of the two-party vote.
>>
>> Why Gallup never referred to this May 1937 poll done by his organization
>> when he commented (many many times) on the failure of the Digest poll...?
>> Well that would take too long... got to get back to work.

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

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

>> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta
>> Sent: Thursday, March 11, 2010 7:55 AM
>> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
>> Subject: George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims

>> George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims
>> By SEAN HIGGINS, INVESTOR'S BUSINESS DAILY
>>
>> <http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=526858>

>> It's one thing to predict an election correctly.
>>
>> It's another to predict how a rival will call an election and just how
>> and why he will get it wrong.

>> Pollster George Gallup did just that in 1936.

>> SNIP

>> --

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

>> -----
>> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
>> <http://www.aapor.org>
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapor.net.html> .

>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:
> aapornet-request@asu.edu
>>
>> -----
>> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
>> <http://www.aapor.org>
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:
> aapornet-request@asu.edu
>>
>>
>
> -----
> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
> <http://www.aapor.org>
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>
>

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 15 Mar 2010 23:40:34 -0700
Reply-To: Dominic Lusinchi <dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Dominic Lusinchi <dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM>
Organization: Far West Research
Subject: Re: George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims
X-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <4B9EFCBB.8070801@jwdp.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Well, Jan, if you consider these two statements semantically equivalent:

- "If the Literary Digest were conducting its poll at the present time, following its usual procedure, Landon would be shown in the lead."
- "When all the results are in the Digest poll will show Landon in the lead."

then I can't much argue about that - we've reached a dead-end.

You say that you don't consider "the May 1937 Gallup data as being reliable enough" to say anything about what caused the 1936 Digest poll to fail so miserably. I agree (along with Squire) that the Gallup survey is less than perfect. But I disagree that it cannot be used for the problem at hand. Gallup polls of the 30s and 40s have been put to good use by researchers: e.g., Baum & Kernell "Economic Class and Popular Support for Franklin Roosevelt in War and Peace," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 65, 2001, 198-229; and Berinsky's 2006 discussion "American Public Opinion in the 1930s and 1940s: The Analysis of Quota-Controlled Sample Survey Data," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 70: 499-529. The polls have their limitations and the data have to be analyzed with that in mind.

The "conventional explanation", as it has been called, that the 1936 Digest poll failed because it was biased in favor of Landon due to the fact that it relied mainly on lists of phone owners and car owners, is pure speculation, plausible speculation perhaps, but speculation nonetheless. In contrast, the only real evidence we have, although it is limited and has flaws (the results from Allentown, Scranton, Chicago, Cedar Rapids and the Gallup data) all points to the same problem: non-response bias. My preference in describing what happened to the 1936 Digest poll leans towards the latter (warts and all). It is, of course, a tentative explanation but it has the advantage of being back by data, however imperfect.

As for your last comment about the belief that the Literary Digest poll failure being the reason why pollsters began using probability samples is, of course, nonsense, so I agree with you on that - but since the issue was not part of the original post, I'll leave it at that.

Cheers,
Dominic

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

From: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com]
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2010 8:36 PM
To: Dominic Lusinchi
Cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims

Some really good stuff here, but, as you suggested in an earlier (off-list) message, we are probably going to have to agree to disagree -- My reaction is that, if anything, your additional material supports my previously expressed opinions.

So, let me clarify what I mean by replacing one set of myths with another.

Myth 1:

Original myth: Gallup predicted the Literary Digest straw poll results.

Revised myth: Gallup did not predict anything.

My take: Gallup presented what he knew full well would be interpreted as a prediction, although he worded it so as to provide him with an escape

if he were wrong. Given what we know now (see Myth 2) he was very lucky to come as close as he did. Whether or not that constitutes a prediction is a semantic judgment.

Myth 2:

Original myth: The Literary Digest poll failed because it did not use a representative sample.

Revised myth: It failed because of nonresponse bias (as shown by the May 1937 Gallup data, and other sources).

My take: The Literary Digest polling procedures were a complete mess. Evidence from other sources does show that an unrepresentative sample was not the sole cause, but is not strong enough to prove anything beyond that. In particular, I don't see the May 1937 Gallup data as being reliable enough to justify giving either bad sampling or nonresponse bias pride of place, so to speak, in assigning blame.

None of this addresses what I consider to be the worst myth about the Literary Digest straw poll failure, namely that it was the reason pollsters began using probability samples.

Jan Werner

Dominic Lusinchi wrote:

> Jan,

>

> Thanks for your response. Here are my comments.

>

> Your statement to the effect that "It's one thing to debunk a myth, it's something quite different to replace one myth with another" is an inaccurate

> characterization of what I am saying. I am not replacing one myth by another

> as you seem to suggest - if I am: what myth is it that I am promoting?

>

> Myth 1

>

> The fact that the protagonists (Funk and Gallup) believe that what Gallup said in his July 12 column is a prediction does not make it a prediction.

I

> repeat that what Gallup was **really** predicting was a close race: so says

> the title of his column (which I hope you received). The Digest editors came

> to believe, and were encouraged to do so by all the praise they received

> regarding its "uncanny accuracy" (10/31/1936, 6), that their poll was a

> "forecasting machine" (8/22/1936, 3), when in reality they had no idea how

> their poll results were produced - in other words, the belief does not

make

> it so.

>

> In any case, this (the so-called "prediction") was used as a great

> promotional story after the Digest fiasco to show and tell: show that the
> new "scientific" polling was the wave of the future and tell that the
Digest
> "straw" polling was a thing of the past. For example, Crossley wrote: "The
> Institute [Gallup] even went so far as to forecast the DIGEST vote, which
it
> did with remarkable accuracy by the simple means of tabulating separately
> that part of its ballots which followed the DIGEST's general basis."
("Straw
> Polls in 1936", Archibald M. Crossley, The Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol.
1,
> No. 1. (Jan., 1937), p.29) The moral of the story: the "scientific" polls
> are superior because not only can they predict correctly the election but
> they can also predict what the Digest would forecast.
>
> I agree with you when you say it was **"presented"** as a "throw-away
> comment"; but it really was a very cleverly worded statement. I also agree
> when you say that it was meant to "generate publicity for Gallup's
fledgling
> organization." Think about it: if I (Gallup) am wrong, I can always say
> (plausible deniability) that's how things (the presidential race) were at
> that time (July); if I'm right, I can present it as a prediction (of the
> results the Digest will publish right before the election) and thereby
> trumpet the superiority of my "scientific" polling methods. The statement
> has to be analyzed within an overall strategy to dominate the opinion
> polling domain.
>
> Gallup and his fellow "scientific" pollsters were not disinterested
parties
> searching for the cause of the failure of the DIGEST poll out of some
> academic interest. They wanted to be top dogs and knock the Digest off its
> pedestal. They used the Digest incident, especially in the early years, to
> promote what they considered to be a superior "product": their
"scientific"
> polling. Of course, they were to receive a nasty shock in 1948 - although
> not fatal to them, as 1936 was for the Digest.
>
> Myth 2
>
> I had the opportunity, thanks to the Roper Center, to have access to the
raw
> data from the May 1937 AIPO (Gallup) poll. First the data in its raw form
> requires some editing because the file contains some anomalies. For
example,
> you might have noticed that in Squire's table 2 (p.130) there are 780
> respondents that claim to have received the Digest ballot, while in table
3
> (p.131), which reports what they did with the ballot (returned or not or
> don't know), there are 829 respondents! Squire analyzed the data at face
> value.
>
> Second, Squire did not weight the data despite the fact that we have
> information that allows us to do so: each candidate's share of the actual
> vote, the response rate to the Digest (~24%), and the percent each

candidate

> received from respondents to the poll. This takes care of anomalies,

pointed

> out by Squire, such as over-report of support for FDR, over-sampling of

> Digest poll respondents, and over-report of support for FDR among

> respondents.

>

> The weighted results confirm much of Squire's conclusions: had the Digest

> relied solely on telephone and car owners it would have forecast a

Roosevelt

> victory; Digest non-respondents were strongly in favor of FDR; and, last

but

> not least, had all those who were polled by the Digest responded, the

> magazine would have pointed to the correct candidate. In other words, yes

> the Digest original sample of 10M was biased but not sufficiently to have

> prevented it from calling a Roosevelt victory. In fact, a less "rough

> calculation" (Squire, p.131) shows that non-response bias was the main

> culprit.

>

> Ironically, the samples Gallup used throughout the 30s and 40s were also

> biased - in favor of Republicans. And he was called on that (e.g. Special

> House Committee Investigating Campaign Expenditures, 1944).

>

> The conclusions based on the May 1937 poll (e.g. non-response as the main

> cause of the 1936 Digest poll failure) are consistent with other available

> data. I have re-analyzed the data provided by Cahalan in his Cedar Rapids

> study in 1936-7 reported in his 1989 POQ (vol. 53 pp.129-133) and in 1939

> Psychological Record (vol.1, no.1, pp.3-11) papers. The results show that

> the Digest list used for that city was not biased and that respondents and

> non-respondents were very different in their candidate preference. Add to

> that the results from Allentown, Scranton and Chicago where only

registered

> voters were polled (Digest, 14 November, 1936, p.7) and I would say we

have

> some pretty solid "real documentation".

>

> Does this amount to a definitive answer? No, absolutely not. The only way

we

> could have resolved the question would have been to conduct, on the

original

> sample of 10M, the same type of study that Cahalan performed in Cedar

> Rapids: select a random sample from the Digest list and ask respondents

> whether or not they sent in their Digest ballot and which candidate they

> favored at that time.

>

> Short of that the May 1937 AIPO survey, the Cahalan study and the results

> from Allentown, Scranton and Chicago is the best we have. Speculation you

> say? Well, yes, I suppose you're right, but a lot less than simply

repeating

> the old refrain repeated by so many: "The failure of the Literary Digest's

> polling approach can be explained simply. The Digest's sample of voters

was

> drawn from lists of automobile and telephones owners." (Gallup, 1972,

> "Opinion Polling in a Democracy", in Statistics: A Guide to the Unknown,

> Judith M. Tanur et al. (eds.), San Francisco, Holden-Day, p.147.)

>

> Best regards,

> Dominic

>

>

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

> From: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com]

> Sent: Friday, March 12, 2010 8:26 PM

> To: Dominic Lusinchi

> Cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

> Subject: Re: George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims

>

> It's one thing to debunk a myth, it's something quite different to

> replace one myth with another.

>

> Myth 1

>

> What Gallup wrote in the July 12 1936 article was: "...if The Literary

> Digest were conducting a poll at the present time...the actual figures

> would be in the neighborhood of 44 per cent for Roosevelt and 56 per

> cent for Landon." Although it was presented as a throw-away comment,

> Gallup did not come up with those numbers lightly. As he explained to a

> journalist a few years later, he "was able to call [The Literary

> Digest's] shot by making a separate survey of telephone subscribers and

> automobile owners -- the class which would mail back most of the

> Digest's ballots." (Williston Rich, Jr., "The Human Yardstick," Saturday

> Evening Post, January 21, 1939)

>

> The statement was clearly intended to provoke a response from The

> Literary Digest and thus generate publicity for Gallup's fledgling

> organization. In that regard, he succeeded. On July 19, 1936, the New

> York Times quoted an open letter from Wilfred J. Funk, editor of The

> Literary Digest, as follows: "I am beginning to wish ... that the

> esteemed Dr. Gallup would confine his political crystal-gazing to the

> offices of the American Institute of Public Opinion and leave our

> Literary Digest and its figures politely and completely alone...We've

> been through many poll battles...We've been buffeted by the gales of

> claims and counter-claims. But never before has any one foretold what

> our poll was going to show before it was even started."

>

> Thus, even if Gallup's claim might not technically be described today as

> a prediction, it was certainly taken as such at the time by his target,

> and was probably meant to be.

>

>

> Myth 2

>

> Peverill Squire did indeed write in POQ (vol. 52, 1988, p.125), "if all

> those who were polled had responded, the magazine would have, at least,

> correctly predicted Roosevelt the winner." However, he then goes on to

> say: "But more importantly, the initial sample was flawed; when

> compounded with the response bias, it produced the wildly erroneous

> forecast of the vote percentages." and then states that "a rough

> calculation of the bias produced by the sample is around 11%, with
> another 7% accounted for by problems with the responses."
> Unfortunately, there is no reason to trust the data from the May 1937
> Gallup poll used to estimate the nonresponse rate (as Squire himself
> admits, before going on to do so). There certainly is nothing to justify
> this kind of precision in divvying up error among specific causes.
>
> The fact is that The Literary Digest did not define a sampling frame and
> did not conduct anything resembling a representative sample, random or
> otherwise, of the voting population, nor did they make much of an effort
> to keep track of what was sent out and what was returned. It's
> convenient to use the spectacular failure of their straw poll as a
> cautionary tale, but without any real documentation of what they did, or
> data to analyze, any attribution of specific causality is little more
> than speculation.

> Jan Werner

> _____

> Dominic Lusinchi wrote:

>> Thank you, Leo, for sharing this. I am always on the look out for stories
> on
>> the Literary Digest's 1936 poll.

>>

>> This story perpetuates two myths:

>>

>> 1) That Gallup "predicted" that the Digest poll would forecast a Landon
>> victory and
>> 2) That the Digest failed because its sampling frame was "skewed ... to
> the
>> wealthy".

>>

>> Myth 1: In a July 12, 1936 syndicated column "America Speak", Gallup
> wrote:

>> "If the Literary Digest were conducting its poll ****at the present time****

> [my

>> emphasis], following its usual procedure, Landon would be shown in the

>> lead." (Wash. Post, Section III, p.2, col. 7, Sunday, July 12, 1936) It's

>> one thing to say "at the present time" and another to say "when the

Digest

>> presents its final results".... It is only after the Digest poll debacle

>> that this story morphed into a "prediction". What Gallup really

predicted,

>> at that time (7/12/1936), was that the election was going to be a close

> one:

>> the title of his column "1936 Election Seen As Closest in Years".

>>

>> Myth 2: The Digest poll failed because its original sample, composed

> mainly

>> of telephone and/or car owners, was irretrievably skewed against

> Roosevelt.

>> A close analysis of a May 1937 Gallup (yes, Gallup!) poll, which asked

its

>> respondents if they had received and returned a Digest ballot card, shows

>> that the ****principal**** cause of the Digest poll's failure was non-response
>> bias. As Peverill Squire wrote in POQ (vol. 52, 1988, p.125), "if all > those > who were polled had responded, the magazine would have, at least, > correctly > predicted Roosevelt the winner." In fact, its prediction (my analysis) > would > have been as good if not better than Gallup's - he was off by nearly 7 >> points of the two-party vote.
>>
>> Why Gallup never referred to this May 1937 poll done by his organization >> when he commented (many many times) on the failure of the Digest poll...? >> Well that would take too long... got to get back to work.

>> Best,
>> Dominic

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

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

>> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta
>> Sent: Thursday, March 11, 2010 7:55 AM
>> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
>> Subject: George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims

>> George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims
>> By SEAN HIGGINS, INVESTOR'S BUSINESS DAILY

>> <http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=526858>

>> It's one thing to predict an election correctly.

>> It's another to predict how a rival will call an election and just how >> and why he will get it wrong.

>> Pollster George Gallup did just that in 1936.

>> SNIP

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

>> -----
>> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

>> <http://www.aapor.org>
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:
> aapornet-request@asu.edu
>>
>> -----
>> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
>> <http://www.aapor.org>
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:
> aapornet-request@asu.edu
>>
>>
>
> -----
> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
> <http://www.aapor.org>
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu
>
>

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Tue, 16 Mar 2010 09:53:44 -0400
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing
Subject: Re: George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims
X-To: Dominic Lusinchi <dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM>
X-cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <EAC5AA4C3F5B46BA838C0BC5183F8CED@acer14219167c5>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The late John Gorman, who founded Opinion Dynamics, liked to mention a specific date in the late 1970's, which he estimated was the day on which George McGovern edged out Richard Nixon, based on trending how respondents said they voted in the 1972 presidential election in polls conducted during the years following the Watergate affair. John's

estimate was also based on data, however imperfect.

As for what is, or isn't, a prediction, I'll let it go at that. Others can make up their own minds as to what Gallup intended when he wrote what he did in 1936, and what it should be called.

Regardless of whether or not we agree, I'd like to thank you for an enlightening discussion and much valuable information. Let me note that the image you sent me of the 7-12-1936 Washington Post article does not include the beginning of the article on page 1, and there is no way to tell whether the headline "1936 Election Seen As Closest in Years" was written by Gallup or by the Washington Post's editor.

Jan Werner

Dominic Lusinchi wrote:

> Well, Jan, if you consider these two statements semantically equivalent:

>

> - "If the Literary Digest were conducting its poll at the present time, following its usual procedure, Landon would be shown in the lead."

> - "When all the results are in the Digest poll will show Landon in the lead."

>

> then I can't much argue about that - we've reached a dead-end.

>

> You say that you don't consider "the May 1937 Gallup data as being reliable enough" to say anything about what caused the 1936 Digest poll to fail so miserably. I agree (along with Squire) that the Gallup survey is less than perfect. But I disagree that it cannot be used for the problem at hand.

> Gallup polls of the 30s and 40s have been put to good use by researchers:

> e.g., Baum & Kernell "Economic Class and Popular Support for Franklin

> Roosevelt in War and Peace," Public Opinion Quarterly 65, 2001, 198-229; and

> Berinsky's 2006 discussion "American Public Opinion in the 1930s and 1940s:

> The Analysis of Quota-Controlled Sample Survey Data," Public Opinion

> Quarterly 70: 499-529. The polls have their limitations and the data have to

> be analyzed with that in mind.

>

> The "conventional explanation", as it has been called, that the 1936 Digest

> poll failed because it was biased in favor of Landon due to the fact that it

> relied mainly on lists of phone owners and car owners, is pure speculation,

> plausible speculation perhaps, but speculation nonetheless. In contrast, the

> only real evidence we have, although it is limited and has flaws (the

> results from Allentown, Scranton, Chicago, Cedar Rapids and the Gallup data)

> all points to the same problem: non-response bias. My preference in

> describing what happened to the 1936 Digest poll leans towards the latter

> (warts and all). It is, of course, a tentative explanation but it has the

> advantage of being back by data, however imperfect.

>

> As for your last comment about the belief that the Literary Digest poll

> failure being the reason why pollsters began using probability samples is,

> of course, nonsense, so I agree with you on that - but since the issue was

> not part of the original post, I'll leave it at that.

>

> Cheers,
> Dominic
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com]
> Sent: Monday, March 15, 2010 8:36 PM
> To: Dominic Lusinchi
> Cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
> Subject: Re: George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims

>
> Some really good stuff here, but, as you suggested in an earlier
> (off-list) message, we are probably going to have to agree to disagree
> -- My reaction is that, if anything, your additional material supports
> my previously expressed opinions.
>
> So, let me clarify what I mean by replacing one set of myths with another.

> Myth 1:

>
> Original myth: Gallup predicted the Literary Digest straw poll results.
> Revised myth: Gallup did not predict anything.

>
> My take: Gallup presented what he knew full well would be interpreted as
> a prediction, although he worded it so as to provide him with an escape
> if he were wrong. Given what we know now (see Myth 2) he was very lucky
> to come as close as he did. Whether or not that constitutes a prediction
> is a semantic judgment.

> Myth 2:

>
> Original myth: The Literary Digest poll failed because it did not use a
> representative sample.
> Revised myth: It failed because of nonresponse bias (as shown by the May
> 1937 Gallup data, and other sources).

>
> My take: The Literary Digest polling procedures were a complete mess.
> Evidence from other sources does show that an unrepresentative sample
> was not the sole cause, but is not strong enough to prove anything
> beyond that. In particular, I don't see the May 1937 Gallup data as
> being reliable enough to justify giving either bad sampling or
> nonresponse bias pride of place, so to speak, in assigning blame.

>
> None of this addresses what I consider to be the worst myth about the
> Literary Digest straw poll failure, namely that it was the reason
> pollsters began using probability samples.

> Jan Werner

> _____
>
> Dominic Lusinchi wrote:

>> Jan,
>>
>> Thanks for your response. Here are my comments.

>>
>> Your statement to the effect that "It's one thing to debunk a myth, it's
>> something quite different to replace one myth with another" is an
> inaccurate
>> characterization of what I am saying. I am not replacing one myth by
> another
>> as you seem to suggest - if I am: what myth is it that I am promoting?
>>
>> Myth 1
>>
>> The fact that the protagonists (Funk and Gallup) believe that what Gallup
>> said in his July 12 column is a prediction does not make it a prediction.
> I
>> repeat that what Gallup was ****really**** predicting was a close race: so
> says
>> the title of his column (which I hope you received). The Digest editors
> came
>> to believe, and were encouraged to do so by all the praise they received
>> regarding its "uncanny accuracy" (10/31/1936, 6), that their poll was a
>> "forecasting machine" (8/22/1936, 3), when in reality they had no idea how
>> their poll results were produced - in other words, the belief does not
> make
>> it so.
>>
>> In any case, this (the so-called "prediction") was used as a great
>> promotional story after the Digest fiasco to show and tell: show that the
>> new "scientific" polling was the wave of the future and tell that the
> Digest
>> "straw" polling was a thing of the past. For example, Crossley wrote: "The
>> Institute [Gallup] even went so far as to forecast the DIGEST vote, which
> it
>> did with remarkable accuracy by the simple means of tabulating separately
>> that part of its ballots which followed the DIGEST's general basis."
> ("Straw
>> Polls in 1936", Archibald M. Crossley, The Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol.
> 1,
>> No. 1. (Jan., 1937), p.29) The moral of the story: the "scientific" polls
>> are superior because not only can they predict correctly the election but
>> they can also predict what the Digest would forecast.
>>
>> I agree with you when you say it was ****"presented"***** as a "throw-away
>> comment"; but it really was a very cleverly worded statement. I also agree
>> when you say that it was meant to "generate publicity for Gallup's
> fledgling
>> organization." Think about it: if I (Gallup) am wrong, I can always say
>> (plausible deniability) that's how things (the presidential race) were at
>> that time (July); if I'm right, I can present it as a prediction (of the
>> results the Digest will publish right before the election) and thereby
>> trumpet the superiority of my "scientific" polling methods. The statement
>> has to be analyzed within an overall strategy to dominate the opinion
>> polling domain.
>>
>> Gallup and his fellow "scientific" pollsters were not disinterested
> parties

>> searching for the cause of the failure of the DIGEST poll out of some
>> academic interest. They wanted to be top dogs and knock the Digest off its
>> pedestal. They used the Digest incident, especially in the early years, to
>> promote what they considered to be a superior "product": their
> "scientific"
>> polling. Of course, they were to receive a nasty shock in 1948 - although
>> not fatal to them, as 1936 was for the Digest.
>>
>> Myth 2
>>
>> I had the opportunity, thanks to the Roper Center, to have access to the
> raw
>> data from the May 1937 AIPO (Gallup) poll. First the data in its raw form
>> requires some editing because the file contains some anomalies. For
> example,
>> you might have noticed that in Squire's table 2 (p.130) there are 780
>> respondents that claim to have received the Digest ballot, while in table
> 3
>> (p.131), which reports what they did with the ballot (returned or not or
>> don't know), there are 829 respondents! Squire analyzed the data at face
>> value.
>>
>> Second, Squire did not weight the data despite the fact that we have
>> information that allows us to do so: each candidate's share of the actual
>> vote, the response rate to the Digest (~24%), and the percent each
> candidate
>> received from respondents to the poll. This takes care of anomalies,
> pointed
>> out by Squire, such as over-report of support for FDR, over-sampling of
>> Digest poll respondents, and over-report of support for FDR among
>> respondents.
>>
>> The weighted results confirm much of Squire's conclusions: had the Digest
>> relied solely on telephone and car owners it would have forecast a
> Roosevelt
>> victory; Digest non-respondents were strongly in favor of FDR; and, last
> but
>> not least, had all those who were polled by the Digest responded, the
>> magazine would have pointed to the correct candidate. In other words, yes
>> the Digest original sample of 10M was biased but not sufficiently to have
>> prevented it from calling a Roosevelt victory. In fact, a less "rough
>> calculation" (Squire, p.131) shows that non-response bias was the main
>> culprit.
>>
>> Ironically, the samples Gallup used throughout the 30s and 40s were also
>> biased - in favor of Republicans. And he was called on that (e.g. Special
>> House Committee Investigating Campaign Expenditures, 1944).
>>
>> The conclusions based on the May 1937 poll (e.g. non-response as the main
>> cause of the 1936 Digest poll failure) are consistent with other available
>> data. I have re-analyzed the data provided by Cahalan in his Cedar Rapids
>> study in 1936-7 reported in his 1989 POQ (vol. 53 pp.129-133) and in 1939
>> Psychological Record (vol.1, no.1, pp.3-11) papers. The results show that
>> the Digest list used for that city was not biased and that respondents and

>> non-respondents were very different in their candidate preference. Add to
>> that the results from Allentown, Scranton and Chicago where only
> registered
>> voters were polled (Digest, 14 November, 1936, p.7) and I would say we
> have
>> some pretty solid "real documentation".
>>
>> Does this amount to a definitive answer? No, absolutely not. The only way
> we
>> could have resolved the question would have been to conduct, on the
> original
>> sample of 10M, the same type of study that Cahalan performed in Cedar
>> Rapids: select a random sample from the Digest list and ask respondents
>> whether or not they sent in their Digest ballot and which candidate they
>> favored at that time.
>>
>> Short of that the May 1937 AIPO survey, the Cahalan study and the results
>> from Allentown, Scranton and Chicago is the best we have. Speculation you
>> say? Well, yes, I suppose you're right, but a lot less than simply
> repeating
>> the old refrain repeated by so many: "The failure of the Literary Digest's
>> polling approach can be explained simply. The Digest's sample of voters
> was
>> drawn from lists of automobile and telephones owners." (Gallup, 1972,
>> "Opinion Polling in a Democracy", in Statistics: A Guide to the Unknown,
>> Judith M. Tanur et al. (eds.), San Francisco, Holden-Day, p.147.)
>>
>> Best regards,
>> Dominic
>>
>>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@jwdep.com]
>> Sent: Friday, March 12, 2010 8:26 PM
>> To: Dominic Lusinchi
>> Cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
>> Subject: Re: George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims
>>
>> It's one thing to debunk a myth, it's something quite different to
>> replace one myth with another.
>>
>> Myth 1
>>
>> What Gallup wrote in the July 12 1936 article was: "...if The Literary
>> Digest were conducting a poll at the present time...the actual figures
>> would be in the neighborhood of 44 per cent for Roosevelt and 56 per
>> cent for Landon." Although it was presented as a throw-away comment,
>> Gallup did not come up with those numbers lightly. As he explained to a
>> journalist a few years later, he "was able to call [The Literary
>> Digest's] shot by making a separate survey of telephone subscribers and
>> automobile owners -- the class which would mail back most of the
>> Digest's ballots." (Williston Rich, Jr., "The Human Yardstick," Saturday
>> Evening Post, January 21, 1939)
>>

>> The statement was clearly intended to provoke a response from The
>> Literary Digest and thus generate publicity for Gallup's fledgling
>> organization. In that regard, he succeeded. On July 19, 1936, the New
>> York Times quoted an open letter from Wilfred J. Funk, editor of The
>> Literary Digest, as follows: "I am beginning to wish ... that the
>> esteemed Dr. Gallup would confine his political crystal-gazing to the
>> offices of the American Institute of Public Opinion and leave our
>> Literary Digest and its figures politely and completely alone...We've
>> been through many poll battles...We've been buffeted by the gales of
>> claims and counter-claims. But never before has any one foretold what
>> our poll was going to show before it was even started."

>>
>> Thus, even if Gallup's claim might not technically be described today as
>> a prediction, it was certainly taken as such at the time by his target,
>> and was probably meant to be.

>>
>>
>> Myth 2

>>
>> Peverill Squire did indeed write in POQ (vol. 52, 1988, p.125), "if all
>> those who were polled had responded, the magazine would have, at least,
>> correctly predicted Roosevelt the winner." However, he then goes on to
>> say: "But more importantly, the initial sample was flawed; when
>> compounded with the response bias, it produced the wildly erroneous
>> forecast of the vote percentages." and then states that "a rough
>> calculation of the bias produced by the sample is around 11%, with
>> another 7% accounted for by problems with the responses."
>> Unfortunately, there is no reason to trust the data from the May 1937
>> Gallup poll used to estimate the nonresponse rate (as Squire himself
>> admits, before going on to do so). There certainly is nothing to justify
>> this kind of precision in divvying up error among specific causes.

>>
>> The fact is that The Literary Digest did not define a sampling frame and
>> did not conduct anything resembling a representative sample, random or
>> otherwise, of the voting population, nor did they make much of an effort
>> to keep track of what was sent out and what was returned. It's
>> convenient to use the spectacular failure of their straw poll as a
>> cautionary tale, but without any real documentation of what they did, or
>> data to analyze, any attribution of specific causality is little more
>> than speculation.

>>
>> Jan Werner

>> _____
>>
>> Dominic Lusinchi wrote:

>>> Thank you, Leo, for sharing this. I am always on the look out for stories
>> on
>>> the Literary Digest's 1936 poll.

>>>
>>> This story perpetuates two myths:

>>>
>>> 1) That Gallup "predicted" that the Digest poll would forecast a Landon
>>> victory and
>>> 2) That the Digest failed because its sampling frame was "skewed ... to

>> the
>>> wealthy".
>>>
>>> Myth 1: In a July 12, 1936 syndicated column "America Speak", Gallup
>> wrote:
>>> "If the Literary Digest were conducting its poll **at the present time**
>> [my
>>> emphasis], following its usual procedure, Landon would be shown in the
>>> lead." (Wash. Post, Section III, p.2, col. 7, Sunday, July 12, 1936) It's
>>> one thing to say "at the present time" and another to say "when the
> Digest
>>> presents its final results"... It is only after the Digest poll debacle
>>> that this story morphed into a "prediction". What Gallup really
> predicted,
>>> at that time (7/12/1936), was that the election was going to be a close
>> one:
>>> the title of his column "1936 Election Seen As Closest in Years".
>>>
>>> Myth 2: The Digest poll failed because its original sample, composed
>> mainly
>>> of telephone and/or car owners, was irretrievably skewed against
>> Roosevelt.
>>> A close analysis of a May 1937 Gallup (yes, Gallup!) poll, which asked
> its
>>> respondents if they had received and returned a Digest ballot card, shows
>>> that the **principal** cause of the Digest poll's failure was
> non-response
>>> bias. As Peverill Squire wrote in POQ (vol. 52, 1988, p.125), "if all
>> those
>>> who were polled had responded, the magazine would have, at least,
>> correctly
>>> predicted Roosevelt the winner." In fact, its prediction (my analysis)
>> would
>>> have been as good if not better than Gallup's - he was off by nearly 7
>>> points of the two-party vote.
>>>
>>> Why Gallup never referred to this May 1937 poll done by his organization
>>> when he commented (many many times) on the failure of the Digest poll...?
>>> Well that would take too long... got to get back to work.
>>>
>>> Best,
>>> Dominic
>>>
>>> Dominic Lusinchi
>>> Far West Research
>>> Statistical Consulting
>>> San Francisco, California
>>> T/F 415-664-3032
>>> www.farwestresearch.com
>>>
>>> -----Original Message-----
>>> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta
>>> Sent: Thursday, March 11, 2010 7:55 AM
>>> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

>>> Subject: George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims

>>>

>>> George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims

>>> By SEAN HIGGINS, INVESTOR'S BUSINESS DAILY

>>>

>>> <http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=526858>

>>>

>>> It's one thing to predict an election correctly.

>>>

>>> It's another to predict how a rival will call an election and just how

>>> and why he will get it wrong.

>>>

>>> Pollster George Gallup did just that in 1936.

>>>

>>> SNIP

>>>

>>> --

>>> Leo G. Simonetta

>>> Director of Research

>>> Art& Science Group

>>> 6115 Falls Road, Suite 101

>>> Baltimore, MD 21209

>>>

>>> -----

>>> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

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

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

>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

>> aapornet-request@asu.edu

>>>

>>> -----

>>> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

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

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

>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

>> aapornet-request@asu.edu

>>>

>>>

>>

>> -----

>> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

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

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

>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

> aapornet-request@asu.edu

>>

>>

>

> -----

> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

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

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

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>

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

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Tue, 16 Mar 2010 10:50:11 -0400
Reply-To: Mick Couper <MCouper@UMICH.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mick Couper <MCouper@UMICH.EDU>
Subject: Research Professor Positions in Survey Methodology at the
University of Michigan
X-To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

The Survey Methodology Program of the Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan has openings in the Research Professor ranks for up to two scholars with a Ph.D. in one of the social sciences. Appointments at the Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, or Research Professor level with ISR tenure are possible, depending on level of experience and qualifications.=20

=20
The Survey Methodology Program scientists conduct research on survey methods, provide direction on innovation in research techniques used within SRC, and provide graduate and postgraduate education in survey methodology. Graduate students at the University of Michigan and University of Maryland (through the Joint Program in Survey Methodology) are taught jointly using distance learning technology. The position involves a mix of teaching, innovation in survey practice, and grant-funded research.=20

=20
The appointment is in the area of social science-based survey methodology. Senior candidates are expected to have developed a successful research program in one or more of the following areas: effects of mode of data collection on survey data quality; social and cognitive psychological influences on measurement error in surveys; the role of the survey interviewer in data quality; effects of question structure, context, and wording on responses; understanding of errors of non-observation, such as coverage and nonresponse. Junior candidates are expected to have developed a trajectory of research in one or more

of these areas.=20

=20
Successful candidates are expected to demonstrate a publication record in scholarly journals and a history of funding for methodological research. Experience in graduate teaching and graduate student mentoring is desirable.

=20
The Survey Research Center in the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan is a unique, world-renowned social science research center that conducts investigator initiated, survey-based research on theoretical and applied problems of both social and scientific importance (please see our website:
<http://www.isr.umich.edu/src/>).

=20
Applicants should submit a letter describing their scholarly activities, funded research programs and plans, and interests in SRC. Please include a CV, names of (but not letters from) references, and one or two recent publications. Salary is highly competitive.=20

=20
Please send applications, nominations and inquiries electronically to SRCSearch@isr.umich.edu or by mail to Survey Research Center Search Committee, Director's Office, Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248. Reference position #38260. Review of applications will begin immediately and will continue until the positions are filled. The University of Michigan is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer and is responsive to the needs of dual career couples. Women and minority candidates are encouraged to apply. Information on the Dual Career Program is available at
http://www.provost.umich.edu/programs/dual_career/.

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Tue, 16 Mar 2010 10:57:53 -0400

Reply-To: hochschild@gov.harvard.edu

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Jennifer Hochschild <hochschild@GOV.HARVARD.EDU>

Organization: Harvard

Subject: surveys of American Indians

X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

X-cc: Vesla Weaver <vmw4r@virginia.edu>,
Traci Burch <traci.burch@gmail.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hello,

My co-authors and I are working on a book about changes (and lack thereof) in the American racial order, and we are including a fair amount of survey research on group identity, attitudes and stereotypes, policy views etc. However, we are finding just about nothing on American Indians -- either as respondents or as topics for survey questions. We have checked Ipoll, ICPSR, Pew, Google Scholar etc. Can anyone point us toward academic articles, polls, responsible journalism -- anything? -- that will convey views of and toward Am. Indians? Your own work, of course, is welcome.

Many thanks, Jennifer

--

Jennifer L. Hochschild
Harvard University
Henry LaBarre Jayne Professor of Government,
Professor of African and African American Studies, and
Harvard College Professor

Department of Government
Harvard University
CGIS -- 1737 Cambridge Street
Cambridge, MA 02138
Phone: 617-496-0181
Fax: 617-495-0438
Hochschild@gov.harvard.edu

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Tue, 16 Mar 2010 11:05:22 -0400
Reply-To: Keith Neuman <Keith.Neuman@ENVIRONICS.CA>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Keith Neuman <Keith.Neuman@ENVIRONICS.CA>
Subject: Re: surveys of American Indians
X-To: "Hochschild@gov.harvard.edu" <Hochschild@gov.harvard.edu>
X-cc: "AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
In-Reply-To: <4B9F9C71.6030602@gov.harvard.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Jennifer,

I can't offer anything on American Indians, but my company (Environics Research) has recently completed some groundbreaking work in Canada that we would be able to share with you if this would be of interest to you. We are

releasing a new study of Aboriginal Peoples living in Canada's urban centres early next month, which includes surveys both with Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal respondents.

Keith Neuman
Environics Research Group
Ottawa, Ontario

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jennifer Hochschild
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 10:58 AM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: surveys of American Indians

Hello,

My co-authors and I are working on a book about changes (and lack thereof) in the American racial order, and we are including a fair amount of survey research on group identity, attitudes and stereotypes, policy views etc. However, we are finding just about nothing on American Indians -- either as respondents or as topics for survey questions. We have checked Ipoll, ICPSR, Pew, Google Scholar etc. Can anyone point us toward academic articles, polls, responsible journalism -- anything? -- that will convey views of and toward Am. Indians? Your own work, of course, is welcome.

Many thanks, Jennifer

--
Jennifer L. Hochschild
Harvard University
Henry LaBarre Jayne Professor of Government,
Professor of African and African American Studies, and
Harvard College Professor

Department of Government
Harvard University
CGIS -- 1737 Cambridge Street
Cambridge, MA 02138
Phone: 617-496-0181
Fax: 617-495-0438
Hochschild@gov.harvard.edu

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Tue, 16 Mar 2010 08:15:16 -0700

Reply-To: Dominic Lusinchi <dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Dominic Lusinchi <dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM>

Organization: Far West Research

Subject: Re: George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims

X-To: jwerner@jwdp.com

X-cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

In-Reply-To: <4B9F8D68.2070103@jwdp.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Thank you, Jan, for your insights; always glad to discuss what I see as the defining moment in the genesis of modern polling.

Aside from our difference regarding the semantics of what constitutes a prediction, the ****perception**** is just as important: i.e. that the Digest editors saw it as such reveals a lot about them - specifically how convinced they were that their poll was an "uncanny" "forecasting machine".

Dominic

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

From: Jan Werner [<mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 6:54 AM

To: Dominic Lusinchi

Cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: Re: George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims

The late John Gorman, who founded Opinion Dynamics, liked to mention a specific date in the late 1970's, which he estimated was the day on which George McGovern edged out Richard Nixon, based on trending how respondents said they voted in the 1972 presidential election in polls conducted during the years following the Watergate affair. John's estimate was also based on data, however imperfect.

As for what is, or isn't, a prediction, I'll let it go at that. Others can make up their own minds as to what Gallup intended when he wrote what he did in 1936, and what it should be called.

Regardless of whether or not we agree, I'd like to thank you for an enlightening discussion and much valuable information. Let me note that the image you sent me of the 7-12-1936 Washington Post article does not include the beginning of the article on page 1, and there is no way to tell whether the headline "1936 Election Seen As Closest in Years" was written by Gallup or by the Washington Post's editor.

Jan Werner

Dominic Lusinchi wrote:

> Well, Jan, if you consider these two statements semantically equivalent:
>
> - "If the Literary Digest were conducting its poll at the present time,
> following its usual procedure, Landon would be shown in the lead."
> - "When all the results are in the Digest poll will show Landon in the
> lead."
>
> then I can't much argue about that - we've reached a dead-end.
>
> You say that you don't consider "the May 1937 Gallup data as being
reliable
> enough" to say anything about what caused the 1936 Digest poll to fail so
> miserably. I agree (along with Squire) that the Gallup survey is less than
> perfect. But I disagree that it cannot be used for the problem at hand.
> Gallup polls of the 30s and 40s have been put to good use by researchers:
> e.g., Baum& Kernell "Economic Class and Popular Support for Franklin
> Roosevelt in War and Peace," Public Opinion Quarterly 65, 2001, 198-229;
and
> Berinsky's 2006 discussion "American Public Opinion in the 1930s and
1940s:
> The Analysis of Quota-Controlled Sample Survey Data," Public Opinion
> Quarterly 70: 499-529. The polls have their limitations and the data have
to
> be analyzed with that in mind.
>
> The "conventional explanation", as it has been called, that the 1936
Digest
> poll failed because it was biased in favor of Landon due to the fact that
it
> relied mainly on lists of phone owners and car owners, is pure
speculation,
> plausible speculation perhaps, but speculation nonetheless. In contrast,
the
> only real evidence we have, although it is limited and has flaws (the
> results from Allentown, Scranton, Chicago, Cedar Rapids and the Gallup
data)
> all points to the same problem: non-response bias. My preference in
> describing what happened to the 1936 Digest poll leans towards the latter
> (warts and all). It is, of course, a tentative explanation but it has the
> advantage of being back by data, however imperfect.
>
> As for your last comment about the belief that the Literary Digest poll
> failure being the reason why pollsters began using probability samples is,
> of course, nonsense, so I agree with you on that - but since the issue was
> not part of the original post, I'll leave it at that.
>
> Cheers,
> Dominic
>

>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com]
> Sent: Monday, March 15, 2010 8:36 PM
> To: Dominic Lusinchi
> Cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
> Subject: Re: George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims

>
> Some really good stuff here, but, as you suggested in an earlier
> (off-list) message, we are probably going to have to agree to disagree
> -- My reaction is that, if anything, your additional material supports
> my previously expressed opinions.
>
> So, let me clarify what I mean by replacing one set of myths with another.

>
> Myth 1:

>
> Original myth: Gallup predicted the Literary Digest straw poll results.
> Revised myth: Gallup did not predict anything.
>
> My take: Gallup presented what he knew full well would be interpreted as
> a prediction, although he worded it so as to provide him with an escape
> if he were wrong. Given what we know now (see Myth 2) he was very lucky
> to come as close as he did. Whether or not that constitutes a prediction
> is a semantic judgment.

>
> Myth 2:

>
> Original myth: The Literary Digest poll failed because it did not use a
> representative sample.
> Revised myth: It failed because of nonresponse bias (as shown by the May
> 1937 Gallup data, and other sources).
>
> My take: The Literary Digest polling procedures were a complete mess.
> Evidence from other sources does show that an unrepresentative sample
> was not the sole cause, but is not strong enough to prove anything
> beyond that. In particular, I don't see the May 1937 Gallup data as
> being reliable enough to justify giving either bad sampling or
> nonresponse bias pride of place, so to speak, in assigning blame.

>
> None of this addresses what I consider to be the worst myth about the
> Literary Digest straw poll failure, namely that it was the reason
> pollsters began using probability samples.

>
> Jan Werner

> _____
>

> Dominic Lusinchi wrote:

>> Jan,
>>
>> Thanks for your response. Here are my comments.

>>
>> Your statement to the effect that "It's one thing to debunk a myth, it's
>> something quite different to replace one myth with another" is an

> inaccurate
>> characterization of what I am saying. I am not replacing one myth by
> another
>> as you seem to suggest - if I am: what myth is it that I am promoting?
>>
>> Myth 1
>>
>> The fact that the protagonists (Funk and Gallup) believe that what Gallup
>> said in his July 12 column is a prediction does not make it a prediction.
> I
>> repeat that what Gallup was ****really**** predicting was a close race: so
> says
>> the title of his column (which I hope you received). The Digest editors
> came
>> to believe, and were encouraged to do so by all the praise they received
>> regarding its "uncanny accuracy" (10/31/1936, 6), that their poll was a
>> "forecasting machine" (8/22/1936, 3), when in reality they had no idea
how
>> their poll results were produced - in other words, the belief does not
> make
>> it so.
>>
>> In any case, this (the so-called "prediction") was used as a great
>> promotional story after the Digest fiasco to show and tell: show that the
>> new "scientific" polling was the wave of the future and tell that the
> Digest
>> "straw" polling was a thing of the past. For example, Crossley wrote:
"The
>> Institute [Gallup] even went so far as to forecast the DIGEST vote, which
> it
>> did with remarkable accuracy by the simple means of tabulating separately
>> that part of its ballots which followed the DIGEST's general basis."
> ("Straw
>> Polls in 1936", Archibald M. Crossley, The Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol.
> 1,
>> No. 1. (Jan., 1937), p.29) The moral of the story: the "scientific" polls
>> are superior because not only can they predict correctly the election but
>> they can also predict what the Digest would forecast.
>>
>> I agree with you when you say it was ****"presented"*** as a "throw-away
>> comment"; but it really was a very cleverly worded statement. I also
agree
>> when you say that it was meant to "generate publicity for Gallup's
> fledgling
>> organization." Think about it: if I (Gallup) am wrong, I can always say
>> (plausible deniability) that's how things (the presidential race) were at
>> that time (July); if I'm right, I can present it as a prediction (of the
>> results the Digest will publish right before the election) and thereby
>> trumpet the superiority of my "scientific" polling methods. The statement
>> has to be analyzed within an overall strategy to dominate the opinion
>> polling domain.
>>
>> Gallup and his fellow "scientific" pollsters were not disinterested
> parties

>> searching for the cause of the failure of the DIGEST poll out of some
>> academic interest. They wanted to be top dogs and knock the Digest off
its
>> pedestal. They used the Digest incident, especially in the early years,
to
>> promote what they considered to be a superior "product": their
> "scientific"
>> polling. Of course, they were to receive a nasty shock in 1948 - although
>> not fatal to them, as 1936 was for the Digest.
>>
>> Myth 2
>>
>> I had the opportunity, thanks to the Roper Center, to have access to the
> raw
>> data from the May 1937 AIPO (Gallup) poll. First the data in its raw form
>> requires some editing because the file contains some anomalies. For
> example,
>> you might have noticed that in Squire's table 2 (p.130) there are 780
>> respondents that claim to have received the Digest ballot, while in table
> 3
>> (p.131), which reports what they did with the ballot (returned or not or
>> don't know), there are 829 respondents! Squire analyzed the data at face
>> value.
>>
>> Second, Squire did not weight the data despite the fact that we have
>> information that allows us to do so: each candidate's share of the actual
>> vote, the response rate to the Digest (~24%), and the percent each
> candidate
>> received from respondents to the poll. This takes care of anomalies,
> pointed
>> out by Squire, such as over-report of support for FDR, over-sampling of
>> Digest poll respondents, and over-report of support for FDR among
>> respondents.
>>
>> The weighted results confirm much of Squire's conclusions: had the Digest
>> relied solely on telephone and car owners it would have forecast a
> Roosevelt
>> victory; Digest non-respondents were strongly in favor of FDR; and, last
> but
>> not least, had all those who were polled by the Digest responded, the
>> magazine would have pointed to the correct candidate. In other words, yes
>> the Digest original sample of 10M was biased but not sufficiently to have
>> prevented it from calling a Roosevelt victory. In fact, a less "rough
>> calculation" (Squire, p.131) shows that non-response bias was the main
>> culprit.
>>
>> Ironically, the samples Gallup used throughout the 30s and 40s were also
>> biased - in favor of Republicans. And he was called on that (e.g. Special
>> House Committee Investigating Campaign Expenditures, 1944).
>>
>> The conclusions based on the May 1937 poll (e.g. non-response as the main
>> cause of the 1936 Digest poll failure) are consistent with other
available
>> data. I have re-analyzed the data provided by Cahalan in his Cedar Rapids

>> study in 1936-7 reported in his 1989 POQ (vol. 53 pp.129-133) and in 1939
>> Psychological Record (vol.1, no.1, pp.3-11) papers. The results show that
>> the Digest list used for that city was not biased and that respondents
and
>> non-respondents were very different in their candidate preference. Add to
>> that the results from Allentown, Scranton and Chicago where only
> registered
>> voters were polled (Digest, 14 November, 1936, p.7) and I would say we
> have
>> some pretty solid "real documentation".
>>
>> Does this amount to a definitive answer? No, absolutely not. The only way
> we
>> could have resolved the question would have been to conduct, on the
> original
>> sample of 10M, the same type of study that Cahalan performed in Cedar
>> Rapids: select a random sample from the Digest list and ask respondents
>> whether or not they sent in their Digest ballot and which candidate they
>> favored at that time.
>>
>> Short of that the May 1937 AIPO survey, the Cahalan study and the results
>> from Allentown, Scranton and Chicago is the best we have. Speculation you
>> say? Well, yes, I suppose you're right, but a lot less than simply
> repeating
>> the old refrain repeated by so many: "The failure of the Literary
Digest's
>> polling approach can be explained simply. The Digest's sample of voters
> was
>> drawn from lists of automobile and telephones owners." (Gallup, 1972,
>> "Opinion Polling in a Democracy", in Statistics: A Guide to the Unknown,
>> Judith M. Tanur et al. (eds.), San Francisco, Holden-Day, p.147.)
>>
>> Best regards,
>> Dominic
>>
>>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com]
>> Sent: Friday, March 12, 2010 8:26 PM
>> To: Dominic Lusinchi
>> Cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
>> Subject: Re: George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims
>>
>> It's one thing to debunk a myth, it's something quite different to
>> replace one myth with another.
>>
>> Myth 1
>>
>> What Gallup wrote in the July 12 1936 article was: "...if The Literary
>> Digest were conducting a poll at the present time...the actual figures
>> would be in the neighborhood of 44 per cent for Roosevelt and 56 per
>> cent for Landon." Although it was presented as a throw-away comment,
>> Gallup did not come up with those numbers lightly. As he explained to a
>> journalist a few years later, he "was able to call [The Literary

>> Digest's] shot by making a separate survey of telephone subscribers and
>> automobile owners -- the class which would mail back most of the
>> Digest's ballots." (Williston Rich, Jr., "The Human Yardstick," Saturday
>> Evening Post, January 21, 1939)

>>
>> The statement was clearly intended to provoke a response from The
>> Literary Digest and thus generate publicity for Gallup's fledgling
>> organization. In that regard, he succeeded. On July 19, 1936, the New
>> York Times quoted an open letter from Wilfred J. Funk, editor of The
>> Literary Digest, as follows: "I am beginning to wish ... that the
>> esteemed Dr. Gallup would confine his political crystal-gazing to the
>> offices of the American Institute of Public Opinion and leave our
>> Literary Digest and its figures politely and completely alone...We've
>> been through many poll battles...We've been buffeted by the gales of
>> claims and counter-claims. But never before has any one foretold what
>> our poll was going to show before it was even started."

>>
>> Thus, even if Gallup's claim might not technically be described today as
>> a prediction, it was certainly taken as such at the time by his target,
>> and was probably meant to be.

>>
>>
>> Myth 2

>>
>> Peverill Squire did indeed write in POQ (vol. 52, 1988, p.125), "if all
>> those who were polled had responded, the magazine would have, at least,
>> correctly predicted Roosevelt the winner." However, he then goes on to
>> say: "But more importantly, the initial sample was flawed; when
>> compounded with the response bias, it produced the wildly erroneous
>> forecast of the vote percentages." and then states that "a rough
>> calculation of the bias produced by the sample is around 11%, with
>> another 7% accounted for by problems with the responses."
>> Unfortunately, there is no reason to trust the data from the May 1937
>> Gallup poll used to estimate the nonresponse rate (as Squire himself
>> admits, before going on to do so). There certainly is nothing to justify
>> this kind of precision in divvying up error among specific causes.

>>
>> The fact is that The Literary Digest did not define a sampling frame and
>> did not conduct anything resembling a representative sample, random or
>> otherwise, of the voting population, nor did they make much of an effort
>> to keep track of what was sent out and what was returned. It's
>> convenient to use the spectacular failure of their straw poll as a
>> cautionary tale, but without any real documentation of what they did, or
>> data to analyze, any attribution of specific causality is little more
>> than speculation.

>>
>> Jan Werner

>> _____
>>
>> Dominic Lusinchi wrote:

>>> Thank you, Leo, for sharing this. I am always on the look out for
stories
>> on
>>> the Literary Digest's 1936 poll.

>>>>
>>> This story perpetuates two myths:
>>>>
>>> 1) That Gallup "predicted" that the Digest poll would forecast a Landon
>>> victory and
>>> 2) That the Digest failed because its sampling frame was "skewed ... to
>> the
>>> wealthy".
>>>>
>>> Myth 1: In a July 12, 1936 syndicated column "America Speak", Gallup
>> wrote:
>>> "If the Literary Digest were conducting its poll **at the present time**
>> [my
>>> emphasis], following its usual procedure, Landon would be shown in the
>>> lead." (Wash. Post, Section III, p.2, col. 7, Sunday, July 12, 1936)
It's
>>> one thing to say "at the present time" and another to say "when the
> Digest
>>> presents its final results".... It is only after the Digest poll debacle
>>> that this story morphed into a "prediction". What Gallup really
> predicted,
>>> at that time (7/12/1936), was that the election was going to be a close
>> one:
>>> the title of his column "1936 Election Seen As Closest in Years".
>>>>
>>> Myth 2: The Digest poll failed because its original sample, composed
>> mainly
>>> of telephone and/or car owners, was irretrievably skewed against
>> Roosevelt.
>>> A close analysis of a May 1937 Gallup (yes, Gallup!) poll, which asked
> its
>>> respondents if they had received and returned a Digest ballot card,
shows
>>> that the **principal** cause of the Digest poll's failure was
> non-response
>>> bias. As Peverill Squire wrote in POQ (vol. 52, 1988, p.125), "if all
>> those
>>> who were polled had responded, the magazine would have, at least,
>> correctly
>>> predicted Roosevelt the winner." In fact, its prediction (my analysis)
>> would
>>> have been as good if not better than Gallup's - he was off by nearly 7
>>> points of the two-party vote.
>>>>
>>> Why Gallup never referred to this May 1937 poll done by his organization
>>> when he commented (many many times) on the failure of the Digest
poll...?
>>> Well that would take too long... got to get back to work.
>>>>
>>> Best,
>>> Dominic
>>>>
>>> Dominic Lusinchi
>>> Far West Research

>>> Statistical Consulting
>>> San Francisco, California
>>> T/F 415-664-3032
>>> www.farwestresearch.com
>>>

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

>>> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta
>>> Sent: Thursday, March 11, 2010 7:55 AM
>>> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
>>> Subject: George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims
>>>

>>> George Gallup's Visionary Grip On American Wins And Whims
>>> By SEAN HIGGINS, INVESTOR'S BUSINESS DAILY
>>>
>>> <http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=526858>
>>>

>>> It's one thing to predict an election correctly.
>>>

>>> It's another to predict how a rival will call an election and just how
>>> and why he will get it wrong.
>>>

>>> Pollster George Gallup did just that in 1936.
>>>

>>> SNIP
>>>

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

>>> -----
>>> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
>>> <http://www.aapor.org>
>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>>> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:
>>> aapornet-request@asu.edu
>>>

>>> -----
>>> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
>>> <http://www.aapor.org>
>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>>> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:
>>> aapornet-request@asu.edu
>>>

>>> -----
>>> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
>>> <http://www.aapor.org>
>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .

>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:
> aapornet-request@asu.edu
>>
>>
>
> -----
> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
> <http://www.aapor.org>
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> set aapornet nomail
> On your return send this: set aapornet mail
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>
>

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Tue, 16 Mar 2010 11:43:12 -0500
Reply-To: Peter Miller <p-miller@NORTHWESTERN.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Peter Miller <p-miller@NORTHWESTERN.EDU>
Subject: Re: surveys of American Indians
X-To: hochschild@gov.harvard.edu
X-cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <4B9F9C71.6030602@gov.harvard.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1

A research synthesis was published in POQ last year:

Bridget Lavelle, Michael D. Larsen, and Craig Gundersen *Strategies for Surveys of American Indians*
Public Opinion Quarterly Advance Access published on May 23, 2009
Public Opin Q 2009 73: 385-403

I hope that it is of help. Peter

On Tue, Mar 16, 2010 at 9:57 AM, Jennifer Hochschild <hochschild@gov.harvard.edu> wrote:

> Hello,
>
> My co-authors and I are working on a book about changes (and lack
> thereof) in the American racial order, and we are including a fair
> amount of survey research on group identity, attitudes and stereotypes,

> policy views etc. However, we are finding just about nothing on
> American Indians -- either as respondents or as topics for survey
> questions. We have checked Ipoll, ICPSR, Pew, Google Scholar etc. Can
> anyone point us toward academic articles, polls, responsible journalism
> -- anything? -- that will convey views of and toward Am. Indians? Your
> own work, of course, is welcome.

> Many thanks, Jennifer

> --
> Jennifer L. Hochschild
> Harvard University
> Henry LaBarre Jayne Professor of Government,
> Professor of African and African American Studies, and
> Harvard College Professor

> Department of Government
> Harvard University
> CGIS -- 1737 Cambridge Street
> Cambridge, MA 02138
> Phone: 617-496-0181
> Fax: 617-495-0438
> Hochschild@gov.harvard.edu

> -----
> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
> <http://www.aapor.org>
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> signoff aapornet
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Tue, 16 Mar 2010 13:41:10 -0400
Reply-To: "Blumberg, Stephen J. (CDC/OSELS/NCHS)" <swb5@CDC.GOV>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Blumberg, Stephen J. (CDC/OSELS/NCHS)" <swb5@CDC.GOV>
Subject: AAPOR Code
X-To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Yesterday, all AAPOR members should have received an e-mail from AAPOR Headquarters inviting you to comment on recommended revisions to the AAPOR Code. Article IX of the AAPOR Bylaws requires a review of the Code at least every five years to keep it current with changing environmental circumstances. =20
The Executive Council has agreed on the draft of the revised Code that is now posted on the AAPOR Web site. Interested members are invited to submit written comments on or before Friday, April 2, 2010 to standards@aapor.org.=20

Regards,

Stephen Blumberg, AAPOR Standards Chair
Reg Baker, Associate Standards Chair

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Tue, 16 Mar 2010 19:42:21 +0100
Reply-To: peter.mohler@uni-mannheim.de
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Peter Mohler <peter.mohler@UNI-MANNHEIM.DE>
Organization: =?ISO-8859-1?Q?Universit=E4t_Mannheim_?=
Subject: Re: surveys of American Indians
X-To: Peter Miller <p-miller@NORTHWESTERN.EDU>
X-cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <815570ad1003160943y105cc6a9v292c91ad84c63745@mail.gmail.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Dear AAPOR, very timely question. Wouldn't it be also timely to dedicate an AAPOR meeting, say in 2011, on the topic of race (including new racism in the US and elsewhere)?

Peter Mohler (Europe)

ps. is there any discussion about the term 'nation' referring to the 'First Nations' on United States territory - or is it still the general view that they have never been 'na

On 16.03.2010 17:43, Peter Miller wrote:

> A research synthesis was published in POQ last year:
>
> Bridget Lavelle, Michael D. Larsen, and Craig Gundersen *Strategies for
> Surveys of American Indians*
> Public Opinion Quarterly Advance Access published on May 23, 2009
> Public Opin Q 2009 73: 385-403

> I hope that it is of help. Peter

> On Tue, Mar 16, 2010 at 9:57 AM, Jennifer Hochschild<
> hochschild@gov.harvard.edu> wrote:

>> Hello,

>> My co-authors and I are working on a book about changes (and lack
>> thereof) in the American racial order, and we are including a fair
>> amount of survey research on group identity, attitudes and stereotypes,
>> policy views etc. However, we are finding just about nothing on
>> American Indians -- either as respondents or as topics for survey
>> questions. We have checked Ipoll, ICPSR, Pew, Google Scholar etc. Can
>> anyone point us toward academic articles, polls, responsible journalism
>> -- anything? -- that will convey views of and toward Am. Indians? Your
>> own work, of course, is welcome.

>> Many thanks, Jennifer

>> Jennifer L. Hochschild
>> Harvard University
>> Henry LaBarre Jayne Professor of Government,
>> Professor of African and African American Studies, and
>> Harvard College Professor

>> Department of Government
>> Harvard University
>> CGIS -- 1737 Cambridge Street
>> Cambridge, MA 02138
>> Phone: 617-496-0181
>> Fax: 617-495-0438
>> Hochschild@gov.harvard.edu

>> -----
>> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
>> <http://www.aapor.org>
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>> Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
>> signoff aapornet
>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>
> --
> Peter V. Miller, PhD.
> Department of Communication Studies
> Northwestern University
> President, American Association for Public Opinion Research
> p-miller@northwestern.edu
>
> -----
> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
> <http://www.aapor.org>
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> signoff aapornet
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>
>
>

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Tue, 16 Mar 2010 14:57:21 -0400
Reply-To: kenneth.steve@DOT.GOV
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: kenneth.steve@DOT.GOV
Subject: Job Opening at BTS
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Job Title: Survey Statistician, GS-1530-9 / 11 / 12 AT=20

Department: Department Of Transportation=20

Agency: Research and Innovative Technology Administration=20

Sub Agency: the U.S. Department of Transportation=20

Job Announcement Number: RITA.BTS-2010-0002=20

=20

SALARY RANGE: 51,630.00 - 97,333.00 USD /year=20

OPEN PERIOD: Monday, March 15, 2010 to Monday, April 05, 2010=20

SERIES & GRADE: GS-1530-09/12=20

POSITION INFORMATION: Full Time Permanent

=20

PROMOTION POTENTIAL: 12=20

DUTY LOCATIONS: 1 vacancy - Washington, DC=20

WHO MAY BE CONSIDERED: Applications will be accepted from any U.S. citizen.

=20

JOB SUMMARY:

This position serves as a Survey Statistician within the Office of Survey Programs, Bureau of Transportation Statistics (BTS), a component of the Research and Innovative Technology Administration (RITA). The Office of Survey Programs is responsible for developing, implementing, and monitoring transportation surveys, and analyzing, publishing, and disseminating data that describe the characteristics, performance, use, and impact of the Nation's transportation systems.=20

=20

RITA is offering a developmental opportunity to a mid-level professional who is motivated and self-reliant who can participate in designing, planning, analyzing and implementing transportation surveys to collect and process data, which includes developing survey forms and data collection plans, designing and implementing analysis plans and preparing statistical findings; and using SAS or other statistical software with skilled professionals who ensure the safety and effectiveness of the transportation industry. This position is located in the New DOT building, which sits directly across the street from the Navy Yard Metro and blocks away from the new National's Baseball stadium. RITA has flexible work schedules (to include Telework) and flexible health benefits.

=20

KEY REQUIREMENTS:

You must be a U.S. Citizen & meet specialized experience=20

Submit application and resume online by 11:59 PM EST on the closing date.=20

Provide ALL required documents by closing date (see How to Apply Tab)=20

Position is telework eligible.=20

Job also advertised under Merit Promotion, see: RITA.BTS-2010-0001=20

Job announcement may be used to fill similar positions within 90 days.

=20

DUTIES:

At the full performance level, the Survey Statistician:

Assists with the development and implementation of the Bureau's program for providing transportation-related data via household and/or establishment surveys;

Consults with survey practitioners within the RITA/BTS; with other OAs within the DOT, with Federal agencies beyond the DOT; with researchers, survey statisticians, and statistical sampling experts in academia and in the private sector; and with data user client groups in a continuous program to examine, test, evaluate, and improve transportation survey techniques, concepts, terminology, materials, and processing;

Initiates and develops projects concerning survey requirements by reviewing transportation policies within and beyond BTS and considering their implications for assigned data needs, as well as the results and designs of other current or previous travel surveys;

Provides technical assistance and assists with developing specifications for any phase of transportation;

Prepares Requests for Proposals (RFPs), Statements of Work (SOW), and interagency agreements for conducting transportation surveys sponsored by the BTS;

Meets with contractors to monitor their participation in the BTS transportation surveys;=20

Maintains a management information system for survey projects, and monitors costs and progress continuously; observes data collection and processing operations;

Represents BTS' interests at regular status meetings with contractors; prepares professional papers and makes presentations to inform the transportation profession, survey practitioners, and data users about BTS survey activities;

Participates in statistical and transportation professional organizations, attends professional meetings and reviews the current research literature to keep abreast of state-of-the-art survey techniques and methodologies.

=20

OFFICIAL JOB POSTING:

atistician%2c+GS-1530-9+%2f+11+%2f+12++AT&q=3DRITA.BTS-2010-0001&where=3D=
&br
d=3D3876&vw=3Db&FedEmp=3DN&FedPub=3DY&x=3D52&y=3D17&AVSDM=3D2010-03-15+00=
%3a03%3a00

=20

atistician%2c+GS-1530-9+%2f+11+%2f+12++AT&q=3DRITA.BTS-2010-0002&where=3D=
&br
d=3D3876&vw=3Db&FedEmp=3DN&FedPub=3DY&x=3D57&y=3D15&AVSDM=3D2010-03-15+00=
%3a03%3a00

=20

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Wed, 17 Mar 2010 10:16:35 -0400

Reply-To: colleen_porter@COX.NET

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Colleen Porter <colleen_porter@COX.NET>

Subject: Re: Presentation Zen: book review

X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.edu

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=UTF-8; format=flowed; delpsp=no

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Disposition: inline

A reader was kind enough to point out that there are actually two PZ books by Garr Reynolds, the 2008 "Presentation Zen: Simple Ideas on Presentation Design and Delivery" (which is what I had reviewed) as well as the 2009 "Presentation Zen Design: Simple Design Principles and Techniques to Enhance Your Presentations."

What I need now is a good book about poster presentations. Any recommendations? Beyond the obvious (56-point type!), what makes for a readable, clear poster?

This is a challenge, because I am supposed to present a poster at a conference the week after AAPOR. There is no data to graph; it's a think piece along the lines of the "Merry-go-rounds and Roller Coasters" essay that I sent to AAPORNET last June. Does sequential art (e.g. comic strips) work well in a poster?

Colleen Porter
Gainesville, FL

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Wed, 17 Mar 2010 16:40:51 +0000
Reply-To: "nickp@marketsharescorp.com" <mkshares@COMCAST.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "nickp@marketsharescorp.com" <mkshares@COMCAST.NET>
Subject: FYI; Pre-Conference
X-To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
In-Reply-To:
<1958981548.2345021268843919914.JavaMail.root@sz0107a.emeryville.ca.mail.comcast.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=utf-8
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

"Fox News Channel commentator and former Alaska Gov. Sarah Palin has been booked to speak at the Rosemont Theatre on May 12."

<http://newsblogs.chicagotribune.com/towerticker/2010/03/sarah-palin-to-speak-at-windam-event-in-may.html>

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Wed, 17 Mar 2010 18:04:04 +0100
Reply-To: Edith de Leeuw <edithl@XS4ALL.NL>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Edith de Leeuw <edithl@XS4ALL.NL>
Subject: Re: Presentation Zen: book review
X-To: colleen_porter@COX.NET, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <24291980.29856.1268835395047.JavaMail.colleen_porter@127.0.0.1>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Some useful tips, including for posters can be found at

<http://www.ploscollections.org/article/browseIssue.action?issue=info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fissue.pcol.v03.i01>

And my personal opinion a (very short) comic strip or a cartoon is always nice. It will certainly draw the attention to your poster, and people will probably stop to read it, and then you have them hooked :-)

Good luck Edith

t 10:16 AM 3/17/2010 -0400, Colleen Porter wrote:

>A reader was kind enough to point out that there are actually two PZ
>books by Garr Reynolds, the 2008 "Presentation Zen: Simple Ideas on
>Presentation Design and Delivery" (which is what I had reviewed) as well
>as the 2009 "Presentation Zen Design: Simple Design Principles and
>Techniques to Enhance Your Presentations."

>
>What I need now is a good book about poster presentations. Any
>recommendations? Beyond the obvious (56-point type!), what makes for a
>readable, clear poster?

>
>This is a challenge, because I am supposed to present a poster at a
>conference the week after AAPOR. There is no data to graph; it's a
>think piece along the lines of the "Merry-go-rounds and Roller Coasters"
>essay that I sent to AAPORNET last June. Does sequential art (e.g.
>comic strips) work well in a poster?

>
>Colleen Porter
>Gainesville, FL

>
>-----
>Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
><http://www.aapor.org>
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

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

Klaag niet dat de rozen doornen hebben,
Maar verheug u dat doornen rozen dragen

Do not moan about roses having thorns
Rejoice at thorns bearing roses

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Wed, 17 Mar 2010 20:28:44 +0100
Reply-To: Edith de Leeuw <edithl@XS4ALL.NL>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Edith de Leeuw <edithl@XS4ALL.NL>
Subject: Milgram revisited
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
X-cc: WAPOR@UNL.EDU
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Every social psychologists remembers the experiments on 'obedience' by Stanley Milgram.

Too many people are willing to give electric shocks to others if asked. Milgram attributed this to obedience to authority. If a scientist in a white lab coat asked to give a high voltage shock, the experimental subjects obeyed (despite the screams of the victim). But is it obedience to authority, or is reality even more grim and are people prepared to do anything for their 15 minutes of fame and some money?

Christophe Nick a French documentary and movie maker just launched 'La zone Extreme'. People who thought they were partaking in a TV quiz program, were asked after each wrong answer if they wanted to stop or continue. If they continued, an innocent man sitting in a chair got an electric shock, starting at 80 volts, and increasing after each wrong answer of the quiz candidate up to 460 volts.

And even when they heard the screams and saw the victim beg for mercy or finally slide down unconscious and presumed dead, some quiz candidates continued.

Of course, the victim was an actor (like in Milgram's experiments) and nobody got really hurt. Except some of us in their belief in humanity.

Is it the new authority, or are people doing just anything for winning and money, or ...

See also

<http://www.rtbef.be/info/societe/medias/le-jeu-de-la-mort-un-docu-fiction-edifiant-191724>

(in French)

or

<http://www.france24.com/en/20100317-disturbing-tv-docu-game-tests-limits-small-screen-power-france-game-of-death>

(in English)

Edith

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

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Wed, 17 Mar 2010 13:26:09 -0700
Reply-To: Michael Sullivan <michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Michael Sullivan <michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM>
Subject: Re: Milgram revisisted
X-To: Edith de Leeuw <edithl@XS4ALL.NL>,
"AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
In-Reply-To: <5.1.0.14.2.20100317201058.01852aa8@pop.xs4all.nl>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Very interesting result. It appears to be a pretty good replication of Milgram's original work on the subject substituting a game show host for Milgram's researchers. What is remarkable about this line of research (including Milgram's work) is the degree to "authority" appears to be defined situationally, so that someone with no societal level authority like a "researcher" or a "television game show host" can elicit compliance just because of the situation in which the compliance is sought.

There is hope for the human race, but not much.

MS

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Edith de Leeuw
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 12:29 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Milgram revisisted

Every social psychologists remembers the experiments on 'obedience' by Stanley Milgram.

Too many people are willing to give electric shocks to others if asked. Milgram attributed this to obedience to authority. If a scientist in a white lab coat asked to give a high voltage shock, the experimental subjects obied (despite the screams of teh victim). But is it obedience to authority, or is reality even more grim and are people prepared to do anything for their 15 minutes of fame and some money?

Christophe Nick a French documentary and movie maker just launched "La zone Extreme'. People who thought they were partaking in a TV quiz program, were asked after each wrong answer if they wanted to stop or continue. If they continued, an innocent man sitting in a chair got an electric shock, starting at 80 volts, and increasig after each wrong answer of the quiz

candidate up to 460 volts.

And even when they heard the screams and saw the victim beg for mercy or finally slide down unconscious and presumed dead, some quiz candidates continued.

Of course, the victim was an actor (like in Milgram's experiments) and nobody got really hurt. Except some of us in their belief in humanity.

Is tv the new authority, or are people doing just anything for winning and money, or ...

See also

<http://www.rtb.be/info/societe/medias/le-jeu-de-la-mort-un-docu-fiction-edifiant-191724>

(in French)

or

<http://www.france24.com/en/20100317-disturbing-tv-docu-game-tests-limits-small-screen-power-france-game-of-death>

(in English)

Edith

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

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Date: Wed, 17 Mar 2010 13:37:25 -0700

Reply-To: Stuart Kasdin <skasdin1@YAHOO.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Stuart Kasdin <skasdin1@YAHOO.COM>

Subject: Re: Milgram revisited

X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

In-Reply-To: <28CCEB02B0B64D4091ED6FD17DF571691837C48ABE@EX-BE-024-

SV1.shared.themessagecenter.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Before we write off humanity, I would want to know how they select the participants for the show. Unlike Milgram where there was the expectation of a somewhat random selection, these participants are selected for particular characteristics (the "Springer" qualities). They also know that they are on a show (assuming this is not a hoax). I don't think that we can treat these people as representative of anything. As far as this show is concerned, humanity is off the hook.

--- On Wed, 3/17/10, Michael Sullivan <michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM> wrote:

From: Michael Sullivan <michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM>
Subject: Re: Milgram revisited
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Date: Wednesday, March 17, 2010, 4:26 PM

Very interesting result. It appears to be a pretty good replication of Milgram's original work on the subject substituting a game show host for Milgram's researchers. What is remarkable about this line of research (including Milgram's work) is the degree to which "authority" appears to be defined situationally, so that someone with no societal level authority like a "researcher" or a "television game show host" can elicit compliance just because of the situation in which the compliance is sought.

There is hope for the human race, but not much.

MS

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Edith de Leeuw
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 12:29 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Milgram revisited

Every social psychologist remembers the experiments on 'obedience' by Stanley Milgram.

Too many people are willing to give electric shocks to others if asked. Milgram attributed this to obedience to authority. If a scientist in a white lab coat asked to give a high voltage shock, the experimental subjects obeyed (despite the screams of the victim). But is it obedience to authority, or is reality even more grim and are people prepared to do anything for their 15 minutes of fame and some money?

Christophe Nick a French documentary and movie maker just launched "La zone Extreme". People who thought they were partaking in a TV quiz program, were asked after each wrong answer if they wanted to stop or continue. If they continued, an innocent man sitting in a chair got an electric shock,

starting at 80 volts, and increasing after each wrong answer of the quiz candidate up to 460 volts.

And even when they heard the screams and saw the victim beg for mercy or finally slide down unconscious and presumed dead, some quiz candidates continued.

Of course, the victim was an actor (like in Milgram's experiments) and nobody got really hurt. Except some of us in their belief in humanity.

Is tv the new authority, or are people doing just anything for winning and money, or ...

See also

<http://www.rtb.be/info/societe/medias/le-jeu-de-la-mort-un-docu-fiction-edifiant-191724>

(in French)

or

<http://www.france24.com/en/20100317-disturbing-tv-docu-game-tests-limits-sm-all-screen-power-france-game-of-death>

(in English)

Edith

Professor Dr. Edith D. de Leeuw

Plantage Doklaan 40, NL-1018 CN Amsterdam

tel + 31 20 622 34 38 fax + 31 20 330 25 97

e-mail edithl@xs4all.nl

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

u

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

u

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Date: Wed, 17 Mar 2010 16:48:38 -0400
Reply-To: "Butler, Sarah" <Sarah.Butler@NERA.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Butler, Sarah" <Sarah.Butler@NERA.COM>
Subject: Re: Milgram revisited
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: A<113600.33874.qm@web53305.mail.re2.yahoo.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Also, there seems to be an interesting difference in that in Milgram the questions were supposedly asked to the recipient of the shocks (who was in on the experiment) not the actual subject of the experiment. From what I see here, it seems that in this case the questions were being put to the subject of the experiment/show and the giver of the shocks. Maybe these people simply thought that they were smarter than they actually were and that for sure they would get the next question right?

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Stuart Kasdin
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 1:37 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: Milgram revisited

Before we write off humanity, I would want to know how they select the participants for the show. Unlike Milgram where there was the expectation of a somewhat random selection, these participants are selected for particular characteristics (the "Springer" qualities). They also know that they are on a show (assuming this is not a hoax). I don't think that we can treat these people as representative of anything. As far as this show is concerned, humanity is off the hook.

--- On Wed, 3/17/10, Michael Sullivan <michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM> wrote:

From: Michael Sullivan <michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM>
Subject: Re: Milgram revisited
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Date: Wednesday, March 17, 2010, 4:26 PM

Very interesting result. It appears to be a pretty good replication of Milgram's original work on the subject substituting a game show host for Milgram's researchers. What is remarkable about this line of research (including Milgram's work) is the degree to "authority" appears to be defined situationally, so that someone with no societal level authority like a "researcher" or a "television game show host" can elicit compliance just because of the situation in which the compliance is sought.

There is hope for the human race, but not much.

MS

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Edith de Leeuw
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 12:29 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Milgram revisisted

Every social psychologists remembers the experiments on 'obedience' by Stanley Milgram.

Too many people are willing to give electric shocks to others if asked. Milgram attributed this to obedience to authority. If a scientist in a white lab coat asked to give a high voltage shock, the experimental subjects obied (despite the screams of teh victim). But is it obedience to authority, or is reality even more grim and are people prepared to do anything for their 15 minutes of fame and some money?

Christophe Nick a French documentary and movie maker just launched "La zone Extreme'. People who thought they were partaking in a TV quiz program, were asked after each wrong answer if they wanted to stop or continue. If they continued, an innocent man sitting in a chair got an electric shock, starting at 80 volts, and increaseng after each wrong answer of the quiz cabdidate up to 460 volts.

And even when they heard the screams and saw the victim beg for mercy or finally slide down unconscious and presumed dead, some quiz candidates continued.

Of course, the victim was an actor (like in Milgram's experiments) and nobody got really hurt. Except some of us in their belief in humanity.

Is tv the new authority, or are people doing just anything for winning and money, or ...

See also

<http://www.rtbfb.be/info/societe/medias/le-jeu-de-la-mort-un-docu-fiction-edifiant-191724>

(in French)

or

<http://www.france24.com/en/20100317-disturbing-tv-docu-game-tests-limits-small-screen-power-france-game-of-death>

(in English)

Edith

Professor Dr. Edith D. de Leeuw
Plantage Doklaan 40, NL-1018 CN Amsterdam
tel + 31 20 622 34 38 fax + 31 20 330 25 97

e-mail edithl@xs4all.nl

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

This e-mail and any attachments may be confidential or legally privileged. If you received this message in error or are not the intended recipient, you should destroy the e-mail message and any attachments or copies, and you are prohibited from retaining, distributing, disclosing or using any information contained herein. Please inform us of the erroneous delivery by return e-mail. Thank you for your cooperation.

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Wed, 17 Mar 2010 17:00:55 -0400
Reply-To: rfunk787@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "G. Ray Funkhouser" <rfunk787@AOL.COM>
Subject: Re: Milgram revisited
X-To: edithl@XS4ALL.NL, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <5.1.0.14.2.20100317201058.01852aa8@pop.xs4all.nl>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

How will the US TV networks ever top this ? They may have to electrocute= some CELEBRITIES.

Ray Funkhouser

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

From: Edith de Leeuw <edithl@XS4ALL.NL>

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Sent: Wed, Mar 17, 2010 3:28 pm

Subject: Milgram revisited

Every social psychologists remembers the experiments on 'obedience' by Stanley Milgram.

Too many people are willing to give electric shocks to others if asked. Milgram attributed this to obedience to authority. If a scientist in a white lab coat asked to give a high voltage shock, the experimental subjects obeyed (despite the screams of the victim). But is it obedience to

authority, or is reality even more grim and are people prepared to do anything for their 15 minutes of fame and some money?

Christophe Nick a French documentary and movie maker just launched "La zone Extreme". People who thought they were partaking in a TV quiz program, were asked after each wrong answer if they wanted to stop or continue. If they continued, an innocent man sitting in a chair got an electric shock, starting at 80 volts, and increasing after each wrong answer of the quiz candidate up to 460 volts.

And even when they heard the screams and saw the victim beg for mercy or finally slide down unconscious and presumed dead, some quiz candidates continued.

Of course, the victim was an actor (like in Milgram's experiments) and nobody got really hurt. Except some of us in their belief in humanity.

Is it the new authority, or are people doing just anything for winning and money, or ...

See also

<http://www.rtf.be/info/societe/medias/le-jeu-de-la-mort-un-docu-fiction-e-difiant-191724>

(in French)

or <http://www.france24.com/en/20100317-disturbing-tv-docu-game-tests-limits-small-screen-power-france-game-of-death>

(in English)=20

=20

Edith=20

=20

=20

Professor Dr. Edith D. de Leeuw=20

Plantage Doklaan 40, NL-1018 CN Amsterdam=20

tel + 31 20 622 34 38 fax + 31 20 330 25 97=20

e-mail edithl@xs4all.nl=20

-----=20

=20

-----=20

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>=20

<http://www.aapor.org>=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.e=](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

du=20

=20

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Date: Wed, 17 Mar 2010 15:04:21 -0700

Reply-To: Michael Sullivan <michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Michael Sullivan <michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM>

Subject: Re: Milgram revisited

X-To: Stuart Kasdin <skasdin1@YAHOO.COM> ,

"AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

In-Reply-To: <113600.33874.qm@web53305.mail.re2.yahoo.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Milgram's sample was neither random nor representative, so it is hard to say how prevalent the responses he obtained were in the population of the US or even in Boston (I think) at the time of his studies. It has been a long time since I read his work, but I recall that between 60 and 70% of subjects completed the entire range of the experiment. It would be interesting to know whether this has changed since Milgram's study or whether these results differ for other cultures. Unfortunately, his experiments cannot be replicated today under controlled conditions because of ethical considerations.

As to whether humanity is on or off the hook because this was a TV show instead of a laboratory experiment I guess the case could be argued either way. Following the timeless wisdom of Professor Pangloss, one might argue that "in this best of all possible worlds, humanity is infused with a sort of goodness that prohibits these kinds of things from happening." Of course then

we are left to explain the Holocaust, the Armenian genocide, Bosnia, Rwanda and seemingly countless other examples of apparently reasonable and good people massacring their fellow humans under the cover of "authority".

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Stuart Kasdin
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 1:37 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: Milgram revisisted

Before we write off humanity, I would want to know how they select the participants for the show. Unlike Milgram where there was the expectation of a somewhat random selection, these participants are selected for particular characteristics (the "Springer" qualities). They also know that they are on a show (assuming this is not a hoax). I don't think that we can treat these people as representative of anything. As far as this show is concerned, humanity is off the hook.

--- On Wed, 3/17/10, Michael Sullivan <michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM> wrote:

From: Michael Sullivan <michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM>
Subject: Re: Milgram revisisted
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Date: Wednesday, March 17, 2010, 4:26 PM

Very interesting result. It appears to be a pretty good replication of Milgram's original work on the subject substituting a game show host for Milgram's researchers. What is remarkable about this line of research (including Milgram's work) is the degree to "authority" appears to be defined situationally, so that someone with no societal level authority like a "researcher" or a "television game show host" can elicit compliance just because of the situation in which the compliance is sought.

There is hope for the human race, but not much.

MS

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Edith de Leeuw
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 12:29 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Milgram revisisted

Every social psychologists remembers the experiments on 'obedience' by Stanley Milgram.

Too many people are willing to give electric shocks to others if asked. Milgram attributed this to obedience to authority. If a scientist in a white lab coat asked to give a high voltage shock, the experimental subjects obied (despite the screams of teh victim). But is it obedience to authority, or is reality even more grim and are people prepared to do

anything for their 15 minutes of fame and some money?

Christophe Nick a French documentary and movie maker just launched "La zone Extreme'. People who thought they were partaking in a TV quiz program, were asked after each wrong answer if they wanted to stop or continue. If they continued, an innocent man sitting in a chair got an electric shock, starting at 80 volts, and increasing after each wrong answer of the quiz candidate up to 460 volts.

And even when they heard the screams and saw the victim beg for mercy or finally slide down unconscious and presumed dead, some quiz candidates continued.

Of course, the victim was an actor (like in Milgram's experiments) and nobody got really hurt. Except some of us in their belief in humanity.

Is tv the new authority, or are people doing just anything for winning and money, or ...

See also

<http://www.rtbfb.be/info/societe/medias/le-jeu-de-la-mort-un-docu-fiction-edifiant-191724>

(in French)

or

<http://www.france24.com/en/20100317-disturbing-tv-docu-game-tests-limits-small-screen-power-france-game-of-death>

(in English)

Edith

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

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Wed, 17 Mar 2010 18:10:05 -0400
Reply-To: "Jonathan E. Brill" <jonathan.brill.wh82@WHARTON.UPENN.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Jonathan E. Brill" <jonathan.brill.wh82@WHARTON.UPENN.EDU>
Subject: Fw: Milgram revisited
X-To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; format=flowed; charset="iso-8859-1";
reply-type=response
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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

From: "Jonathan E. Brill" <jonathan.brill.wh82@wharton.upenn.edu>
To: "Edith de Leeuw" <edithl@XS4ALL.NL>
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 6:08 PM
Subject: Re: Milgram revisited

> Interesting, but unlike Milgram's experiment, this result seems more like
> one that has value for primarily entertainment purposes. Milgram
> recruited a relatively large sample; if I recall correctly, there were 160
> subjects divided into four groups of 40 with each group exposed to
> different treatments in the form of specific types of prompts by and
> physical proximity to the "researcher" authority. Presumably a
> documentary film about quiz show contestants includes a much smaller
> sample size, no such experimental design controls, and greater threats to
> sample representativeness in terms of recruitment protocol. Furthermore,
> the "situational conditions" between the two studies seem substantively
> different to me. In Milgram's study, people were recruited to participate
> in a research study on human learning. Being asked to participate in
> research represents a fairly normal activity and one that is relatively
> private, involving few others. This seems quite different than the likely
> scenario of being invited to be a contestant on a television game show.
> This opportunity is a somewhat extraordinary event for most people and it
> would be recognized to involve widespread public exposure, presumably
> involving thousands upon thousands of observers (perhaps a few hundred
> live in a studio and certainly many more television viewers watching from
> the comfort of their homes. So the "personality type" who is eager or
> even willing to be involved in such an enterprise probably does not
> represent a generalizeable cross-section of the population as Milgram's

> sampling design was intended to produce. Yes, it sounds interesting to be
> sure, but I would not put a lot of stock in the results as being
> representative on anything.

>
> Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
> Intelligence - Research - Strategy
> 3 Oak Ridge Court
> Voorhees, New Jersey 08043
> Office: 856.772.9030
> e-Mail: jonathan.brill.wh82@wharton.upenn.edu

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

> From: "Edith de Leeuw" <edithl@XS4ALL.NL>
> To: <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
> Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 3:28 PM
> Subject: Milgram revisisted

>
>
>> Every social psychologists remembers the experiments on 'obedience' by
>> Stanley Milgram.

>>
>> Too many people are willing to give electric shocks to others if asked.
>> Milgram attributed this to obedience to authority. If a scientist in a
>> white lab coat asked to give a high voltage shock, the experimental
>> subjects obied (despite the screams of teh victim). But is it obedience
>> to
>> authority, or is reality even more grim and are people prepared to do
>> anything for their 15 minutes of fame and some money?

>>
>> Christophe Nick a French documentary and movie maker just launched "La
>> zone
>> Extreme'. People who thought they were partaking in a TV quiz program,
>> were asked after each wrong answer if they wanted to stop or continue. If
>> they continued, an innocent man sitting in a chair got an electric shock,
>> starting at 80 volts, and increaseng after each wrong answer of the quiz
>> cabdicate up to 460 volts.
>> And even when they heard the screams and saw the victim beg for mercy or
>> finally slide down unconscious and presumed dead, some quiz candidates
>> continued.

>>
>> Of course, the victim was an actor (like in Milgram's experiments) and
>> nobody got really hurt. Except some of us in their belief in humanity.

>>
>> Is tv the new authority, or are people doing just anything for winning
>> and
>> money, or ...

>>
>> See also
>> <http://www.rtbef.be/info/societe/medias/le-jeu-de-la-mort-un-docu-fiction-edifiant-191724>

>> (in French)
>> or
>> <http://www.france24.com/en/20100317-disturbing-tv-docu-game-tests-limits-small-screen-power-france-game-of-death>
>> (in English)
>>
>>
>> Edith
>>
>>
>>
>> Professor Dr. Edith D. de Leeuw
>> Plantage Doklaan 40, NL-1018 CN Amsterdam
>> tel + 31 20 622 34 38 fax + 31 20 330 25 97
>> e-mail edithl@xs4all.nl
>> -----
>>
>> -----
>> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
>> <http://www.aapor.org>
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:
>> aapornet-request@asu.edu
>

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Wed, 17 Mar 2010 20:00:15 -0500
Reply-To: res4research@att.net
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Robert Steen <res4research@ATT.NET>
Organization: RES for Research
Subject: Re: Milgram revisisted
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <28CCEB02B0B64D4091ED6FD17DF571691837C48ABE@EX-BE-024-SV1.shared.themessagecenter.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

As a teenager I often participated in experiments at the Psychology Department at Princeton University from 1961 to 1965. The work was usually easy and the pay was excellent--If I recall correctly, the compensation was \$10 to \$15 per session. I was earning \$2.50/hour at other part time jobs. I was one who "obeyed" in a Milgram experiment.

Of course I understand the observation that "the victim was an actor (like

in Milgram's experiments) and nobody got really hurt. Except some of us in their belief in humanity." When referencing the Milgram experiments, we need to keep in mind that the test subjects were the "victims" and the researchers were the "villains." I feel very uncomfortable recalling that afternoon, recognizing how I knowingly relinquished personal responsibility and consciously transferred my personal liability to the villainous researchers in the white lab coats. It was a traumatizing experience.

From my perspective, I would suggest an alternate wording: "The victim was the manipulated participant who was really hurt psychologically, if not physically, albeit of his/her own volition. As a result, the participant questioned his/her belief in his/her personal humanity."

Perhaps questioning your own humanity once in a while is a virtue, but I don't recommend taking the Milgram approach. Or going on this quiz show.

Bob

Robert E. Steen
res4research@att.net

Mobile: 314 580 7699
Office: 314 821 4617
Fax: 314 288 0666

RES for Research
1702 Ben Davis
St. Louis, MO 63122

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Michael Sullivan
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 3:26 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: Milgram revisited

Very interesting result. It appears to be a pretty good replication of Milgram's original work on the subject substituting a game show host for Milgram's researchers. What is remarkable about this line of research (including Milgram's work) is the degree to "authority" appears to be defined situationally, so that someone with no societal level authority like a "researcher" or a "television game show host" can elicit compliance just because of the situation in which the compliance is sought.

There is hope for the human race, but not much.

MS

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Edith de Leeuw

Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 12:29 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Milgram revisited

Every social psychologists remembers the experiments on 'obedience' by Stanley Milgram.

Too many people are willing to give electric shocks to others if asked. Milgram attributed this to obedience to authority. If a scientist in a white lab coat asked to give a high voltage shock, the experimental subjects obeyed (despite the screams of the victim). But is it obedience to authority, or is reality even more grim and are people prepared to do anything for their 15 minutes of fame and some money?

Christophe Nick a French documentary and movie maker just launched 'La zone Extreme'. People who thought they were partaking in a TV quiz program, were asked after each wrong answer if they wanted to stop or continue. If they continued, an innocent man sitting in a chair got an electric shock, starting at 80 volts, and increasing after each wrong answer of the quiz candidate up to 460 volts. And even when they heard the screams and saw the victim beg for mercy or finally slide down unconscious and presumed dead, some quiz candidates continued.

Of course, the victim was an actor (like in Milgram's experiments) and nobody got really hurt. Except some of us in their belief in humanity.

Is tv the new authority, or are people doing just anything for winning and money, or ...

See also

<http://www.rtbf.be/info/societe/medias/le-jeu-de-la-mort-un-docu-fiction-edifiant-191724>
(in French)

or

<http://www.france24.com/en/20100317-disturbing-tv-docu-game-tests-limits-small-screen-power-france-game-of-death>
(in English)

Edith

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

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====
Date: Wed, 17 Mar 2010 21:38:50 -0400

Reply-To: howard schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: howard schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>

Subject: Re: Milgram revisited

X-To: aapor <aapornet@asu.edu>

In-Reply-To: <28CCEB02B0B64D4091ED6FD17DF571691837C48AFA@EX-BE-024-SV1.shared.themessagecenter.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Although Milgram's sample was not and probably could not have been a probability sample, he made a considerable effort to replicate his work across social class and other lines. He also varied the nature of the experimental setup and the titles and other characteristics of the experimenters, more so than most surveys do (though that is changing somewhat because of the need to combine different modes). Someone who reads Milgram's original work, not the second and third hand accounts generally available, is likely to be impressed by his concern to avoid limiting his conclusions by artifacts of one kind or another--something often not done by even major surveys.

In addition, Milgram was not interested only or even mainly in showing the extent of obedience ("the marginals"), but in varying a number of important conditions, e.g., the physical distance between the true subject and the confederate--again something seldom done in surveys. His research built on a long tradition in social psychology, dating from at least the 1890s and including major figures like Solomon Asch.

There was a partial replication of Milgram's results a few years ago, and I can probably locate the reference if there is interest. Examples of that research were also presented on a television program likely to be still available. There have also been a number of cross-national replications over the years, so the basic research has a long track

record of reliability across many different situations.

Also, as someone has noted, Milgram's research was inspired in part by what actually happened in many parts of Europe (not just Germany) during WWII, and has subsequently been documented in many military and similar situations, including those involving U.S. troops in Vietnam (My Lai, the best known instance but hardly the only one) and Iraq. hs

Michael Sullivan wrote:

> Milgram's sample was neither random nor representative, so it is hard to say how prevalent the responses he obtained were in the population of the US or even in Boston (I think) at the time of his studies. It has been a long time since I read his work, but I recall that between 60 and 70% of subjects completed the entire range of the experiment. It would be interesting to know whether this has changed since Milgram's study or whether these results differ for other cultures. Unfortunately, his experiments cannot be replicated today under controlled conditions because of ethical considerations.

>

> As to whether humanity is on or off the hook because this was a TV show instead of a laboratory experiment I guess the case could be argued either way. Following the timeless wisdom of Professor Pangloss, one might argue that "in this best of all possible worlds, humanity is infused with a sort of goodness that prohibits these kinds of things from happening." Of course then we are left to explain the Holocaust, the Armenian genocide, Bosnia, Rwanda and seemingly countless other examples of apparently reasonable and good people massacring their fellow humans under the cover of "authority".

>

>

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Stuart Kasdin

> Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 1:37 PM

> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

> Subject: Re: Milgram revisisted

>

> Before we write off humanity, I would want to know how they select the participants for the show. Unlike Milgram where there was the expectation of a somewhat random selection, these participants are selected for particular characteristics (the "Springer" qualities). They also know that they are on a show (assuming this is not a hoax). I don't think that we can treat these people as representative of anything. As far as this show is concerned, humanity is off the hook.

>

> --- On Wed, 3/17/10, Michael Sullivan <michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM> wrote:

>

>

> From: Michael Sullivan <michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM>

> Subject: Re: Milgram revisisted

> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

> Date: Wednesday, March 17, 2010, 4:26 PM

>

>

> Very interesting result. It appears to be a pretty good replication of Milgram's original work on the subject substituting a game show host for Milgram's researchers. What is remarkable about this line of research

(including Milgram's work) is the degree to "authority" appears to be defined situationally, so that someone with no societal level authority like a "researcher" or a "television game show host" can elicit compliance just because of the situation in which the compliance is sought.

>
> There is hope for the human race, but not much.

>
> MS

>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Edith de Leeuw
> Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 12:29 PM
> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
> Subject: Milgram revisisted

>
> Every social psychologists remembers the experiments on 'obedience' by
> Stanley Milgram.

>
> Too many people are willing to give electric shocks to others if asked.
> Milgram attributed this to obedience to authority. If a scientist in a
> white lab coat asked to give a high voltage shock, the experimental
> subjects obied (despite the screams of teh victim). But is it obedience to
> authority, or is reality even more grim and are people prepared to do
> anything for their 15 minutes of fame and some money?

>
> Christophe Nick a French documentary and movie maker just launched "La zone
> Extreme'. People who thought they were partaking in a TV quiz program,
> were asked after each wrong answer if they wanted to stop or continue. If
> they continued, an innocent man sitting in a chair got an electric shock,
> starting at 80 volts, and increaseng after each wrong answer of the quiz
> cabdicate up to 460 volts.
> And even when they heard the screams and saw the victim beg for mercy or
> finally slide down unconscious and presumed dead, some quiz candidates
> continued.

>
> Of course, the victim was an actor (like in Milgram's experiments) and
> nobody got really hurt. Except some of us in their belief in humanity.

>
> Is tv the new authority, or are people doing just anything for winning and
> money, or ...

>
>
> See also
> <http://www.rtbf.be/info/societe/medias/le-jeu-de-la-mort-un-docu-fiction-edifiant-191724>
> (in French)
> or
> <http://www.france24.com/en/20100317-disturbing-tv-docu-game-tests-limits-small-screen-power-france-game-of-death>
> (in English)

>
>
> Edith

>

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

> -----

>
> -----
> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
> <http://www.aapor.org>
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

>

> -----

> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
> <http://www.aapor.org>
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

>

> -----

> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
> <http://www.aapor.org>
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

>

> -----

> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
> <http://www.aapor.org>
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

>

>

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Wed, 17 Mar 2010 22:02:53 -0400
Reply-To: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Susan Losh <slosh@FSU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Milgram revisited
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <4BA1842A.7030609@umich.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0

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

The Milgram documentary film, Obedience, went out of print, then back into print. The last I knew it was available through Penn State. Many colleges and universities still have the tape in their media libraries.

Not only do I show this in every class in which it could apply (e.g., methods for experiments and ethics; general social psychology, group dynamics--and if I could fit it somehow into loglinear analysis I would, no puns about categorical thinking, please), but we show it and have discussion at Florida State's Holocaust Institute for Teachers every year.

Susan

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

From: howard schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>
Date: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 9:45 pm
Subject: Re: Milgram revisited
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

> Although Milgram's sample was not and probably could not have been a
> probability sample, he made a considerable effort to replicate his
> work across social class and other lines. He also varied the nature
> of the
> experimental setup and the titles and other characteristics of the
> experimenters, more so than most surveys do (though that is changing
> somewhat because of the need to combine different modes). Someone who
> reads Milgram's original work, not the second and third hand accounts
> generally available, is likely to be impressed by his concern to avoid
> limiting his conclusions by artifacts of one kind or another--
> something often not done by even major surveys.
>
> In addition, Milgram was not interested only or even mainly in showing
> the extent of obedience ("the marginals"), but in varying a number of
> important conditions, e.g., the physical distance between the true
> subject and the confederate--again something seldom done in
> surveys. His
> research built on a long tradition in social psychology, dating
> from at
> least the 1890s and including major figures like Solomon Asch.
>
> There was a partial replication of Milgram's results a few years ago,
> and I can probably locate the reference if there is interest. Examples
> of that research were also presented on a television program likely to
> be still available. There have also been a number of cross-national
> replications over the years, so the basic research has a long track
> record of reliability across many different situations.
>
> Also, as someone has noted, Milgram's research was inspired in part by
> what actually happened in many parts of Europe (not just Germany)
> during WWII, and has subsequently been documented in many military
> and similar

> situations, including those involving U.S. troops in Vietnam (My Lai,
> the best known instance but hardly the only one) and Iraq. hs

>
> Michael Sullivan wrote:

>> Milgram's sample was neither random nor representative, so it is
> hard to say how prevalent the responses he obtained were in the
> population of the US or even in Boston (I think) at the time of his
> studies. It has been a long time since I read his work, but I
> recall that between 60 and 70% of subjects completed the entire
> range of the experiment. It would be interesting to know whether
> this has changed since Milgram's study or whether these results
> differ for other cultures. Unfortunately, his experiments cannot
> be replicated today under controlled conditions because of ethical
> considerations.>

>> As to whether humanity is on or off the hook because this was a
> TV show instead of a laboratory experiment I guess the case could
> be argued either way. Following the timeless wisdom of Professor
> Pangloss, one might argue that "in this best of all possible
> worlds, humanity is infused with a sort of goodness that prohibits
> these kinds of things from happening." Of course then we are left
> to explain the Holocaust, the Armenian genocide, Bosnia, Rwanda and
> seemingly countless other examples of apparently reasonable and
> good people massacring their fellow humans under the cover of
> "authority".>

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

>> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Stuart Kasdin
>> Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 1:37 PM
>> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
>> Subject: Re: Milgram revisited

>>
>> Before we write off humanity, I would want to know how they
> select the participants for the show. Unlike Milgram where there
> was the expectation of a somewhat random selection, these
> participants are selected for particular characteristics (the
> "Springer" qualities). They also know that they are on a show
> (assuming this is not a hoax). I don't think that we can treat
> these people as representative of anything. As far as this show is
> concerned, humanity is off the hook.

>>
>> --- On Wed, 3/17/10, Michael Sullivan
> <michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM> wrote:

>>
>> From: Michael Sullivan <michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM>
>> Subject: Re: Milgram revisited
>> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
>> Date: Wednesday, March 17, 2010, 4:26 PM

>>
>> Very interesting result. It appears to be a pretty good
> replication of Milgram's original work on the subject substituting
> a game show host for Milgram's researchers. What is remarkable
> about this line of research (including Milgram's work) is the

> degree to "authority" appears to be defined situationally, so that
> someone with no societal level authority like a "researcher" or a
> "television game show host" can elicit compliance just because of
> the situation in which the compliance is sought.
>>
>> There is hope for the human race, but not much.
>>
>> MS
>>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Edith de Leeuw
>> Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 12:29 PM
>> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
>> Subject: Milgram revisited
>>
>> Every social psychologists remembers the experiments on
> 'obedience' by
>> Stanley Milgram.
>>
>> Too many people are willing to give electric shocks to others if
> asked.> Milgram attributed this to obedience to authority. If a
> scientist in a
>> white lab coat asked to give a high voltage shock, the experimental
>> subjects obied (despite the screams of teh victim). But is it
> obedience to
>> authority, or is reality even more grim and are people prepared
> to do
>> anything for their 15 minutes of fame and some money?
>>
>> Christophe Nick a French documentary and movie maker just
> launched "La zone
>> Extreme'. People who thought they were partaking in a TV quiz
> program,> were asked after each wrong answer if they wanted to stop
> or continue. If
>> they continued, an innocent man sitting in a chair got an
> electric shock,
>> starting at 80 volts, and increasig after each wrong answer of
> the quiz
>> cabddiate up to 460 volts.
>> And even when they heard the screams and saw the victim beg for
> mercy or
>> finally slide down unconscious and presumed dead, some quiz
> candidates> continued.
>>
>> Of course, the victim was an actor (like in Milgram's
> experiments) and
>> nobody got really hurt. Except some of us in their belief in
> humanity.>
>> Is tv the new authority, or are people doing just anything for
> winning and
>> money, or ...
>>
>>
>> See also

>> <http://www.rtbf.be/info/societe/medias/le-jeu-de-la-mort-un-docu-fiction-edifiant-191724>
>> (in French)
>> or
>> <http://www.france24.com/en/20100317-disturbing-tv-docu-game-tests-limits-small-screen-power-france-game-of-death>
>> (in English)
>>
>>
>> Edith

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

I try to take one day at a time but sometimes several days attack me all at once. Anonymous.

Susan Carol Losh, PhD

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>

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Thu, 18 Mar 2010 06:01:33 -0400
Reply-To: Phil Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Phil Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>
Subject: Re: Milgram revisited
X-To: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
X-cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <f467b296bfee.4ba1518d@fsu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I agree with Howard that Stanley Milgram needs to be read in the original to be appreciated. However, for your reading pleasure, I can also offer this from the February 1970 issue of Esquire. It was the first popular report on Milgram's work and written with his cooperation. It is still reprinted in collections of readings for psychology, sociology, and other courses.

http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer/General_Publications/Hitler.pdf

From 1998-2000, I served on the Institutional Review Board at UNC, and we were asked, as an academic exercise, to approve or disapprove the Milgram experiments -- as were other IRBs around the nation. I was the only one who voted in favor of Milgram -- on the ground that the contribution to knowledge outweighed the discomfort for the human subjects.

Phil

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====
Date: Thu, 18 Mar 2010 08:18:52 -0400

Reply-To: "Caplan, James R., , CPMS Civ" <james.caplan@CPMS.OSD.MIL>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Caplan, James R., , CPMS Civ" <james.caplan@CPMS.OSD.MIL>

Subject: Re: Milgram revisited

X-To: Edith de Leeuw <edithl@XS4ALL.NL>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

In-Reply-To: A<5.1.0.14.2.20100317201058.01852aa8@pop.xs4all.nl>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Many years ago, we used to show the Milgram documentary to intro psych classes -- as much for the lesson on obedience as for the demonstration of ethical violations of human subjects protection. Every instructor would say, almost disappointedly, " nowadays, no research like this would ever be permitted by an IRB."

As to the questions of whether people were singled out for the show by personality or if people in general are prepared to do anything for fame or fortune, I well remember the enrapt attention of the typical undergrads to that film. Intensity, excitement, sure. Horror, disgust? Not so much. Humanity is back on the hook, I'd say.

Jim

James R. Caplan, Ph.D.

Management Analyst

Department of Defense

Civilian Personnel Management Service

HR-Business Information Technology Solutions: CDA
703-696-8754
DSN: 426-8754

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Edith de Leeuw
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2010 3:29 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Milgram revisisted

Every social psychologists remembers the experiments on 'obedience' by Stanley Milgram.

Too many people are willing to give electric shocks to others if asked. Milgram attributed this to obedience to authority. If a scientist in a white lab coat asked to give a high voltage shock, the experimental subjects obied (despite the screams of teh victim). But is it obedience to authority, or is reality even more grim and are people prepared to do anything for their 15 minutes of fame and some money?

Christophe Nick a French documentary and movie maker just launched "La zone Extreme'. People who thought they were partaking in a TV quiz program, were asked after each wrong answer if they wanted to stop or continue. If they continued, an innocent man sitting in a chair got an electric shock, starting at 80 volts, and increasig after each wrong answer of the quiz cabdidate up to 460 volts. And even when they heard the screams and saw the victim beg for mercy or finally slide down unconscious and presumed dead, some quiz candidates continued.

Of course, the victim was an actor (like in Milgram's experiments) and nobody got really hurt. Except some of us in their belief in humanity.

Is tv the new authority, or are people doing just anything for winning and money, or ...

See also

<http://www.rtbef.be/info/societe/medias/le-jeu-de-la-mort-un-docu-fiction-edifiant-191724>

(in French)

or

<http://www.france24.com/en/20100317-disturbing-tv-docu-game-tests-limits-small-screen-power-france-game-of-death>

(in English)

Edith

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

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Thu, 18 Mar 2010 08:57:39 -0400
Reply-To: Jaki McCarthy <Jaki_McCarthy@NASS.USDA.GOV>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jaki McCarthy <Jaki_McCarthy@NASS.USDA.GOV>
Subject: Re: Milgram revisited
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <5.1.0.14.2.20100317201058.01852aa8@pop.xs4all.nl>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Actually there has been a recent replication (of sorts) of Milgram's experiments, conducted by Jerry Burger of Santa Clara University. It was reported in the Association for Psychological Science's Observer publication among other places. The link to that is here (although I am not sure non-members can access it):
<http://www.psychologicalscience.org/observer/getArticle.cfm?id=2264>

For a more popular citation here it is discussed in Psychology Today:
<http://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/minding-the-law/200909/stanley-milgram-revisited>

His findings were similar to what were found in the original experiments.
So people don't appear to have changed much.

Jaki S. McCarthy

USDA's National Agricultural Statistics Service
Research and Development Division
703-877-8000 ext 142
jaki_mccarthy@nass.usda.gov

"Edith de Leeuw" <edithl@XS4ALL.NL>
Sent by: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
03/17/2010 03:28 PM
Please respond to
"Edith de Leeuw" <edithl@XS4ALL.NL>

To
AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
cc

Subject
Milgram revisisted

Every social psychologists remembers the experiments on 'obedience' by Stanley Milgram.

Too many people are willing to give electric shocks to others if asked. Milgram attributed this to obedience to authority. If a scientist in a white lab coat asked to give a high voltage shock, the experimental subjects obied (despite the screams of teh victim). But is it obedience to authority, or is reality even more grim and are people prepared to do anything for their 15 minutes of fame and some money?

Christophe Nick a French documentary and movie maker just launched "La zone Extreme'. People who thought they were partaking in a TV quiz program, were asked after each wrong answer if they wanted to stop or continue. If they continued, an innocent man sitting in a chair got an electric shock, starting at 80 volts, and increasig after each wrong answer of the quiz cabdidate up to 460 volts. And even when they heard the screams and saw the victim beg for mercy or finally slide down unconscious and presumed dead, some quiz candidates continued.

Of course, the victim was an actor (like in Milgram's experiments) and nobody got really hurt. Except some of us in their belief in humanity.

Is tv the new authority, or are people doing just anything for winning and money, or ...

See also

<http://www.rtf.be/info/societe/medias/le-jeu-de-la-mort-un-docu-fiction-edifiant-191724>

(in French)

or

<http://www.france24.com/en/20100317-disturbing-tv-docu-game-tests-limits-small-screen-power-france-game-of-death>

(in English)

Edith

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

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

aapornet-request@asu.edu

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Date: Thu, 18 Mar 2010 08:06:24 -0500

Reply-To: Smith-Tom <smitht@NORC.UCHICAGO.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Smith-Tom <smitht@NORC.UCHICAGO.EDU>

Subject: FW: WAPOR Press Release: Proposed Right of Observation in Peru

X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64
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ZWQg
UE9SJMgcHJlc2lkZW50LCBUaG9tYXMGUGV0ZXJzZW4gKEdlcm1hbnpkLCBoYXMGYXNrZWQgdGhh
dCBXQVBPUEiBtZWliZXJzIHVzZSB0aGVpciBpbN0aXR1dGlvbmFsIG5ldHdvcmtzLCBkYXRhYmFz
ZXMgb2Ygam9lcm5hbGlzdHMslGV0Yy4sIHRvIGRlZ2FyZGluZyB0aGUgcHJvcG9zZWQg
ZWN0aXZlIGNvdW50cmllcy4gDQoNCiRoZSBYb3Bvc2VkIFJpZ2h0IG9mIE9ic2VydMf0aW9uIGlu
Oi8vd3d3LnVubC5lZHUVd2Fwb3IvUHJlc3MIMjBSZWxlYXNlcy9wZXJlX2JpbGxfcHJlc3NfcmVs
ZWZzZS5wZG9yYy4sIHRvIGRlZ2FyZGluZyB0aGUgcHJvcG9zZWQg
cmRzLCANCiJlbnFIIA0KV0FQT1IgtDQoNCg0KUmVuYXUgUmVpcywgTVBBIA0KRXhlY3V0aXZlIENv
b3JkaW5hdG9yIA0KV0FQT1IgtDQoNCg0KUmVuYXUgUmVpcywgTVBBIA0KRXhlY3V0aXZlIENv
NTg4LTAYNDIgdQpVU0EgDQpQOIAxIDQwMi00NzItNzcyMCANCkY6IDEGNDAYLTQ3Mi03NzI3IA0K
aHR0cDovL3d3dy53YXBvci5vcmcgDQoNCg==

Date: Thu, 18 Mar 2010 07:20:37 -0700
Reply-To: Michael Larsen <mlarsen@BSC.GWU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Michael Larsen <mlarsen@BSC.GWU.EDU>
Subject: ASA SRMS/AAPOR webinar, April 6, 2010, 1-3pm Eastern
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

2nd notice, registration is now open

The ASA Survey Research Methods Section and AAPOR are proud to announce the
next webinar in their joint web-based training program. =20
=20
=E2=80=9CHuman Resources in Science and Technology: Surveys, Data, and In=
dicators
from the National Science Foundation =E2=80=9D will be presented by Nirmal=
a
Kannankutty on Tuesday, April 6, 2010, 1:00 PM - 3:00 PM Eastern time.
=20

Webinar Description:

The Division of Science Resources Statistics (SRS) is a federal statistic=
al
agency housed at the National Science Foundation (NSF). SRS's role within=
NSF is to "provide a central clearinghouse for the collection,
interpretation, and analysis of data on scientific and engineering
resources, and to provide a source of information for policy formulation =
by
other agencies of the Federal Government..." Within this mandate SRS is
involved in collecting and disseminating information on R&D expenditures =
and

activities and on human capital issues. The United States is unique among major industrialized nations in that it has directly invested in collecting detailed data from a variety of sources on the entire science and engineering pipeline. Each of the data sources came about from U.S. federal administrative needs. The sources have evolved into important elements for the study of higher education and the scientific workforce. In this webinar, these surveys and data sources are described. Key indicators regarding trends in U.S. science and engineering degree production, enrollments, and workforce are defined and described. The Science and Engineering

Indicators: 2010 and Women, Minorities and Persons with Disabilities in Science and Engineering reports will be used as examples for these indicators. At the end of the webinar participants should be aware of data sources and how data are collected, indicators and reports from the NSF, and where to find more information from the NSF.

To register, please visit the SRMS web site at: <http://www.amstat.org/sections/SRMS/webinar.cfm>

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Rick Peterson at the ASA office using the below information.

Rick Peterson
Education Programs Associate
American Statistical Association
732 North Washington Street
Alexandria, VA 22153
(703) 684-1221 ext. 1864
FAX: (703) 684-3768

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====
Date: Thu, 18 Mar 2010 12:13:14 -0400

Reply-To: Richard Perloff <r.perloff@CSUOHIO.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Richard Perloff <r.perloff@CSUOHIO.EDU>
Subject: Re Milgram and Burger
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed

Jerry M. Burger replicated Milgram in a 2006 study published in American Psychologist in 2009. Three things are significant: 1. Conformity was lower than the appropriate condition in one of Milgram's many experiments, but not significantly so, suggesting that the same phenomena were at work; 2. Burger was able to replicate the study from a human subjects point of view, as he stopped the shocks at 150, not 450, volts, screened people for anxiety and depression, and let participants know both the teacher and student could leave at any time; and 3. Re the helpful external validity points in earlier posts, neither Burger nor Milgram had many participants from non-white ethnic groups, leaving open the question of how African Americans, Hispanics, and others would react to an authority requesting compliance and how race of the teacher interacts with race of the subject. The findings the Milgram studies obtained, while admirable in their respect for external validity concerns, do not appear to be generalizable to the multicultural mix of America now, to the extent that one reasonably assumes there may be psychological differences in degree of conformity traceable to demographic factors.

Cheers,

Richard Perloff

Professor and Director
School of Communication
Cleveland State

--

Richard M. Perloff
Director and Professor
School of Communication
Cleveland State University
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
216-687-4631

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Thu, 18 Mar 2010 09:33:52 -0700
Reply-To: Michael Sullivan <michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Michael Sullivan <michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM>
Subject: Re: Re Milgram and Burger
X-To: Richard Perloff <r.perloff@CSUOHIO.EDU>,
"AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
In-Reply-To: <4BA2511A.3040507@csuohio.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I don't have time to really go into this right now, but Milgram's findings (that Americans will intentionally inflict pain and possibly death on others when instructed to do so by persons they perceive to have the authority to do so; and that such authority may be situational rather than societal) are certainly generalizable to situations outside the laboratory experiments he conducted. The exact fractions of the population that will exhibit this behavior depends on the situation and possibly other cultural considerations. It is often, indeed usually, the case that the purpose of laboratory experiments is to establish conditions that cause changes in behavior under controlled conditions to see whether the expected changes actually occur. The findings generalize to the situations and conditions, not the participants. I'd have to say I think Milgram's findings regarding the likelihood that persons will exhibit compliance in the presence of perceived authority (to the point of injuring another) are unassailable. Milgram belongs on a very short list of social scientists who have really added to our knowledge of how society actually functions. Ok, I said it, I'm a Milgram worshiper and proud of it.

MS

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Richard Perloff
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2010 9:13 AM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re Milgram and Burger

Jerry M. Burger replicated Milgram in a 2006 study published in American Psychologist in 2009. Three things are significant: 1. Conformity was lower than the appropriate condition in one of Milgram's many experiments, but not significantly so, suggesting that the same phenomena were at work; 2. Burger was able to replicate the study from a human subjects point of view, as he stopped the shocks at 150, not 450, volts, screened people for anxiety and depression, and let participants know both the teacher and student could leave at any time; and 3. Re the helpful external validity points in earlier posts, neither Burger nor Milgram had many participants from non-white ethnic groups, leaving open the question of how African Americans, Hispanics, and others would react to an authority requesting compliance and how race of the teacher interacts with race of the subject. The findings the Milgram studies obtained, while admirable in their respect for external validity concerns, do not appear to be generalizable to the multicultural mix of America now, to the extent that one reasonably assumes there may be

psychological differences in degree of conformity traceable to demographic factors.

Cheers,

Richard Perloff

Professor and Director
School of Communication
Cleveland State

--

Richard M. Perloff
Director and Professor
School of Communication
Cleveland State University
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
216-687-4631

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Thu, 18 Mar 2010 14:14:13 -0400
Reply-To: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Susan Losh <slosh@FSU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Re Milgram and Burger
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <4BA2511A.3040507@csuohio.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Disposition: inline
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

My impression also was that Milgram had few or no female participants. Yale

(New Haven CT) was virtually all male at the time, certainly on the undergraduate level. His "general population" major group responded to newspaper ads and they were virtually all male. When students and teachers inevitably ask me about gender effects I can't give them an answer based on experimental evidence (Haney, Banks and Zimbardo used all male students at Stanford in their "Prison Study" as well.)

One of my undergraduate social psychology students eons ago Steve McDonald (now on the NC State faculty) replicated Asch's line judging task using residents from his large student apartment complex. Despite the gulf in time, the geographic distance and other differences, the results almost exactly replicated Asch's study from the late 1940s.

Susan

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

From: Richard Perloff <r.perloff@CSUOHIO.EDU>

Date: Thursday, March 18, 2010 12:15 pm

Subject: Re Milgram and Burger

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

> Jerry M. Burger replicated Milgram in a 2006 study
> published in
> American Psychologist in 2009. Three things are significant: 1.
> Conformity was lower than the appropriate condition in one of
> Milgram's many experiments, but not significantly so, suggesting
> that the same
> phenomena were at work; 2. Burger was able to replicate the study
> from a
> human subjects point of view, as he stopped the shocks at 150, not
> 450, volts, screened people for anxiety and depression, and let
> participants know both the teacher and student could leave at any
> time; and 3. Re the
> helpful external validity points in earlier posts, neither Burger nor
> Milgram had many participants from non-white ethnic groups, leaving
> open the question of how African Americans, Hispanics, and others
> would react
> to an authority requesting compliance and how race of the teacher
> interacts with race of the subject. The findings the Milgram studies
> obtained, while admirable in their respect for external validity
> concerns, do not appear to be generalizable to the multicultural
> mix of
> America now, to the extent that one reasonably assumes there may be
> psychological differences in degree of conformity traceable to
> demographic factors.

>
> Cheers,

>
> Richard Perloff

>
> Professor and Director
> School of Communication
> Cleveland State

>

>
>
> --
> Richard M. Perloff
> Director and Professor
> School of Communication
> Cleveland State University
> Cleveland, Ohio 44115
> 216-687-4631
>
> -----
> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
> <http://www.aapor.org>
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> set aapornet nomail
> On your return send this: set aapornet mail
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)
> 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

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>

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Thu, 18 Mar 2010 14:48:04 -0400
Reply-To: Joseph Graf <jgraf2002@YAHOO.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Joseph Graf <jgraf2002@YAHOO.COM>
Subject: Re: Re Milgram and Burger
X-To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <28CCEB02B0B64D4091ED6FD17DF571691837C48BBE@EX-BE-024-

SV1.shared.themessagecenter.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1

A skeptical view of the generalizability of Milgram's findings is found in this excellent article on the subject. It is well worth assigning in a research methods class.

"Obedience," by Ian Parker, *Granta*, vol. 71, autumn 2000. pp. 99-125

Joseph Graf
Assistant Professor
American University
School of Communication
graf@american.edu, (202) 885-2147

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Fri, 19 Mar 2010 08:06:33 -0400
Reply-To: Ward R Kay <wkay1@GMU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Ward R Kay <wkay1@GMU.EDU>
Subject: CBS News and the Census
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Content-disposition: inline

Last night CBS News ran a piece on the Census. My 11-year-old daughter was in the room with me and I took a teaching moment to show her the form. She was excited about it and we answered the form together. On the CBS piece, they showed a white woman questioning why the form asks about race. My daughter referred to her and asked me why. It took 3 sentences to tell her about redistricting and why it was important to take race into account. She, bless her heart, doesn't understand racism, but got the idea. We both agree that a minority would never question why the Census asks about race. This morning I woke up angry at CBS News. How could they let go unanswered? It took me 3 sentences to explain it to a 6th grader. It is not controversial why we ask race on the Census -- it has been asked on every Census since the first one!

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Fri, 19 Mar 2010 06:54:34 -0700

Reply-To: Marty Plissner <plissner@VERIZON.NET>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Marty Plissner <plissner@VERIZON.NET>

Subject: Ward Kay on CBS and the Census

X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

But, in drawing the district lines with a view to equal rights for all, is

it really necessary to take Laotians and Fiji Islanders into account? And

what civil rights goal is embodied in the upwards of fourteen options

(including "housemates" and "unmarried partners") for describing the

relationship of individuals within the household? Most curious of all,

perhaps, are the instructions to return the form, received on March

15 "TODAY," since the very first question is: "How many people were living

or staying in this house, apartment or mobile home on April 1?" How does

one answer this question Today? My elder daughter may or may not be at

home that day. And the form also wants to know about overnight drop-ins

as well. Who can know about that in advance? And, just to top it off,

the covering letter says testing has shown that the average person can

complete the form in ten minutes.

Oddly enough, the CBS piece did not address the ominous, bold face

declaration on the envelope, "A RESPONSE IS REQUIRED BY LAW." Were any of

the thirty million or so violators of this law in 2,000 called to

account. CBS, as I said, doesn't say. Do scofflaws this time have

anything to worry about? You can get the answer on the bureau's

website: "The Census Bureau is not a prosecuting agency. Failure to

provide information is not likely to result in a fine." This outfit is

not a paper tiger. It's a paper pussycat.

And, oh yes, what mastermind, long ago I imagine, in the bureau's

determination to get its mission taken seriously, chose April 1 as the

date of reference for the survey?

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Fri, 19 Mar 2010 11:55:49 -0400
Reply-To: kenneth.steve@DOT.GOV
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: kenneth.steve@DOT.GOV
Subject: Re: CBS News and the Census
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: A<f88ca22052f9.4ba33089@gmu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

"We both agree that a minority would never question why the Census asks about race."

On the commuter train back to Baltimore last night, I sat amongst a group of minorities. I wasn't involved in their conversation, but overheard one woman complaining about the census form and how it asks about race. I found her interpretation of the race question to be invalid. Without getting into the details of her argument, she felt the question was biased toward whites, and that it was how feds kept from spending money in areas where minorities were concentrated.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Ward R Kay
Sent: Friday, March 19, 2010 8:07 AM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: CBS News and the Census

Last night CBS News ran a piece on the Census. My 11-year-old daughter was in the room with me and I took a teaching moment to show her the form. She was excited about it and we answered the form together. On the CBS piece, they showed a white woman questioning why the form asks about race. My daughter referred to her and asked me why. It took 3 sentences to tell her about redistricting and why it was important to take race into account. She, bless her heart, doesn't understand racism, but got the idea. We both agree that a minority would never question why the Census asks about race. This morning I woke up angry at CBS News. How could they let go unanswered? It took me 3 sentences to explain it to a 6th grader. It is not controversial why we ask race on the Census -- it has been asked on every Census since the first one!

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .

Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Fri, 19 Mar 2010 12:39:52 -0400
Reply-To: jeffrey.c.moore@CENSUS.GOV
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Jeffrey C. Moore" <jeffrey.c.moore@CENSUS.GOV>
Subject: 2010 Census -- Myths and Misconceptions
X-To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

The following arrived in my in-box this morning -- nicely timed, given the recent AAPORnet postings. It's a stretch to think of AAPORnet as my "stakeholders and constituents," but I almost always try to do as I'm told.

-- Jeff Moore --

From the Desk of Steve Jost, Associate Director, Communications...

The 2010 Census is now in full gear. As with any operation this large, there is bound to be misleading information circulated about nature and goals of the endeavor. Your office or your constituents may be receiving emails or inquiries about misconceptions on the Census.

The independent website [Factcheck.org](http://factcheck.org) , has today posted a point by point rebuttal of this video. I draw your attention to it as it represents an independent defense of the Census Bureau and a comprehensive explanation of the 2010 Census, and its relationship with the other surveys conducted by the Census Bureau. This post is helpful in debunking many of the myths about the Census currently making the rounds, and I urge you to share it with your stakeholders and constituents.

<http://factcheck.org/2010/03/census-nonsense/>

You may also find the blog of Census Director Robert Groves on our website useful to answer other questions. You can find it on our homepage at www.2010census.gov.

Additionally, you may be hearing questions about the constitutional origins of the census or where in law the census questionnaire is authorized. For

more information on these questions, we have created a page on our website here:

<http://2010.census.gov/2010census/why/constitutional.php>

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Fri, 19 Mar 2010 12:47:45 -0700

Reply-To: Barb Gunderson <bgunderson@AAPOR.ORG>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Barb Gunderson <bgunderson@AAPOR.ORG>

Subject: Job Posting: Senior Manager for Survey Research

X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

JOB OPENING: SENIOR MANAGER FOR SURVEY RESEARCH
Consortium on Chicago School Research at the University of Chicago

The Consortium on Chicago School Research at the University of Chicago=20=

(CCSR) is looking for a Senior Manager for Survey Research to oversee the=

=20 design, administration and analysis of their biennial survey. CCSR=20

conducts research on Chicago's public schools, the problems they face, an=

d=20 the mechanisms for improvement. A central part of our research activity i=

s=20 a biennial survey of all Chicago Public Schools=80=99 (CPS) principals=

,=20 teachers and students (6-12th grade) that is conducted in close=20

cooperation with CPS. Data from the surveys are used in multiple CCSR=20

studies and evaluations as well as confidential school reports for=20

participating schools. While surveys are administered every other spring,=

=20 analysis, planning and outreach are continuing activities.

Full job description can be found at our web site:=20

<http://ccsr.uchicago.edu> under Careers or at the University of Chicago=E2=

=80=99s=20 job openings site: <https://jobopportunities.uchicago.edu>. Go to Search=20=

Postings and use requisition number 084319. Applications must be submitte=

d=20 to the university online.

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Fri, 19 Mar 2010 16:03:33 -0400
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing
Subject: 2010 Census form
X-To: AAPORNET <aapornet@asu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Having received my Census form (D-1) and read through it, I found it appallingly confusing and at times inconsistent. That does not bode well for the quality of the data to be obtained or hopes for keeping administrative costs down.

To begin with, a separate note contains a message from the "Director, U.S. Census Bureau" (unnamed), dated March 15, 2010, that instructs the recipient, in bold face: "Please complete and mail back the enclosed census form today." This contradicts the instructions on the form itself, which instruct the person filling it out to count people who "were living or staying in this house, apartment or mobile home on April 1, 2010." So, should respondents wait until April 1 and answer the form truthfully, or should they predict what will be on that date and send in the form now? There is no explanation provided.

The boxed instructions at the top of the form first say to "Count all people, including babies, who live and sleep here most of the time," then go on to list types of people who should not be counted because they are currently living in institutions, and finally ask for a count of those who "were living or staying" in the dwelling on April 1.

That makes it reasonably clear for Person 1, but the last question of each section (Q10/Q7) asks "Does Person () sometimes live or stay somewhere else?" and lists institutions that the original instructions say to exclude. So how should one answer if in doubt? If one checks back to the instruction box, the first thing one sees is to count all people who live there most of the time, rather than people living there on April 1. Which way a given respondent will go is anyone's guess.

Q2 (Additional people) has 5 categories, with instructions to mark all that apply and nothing to indicate that that item 5, "No additional people," is in any way different from the first 4. This a classic example of poor question design -- I remember Warren Mitofsky discussing it more than 40 years ago. Some respondents who check one or more of the first 4 boxes, will also check the last box to indicate either that they have no more people to list, or that there are no people who fall into

some other category than those listed.

Q3 is also needlessly confusing in both wording and layout. A slight indent of the first two items could have provided an instant visual cue clarifying the question structure and meaning instead of forcing the respondent to figure it out, which increases the likelihood of error.

Q4 (for person 1) reads: "What is your telephone number? We may call if we don't understand an answer." Is this a Census question, meaning that the information is being collected for demographic purposes, or is it an administrative question to allow recontacting the person answering? If the latter, why not ask, outside of the demographic sections, for a telephone number where the respondent can be conveniently reached. If meant as a demographic, the wording seems better suited to telephone ownership in 1950 than in 2010.

The race question (Q9/Q6) looks like a double crostic, with no fewer than 15 check boxes, some of them 1 abreast, others 3 abreast, and three fill-in fields provided for four "Others" categories. Those fill-in fields allow for 19 characters, while in Q5, the person's surname allows only for 15 characters, and the first name only for 13, which can present a problem for those who use hyphenated names. In this country, that means members of ethnic minorities more often than not.

I realize that Census questionnaire design is subject to many severe constraints, but this level of sloppiness is inexcusable. Many of these problems could have easily been addressed by good design and an insert to explain the questions and how to answer them. That would be a more cost-effective approach than relying on telephone support and follow-up visits (at an estimated \$57 each) to straighten things out. It would also give one much greater confidence in the quality of the results.

Members of this group (AAPOR), like most well-educated Americans, are not likely to have any difficulty in filling out their Census forms. The problems mentioned will disproportionately affect those with lower levels of education and/or communication skills. In other words, the poor and minorities.

I note that the questionnaire is identified as Form D-1 (12-5-2008) which would indicate that the design was completed and approved under the previous administration. This makes me wonder if at least some of the deficiencies were intended to undercut the effectiveness of the 2010 Census, particularly in reaching less affluent segments of the population. Or was this just another "heckuva job?"

In any event, I can't blame the current director for not putting his name on the cover sheet.

Jan Werner

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Fri, 19 Mar 2010 17:03:50 -0400

Reply-To: "Milton R. Goldsamt" <miltrgold@COMCAST.NET>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Milton R. Goldsamt" <miltrgold@COMCAST.NET>

Subject: Re: 2010 Census form

X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

X-cc: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>

In-Reply-To: <4BA3D895.5060703@jwdp.com>

Mime-Version: 1.0 (Apple Message framework v753.1)

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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

On Mar 19, 2010, at 4:03 PM, Jan Werner wrote:

> Having received my Census form (D-1) and read through it, I found it
> appallingly confusing and at times inconsistent. That does not bode
> well
> for the quality of the data to be obtained or hopes for keeping
> administrative costs down. [And a number of other inconsistencies
> or omissions that she believed present n the form.]
>
>

Let me add another one that caught my eye, as if it were possible to
note another possible flaw, given all that Jan Werner has spotted:

Question 2, relationship of second (or third through seventh) person
in household to the first person listed, doesn't seem to have a
category for "married partner" or its equivalent term to characterize
same-sex marriages. This category is not included, although enough
states were considering passing such legislation at the time of
developing the Census form. I wonder which of the following
categories (I've excluded a few that seemed unlikely) might be used
by respondents?

2. How is this person related to Person 1? Mark ONE box.
Husband or wife

Other relative

Roomer or boarder

Housemate or roommate

Unmarried partner

Other nonrelative

Like no doubt Jan, we were taught to always provide a list of
mutually exclusive, completely exhaustive categories as survey
question response options. Was the lack of a category such as "same

sex partner" or any similar, yet more neutral term intended? Was the goal to not prepare counts of same-sex marriages? Would all same-sex married respondents select the same category?

Milton Goldsamt

Milton R. Goldsamt, Ph.D.
Consulting Research Psychologist & Statistician
Silver Spring, MD
miltrgold@comcast.net

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Mon, 22 Mar 2010 12:13:56 -0400
Reply-To: colleen_porter@COX.NET
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Colleen Porter <colleen_porter@COX.NET>
Subject: Second- or third-person?
X-To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=UTF-8; format=flowed; delp=no
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Disposition: inline

So here is a question that came up as I was studying up about vignettes, an issue which has a much broader application than that particular technique.

Should the questions be framed in second person or third? Should we have names for the characters and ask about Allison or James? Or ask what "you" would do in that situation?

Reviewing those articles on vignettes, Finch said, "These studies also make use of the vignettes to distance the judgment requested from the respondent's personal circumstances. Questions come in the form 'What should these people do next?' rather than 'What would you do next?' "

Beck observed, "When directly reporting attitudes and behaviors, people can show a social desirability bias, or an unwillingness to disclose negative attitudes and beliefs....vignettes provide a neutral psychological anchor for validating and revealing judgments outside of self-serving biases. People may be unwilling to directly express negative attitudes. However, they may be more willing to express those

attitudes and beliefs toward fictional people in fictional situations."

But other studies, after describing a particular situation, do ask about "what you would do/prefer."

We're going to be asking health professionals about their practice of, and barriers to, counseling patients about health risk factors (e.g., tobacco use, diet) which is an area where there is a lot of social desirability bias.

However, if their answers about Allison or James aren't predictive of what they would actually do, then it isn't helpful for policy purposes, either.

Thoughts?

Colleen Porter
Gainesville, FL

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Mon, 22 Mar 2010 12:01:00 -0400
Reply-To: colleen_porter@COX.NET
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Colleen Porter <colleen_porter@COX.NET>
Subject: Vignettes, summary report
X-To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=UTF-8; format=flowed; delp=no
Content-Disposition: inline
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

(This was delayed by our college's migration to Windows 7, but several folks had asked for a summary...)

A very recent addition to the literature is

On the Usefulness of Pretesting Vignettes in Exploratory Research

Jennifer Beck

RESEARCH REPORT SERIES

(Survey Methodology #2010-02)

Statistical Research Division, U.S. Census Bureau

Report Issued: January 21, 2010

<http://www.census.gov/srd/papers/pdf/rsm2010-02.pdf>

As the title says, this is about using vignettes in the pretesting process. She observes, "Vignettes are a powerful methodological tool because, at the most basic level, they are neutral stimuli that allow researchers to study people's judgments and decision-making processes in

a controlled context."

Some of the classic papers on vignette methodology include these three:

The Use of Vignettes in Survey Research

Author(s): Cheryl S. Alexander and Henry Jay Becker

Source: The Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 42, No. 1 (Spring, 1978), pp. 93-104

They define vignettes as "systematically elaborated descriptions of concrete situations," and note that one of the strengths of vignettes is avoiding ambiguous abstract questions, instead, "more closely approximate a real-life decision-making or judgmentmaking situation." They describe a fractional replication experimental design, in which variables are modified in different versions, which the authors argue permits more accurate measurement of the determinants of respondent opinion.

INNOVATIONS IN EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN IN ATTITUDE SURVEYS

Paul M. Sniderman and Douglas B. Grob

Annu. Rev. Sociol. 1996. 22:377-399

They talk about the role of CATI in allowing experimentation and variation in survey questionnaires, and nondirective and directive designs. They provide a very readable overview of Rossi's work in which the same question is asked, 50 vignettes offered, and vignette not the respondent becomes the unit of analysis.

The Vignette Technique in Survey Research

Janet Finch

Sociology 1987; 21; 105-114

She provides some insights about the British vs. American approaches, and some observations on strengths and weaknesses of the vignette method.

I already mentioned Gary King at Harvard, who has a bunch of information on his website at

<http://gking.harvard.edu/vign/>

But also, there is a wonderful series of video lectures (a bit over an hour) at

<http://athome.harvard.edu/programs/vsr/index.html>

Inspired by King's work with anchoring vignettes, Trish Gallagher did some work in the context of health care preferences, which she presented at AAPOR in 2005 and was ultimately published in Health Affairs.

<http://content.healthaffairs.org/cgi/reprint/28/3/864.pdf>

(That link should take you to the .pdf of the article, but the exact text of the vignettes is available in the journal's web archives.)

It was fascinating to see the wide variety of content areas where vignettes had been used. Of course King's work in standardizing across cultures but also legal questions, political topics, clinical decision

making, consumer choices, and even nanotechnology. The use of the web for surveys involving vignettes--showing videos and having people react to what they see--should take things to a whole 'nother level.

Thanks for all the input,

Colleen

Colleen K. Porter, Coordinator
SE Center for Research to Reduce Disparities in Oral Health
"Taking the bite out of head and neck cancer"
<http://www.dental.ufl.edu/TakeTheBite/>
University of Florida, College of Dentistry Community Dentistry & Behavioral Science

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Mon, 22 Mar 2010 12:26:11 -0400
Reply-To: Jason Boxt <jboxt@GLOVERPARKGROUP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jason Boxt <jboxt@GLOVERPARKGROUP.COM>
Subject: question about the use of open-ended questions
X-To: "AAPORNET@asu.edu" <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

I'm curious to know what people's takes are on the legitimacy of open-ended questions vs. closed questions? My preference has always been to use closed questions from a standpoint of statistical validity, whereas open-ended questions offer a richness that closed questions can't achieve.

Are there any respected articles that offer a good critique of open-ended questions from an academic perspective?

Thanks in advance,

Jason

[cid:image001.jpg@01CAC9BA.DB255F40]

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Mon, 22 Mar 2010 13:43:58 -0400
Reply-To: "Caplan, James R., , CPMS Civ" <james.caplan@CPMS.OSD.MIL>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Caplan, James R., , CPMS Civ" <james.caplan@CPMS.OSD.MIL>
Subject: Re: Second- or third-person?
X-To: colleen_porter@COX.NET, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To:
A<26313033.51181.1269274437008.JavaMail.colleen_porter@127.0.0.1>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="utf-8"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Interestingly, when using vignettes for job testing (as opposed to pre-testing) and the objective is to evaluate a job candidate's judgment, savvy, common sense, or what-have-you in structured settings, I believe the practice is to try to make the scene as personal ("you", rather than "someone") as possible. This brings the decision out of the abstract and into the concrete. But please leave "James" out of your stories, he isn't interested in being involved <grin>.
JRC

James R. Caplan, Ph.D.
Management Analyst
Department of Defense
Civilian Personnel Management Service
HR-Business Information Technology Solutions: CDA
703-696-8754
DSN: 426-8754

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Colleen Porter
Sent: Monday, March 22, 2010 12:14 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Second- or third-person?

So here is a question that came up as I was studying up about vignettes, an issue which has a much broader application than that particular technique.

Should the questions be framed in second person or third? Should we have names for the characters and ask about Allison or James? Or ask what "you" would do in that situation?

Reviewing those articles on vignettes, Finch said, "These studies also make use of the vignettes to distance the judgment requested from the respondent's personal circumstances. Questions come in the form 'What should these people do next?' rather than 'What would you do next?' "

Beck observed, "When directly reporting attitudes and behaviors, people can show a social desirability bias, or an unwillingness to

disclose negative attitudes and beliefs....vignettes provide a neutral psychological anchor for validating and revealing judgments outside of self-serving biases. People may be unwilling to directly express negative attitudes. However, they may be more willing to express those attitudes and beliefs toward fictional people in fictional situations."

But other studies, after describing a particular situation, do ask about "what you would do/prefer."

We're going to be asking health professionals about their practice of, and barriers to, counseling patients about health risk factors (e.g., tobacco use, diet) which is an area where there is a lot of social desirability bias.

However, if their answers about Allison or James aren't predictive of what they would actually do, then it isn't helpful for policy purposes, either.

Thoughts?

Colleen Porter
Gainesville, FL

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Mon, 22 Mar 2010 15:50:28 -0500
Reply-To: Howard Gordon <hgordon@GRFILTD.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Howard Gordon <hgordon@GRFILTD.COM>
Subject: Re: question about the use of open-ended questions
X-To: Jason Boxt <jboxt@GLOVERPARKGROUP.COM>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <4B057B6CD4B082488FADE7ABB7AAEA970479439290@exchange2007.hq.gpg.local>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Three references come to mind with respect to closed v. open-ended questions:

Schuman & Presser, Questions and Answers in Attitude Surveys, Academic Press 1981, Chap. 3

Churchill, Marketing Research, Dryden Press 5th ed. Chap. 8, "Some Do's and Don'ts When Preparing Questionnaires"

Payne, The Art of Asking Questions, Princeton Univ. 1951, Chaps. 3,4.

Pretty well-identified options lends well for closed end. And often times for use in experimental designs.

I'd be interested in learning what other references you collect AAPOR folks on this age-old topic -- plus what they think about the pluses and minuses of open v. closed.

Howard Gordon
GRFI Ltd. Marketing Forensics Practice
Chicago

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jason Box
Sent: Monday, March 22, 2010 11:26 AM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: question about the use of open-ended questions

I'm curious to know what people's takes are on the legitimacy of open-ended questions vs. closed questions? My preference has always been to use closed questions from a standpoint of statistical validity, whereas open-ended questions offer a richness that closed questions can't achieve.

Are there any respected articles that offer a good critique of open-ended questions from an academic perspective?

Thanks in advance,

Jason

[cid:image001.jpg@01CAC9BA.DB255F40]

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Mon, 22 Mar 2010 16:57:45 -0400
Reply-To: Rich Clark <clark@CVIOG.UGA.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Rich Clark <clark@CVIOG.UGA.EDU>
Subject: Re: question about the use of open-ended questions
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
X-cc: Howard Gordon <hgordon@GRFILTD.COM>, jboxt@GLOVERPARKGROUP.COM
In-Reply-To: <E1NtoZv-0002iP-Rq@cl01.gs02.gridserver.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I would add to that list the brief discussion in Floyd Fowler, *Improving Survey Questions: Design and Evaluation*, Sage Press, 1995. He expands upon the best uses for open-ended question in the Appendix.

On 3/22/2010 4:50 PM, Howard Gordon wrote:

> Three references come to mind with respect to closed v. open-ended
> questions:
>
> Schuman& Presser, *Questions and Answers in Attitude Surveys*, Academic Press
> 1981, Chap. 3
> Churchill, *Marketing Research*, Dryden Press 5th ed. Chap. 8, "Some Do's and
> Don'ts When Preparing Questionnaires"
> Payne, *The Art of Asking Questions*, Princeton Univ. 1951, Chaps. 3,4.
>
> Pretty well-identified options lends well for closed end. And often times
> for use in experimental designs.
>
> I'd be interested in learning what other references you collect AAPOR folks
> on this age-old topic -- plus what they think about the pluses and minuses
> of open v. closed.

>
> Howard Gordon
> GRFI Ltd. Marketing Forensics Practice
> Chicago

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jason Boxt
> Sent: Monday, March 22, 2010 11:26 AM
> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
> Subject: question about the use of open-ended questions

>
> I'm curious to know what people's takes are on the legitimacy of open-ended
> questions vs. closed questions? My preference has always been to use closed
> questions from a standpoint of statistical validity, whereas open-ended
> questions offer a richness that closed questions can't achieve.

>
> Are there any respected articles that offer a good critique of open-ended

> questions from an academic perspective?
>
> Thanks in advance,
>
> Jason
>
>
> [cid:image001.jpg@01CAC9BA.DB255F40]
>
>
> -----
> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
> <http://www.aapor.org>
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> signoff aapornet
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>
> -----
> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
> <http://www.aapor.org>
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> signoff aapornet
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>

--

Richard L. Clark, Ph.D
Division of Government Services& Research
Carl Vinson Institute of Government
University of Georgia
201 N. Milledge Avenue
Athens, GA 30602

Office phone: (706) 542-9404
Email address: clark@cviog.uga.edu

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Mon, 22 Mar 2010 18:47:33 -0400
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing
Subject: Re: question about the use of open-ended questions
X-To: Jason Boxt <jboxt@GLOVERPARKGROUP.COM>

X-cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

In-Reply-To:

<4B057B6CD4B082488FADE7ABB7AAEA970479439290@exchange2007.hq.gpg.local>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

For a wonderful discussion of that issue, I recommend reading Howard Schuman's "Method and Meaning in Polls and Surveys" (Harvard University Press, 2008), and in particular, Chapter 2, titled "The Primordial Distinction between Open and Closed Attitude Questions."

Jan Werner

Jason Boxt wrote:

> I'm curious to know what people's takes are on the legitimacy of
> open-ended questions vs. closed questions? My preference has always
> been to use closed questions from a standpoint of statistical
> validity, whereas open-ended questions offer a richness that closed
> questions can't achieve.

>

> Are there any respected articles that offer a good critique of
> open-ended questions from an academic perspective?

>

> Thanks in advance,

>

> Jason

>

>

> [cid:image001.jpg@01CAC9BA.DB255F40]

>

>

> ----- Preliminary

> conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

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

> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> . Unsubscribe? Send email

> to listserv@asu.edu with this text: signoff aapornet Please ask

> authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>

>

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Mon, 22 Mar 2010 16:03:06 -0700

Reply-To: Cathy Cirina <ccirina@MAIL.SDSU.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Cathy Cirina <ccirina@MAIL.SDSU.EDU>

Subject: web survey software with strong reporting/charting capabilities
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <4BA7F385.9030106@jwdp.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I'm looking for a web survey software package with good reporting and charting capabilities. I have a client needing multiple iterations of a survey with different groups, each group will need a separate report. Can anyone recommend a product they've had good experiences with?

Thanks!
Cathy

Cathy Cirina-Chiu, MA, MPH

Managing Director

Social Science Research Lab

San Diego State University

619.594.1363

<http://ssrl.sdsu.edu>

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jan Werner
Sent: Monday, March 22, 2010 3:48 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: question about the use of open-ended questions

For a wonderful discussion of that issue, I recommend reading Howard Schuman's "Method and Meaning in Polls and Surveys" (Harvard University Press, 2008), and in particular, Chapter 2, titled "The Primordial Distinction between Open and Closed Attitude Questions."

Jan Werner

Jason Boxt wrote:

> I'm curious to know what people's takes are on the legitimacy of
> open-ended questions vs. closed questions? My preference has always
> been to use closed questions from a standpoint of statistical
> validity, whereas open-ended questions offer a richness that closed
> questions can't achieve.
>
> Are there any respected articles that offer a good critique of
> open-ended questions from an academic perspective?
>
> Thanks in advance,
>

> Jason
>
>
> [cid:image001.jpg@01CAC9BA.DB255F40]
>
>
> ----- Preliminary
> conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
> <http://www.aapor.org> Archives:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> . Unsubscribe? Send email
> to listserv@asu.edu with this text: signoff aapornet Please ask
> authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>
>

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Mon, 22 Mar 2010 20:56:14 -0400
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing
Subject: Opposition to Health Care Reform???
X-To: AAPORNET <aapornet@asu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

A CNN poll on health care reform conducted over the weekend was released today. Topline results are at:

<http://i2.cdn.turner.com/cnn/2010/images/03/22/re15a.pdf>

or: <http://tinyurl.com/yfybhdh>

The poll shows 39% in favor of the HCR legislation and 59% opposed, which is in line with the conventional wisdom one reads every day in the mainstream media. But this poll followed up by asking those against whether they opposed it as being too liberal or not liberal enough.

The combined results were:

39% Favor
43% Oppose, too liberal
13% Oppose, not liberal enough
5% No opinion

So while the response to the initial question seems to support the idea that the American people don't want health care reform, the picture that emerges after the follow-up shows a majority of 52% to 43% who want at least as much, if not more, health care reform than they are being offered in this legislation.

So much for the Inside The Beltway meme that passing health care reform will cost Democrats dearly in November. Democrats may lose big for many other reasons, but it certainly won't be because of health care reform.

But more importantly, this illustrates once again the silliness of the simple favor/oppose numbers that are constantly bandied about in the media and charted on sites all over the web.

Not that I expect many in the press to take notice.

Jan Werner

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Mon, 22 Mar 2010 22:19:19 -0400

Reply-To: rfunk787@AOL.COM

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "G. Ray Funkhouser" <rfunk787@AOL.COM>

Subject: Re: Opposition to Health Care Reform???

X-To: jwerner@jwdp.com, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

In-Reply-To: <4BA811AE.9070001@jwdp.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

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

Considering that the issue in question -- a comprehensive overhaul of the nation's health care system with major impacts on the national economy, employer/employee relations, the size of the national debt, the availability and quality of health care and many other factors that directly impact people's lives -- rammed through the legislative process solely by one political party -- perhaps the fact that 43% of the public opposes it is a significant finding? This is certainly more weighty a matter than, for example, "what do you think is the most important problem?" or "should we lengthen the period of daylight savings time?" =20

The triviality of the comment on the CNN poll is beneath AAPOR.

Ray Funkhouser

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

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Sent: Mon, Mar 22, 2010 8:56 pm

Subject: Opposition to Health Care Reform???

A CNN poll on health care reform conducted over the weekend was released=

today. Topline results are at:=20

<http://i2.cdn.turner.com/cnn/2010/images/03/22/rel5a.pdf>=20

or: <http://tinyurl.com/yfybhdh>=20

The poll shows 39% in favor of the HCR legislation and 59% opposed,=20

which is in line with the conventional wisdom one reads every day in the=

mainstream media. But this poll followed up by asking those against=20

whether they opposed it as being too liberal or not liberal enough.=20

The combined results were:=20

39% Favor=20

43% Oppose, too liberal=20

13% Oppose, not liberal enough=20

5% No opinion=20

So while the response to the initial question seems to support the idea=20

that the American people don't want health care reform, the picture that=

emerges after the follow-up shows a majority of 52% to 43% who want at=20

least as much, if not more, health care reform than they are being=20

offered in this legislation.=20

So much for the Inside The Beltway meme that passing health care reform=20

will cost Democrats dearly in November. Democrats may lose big for many=20

other reasons, but it certainly won't be because of health care reform.=20

But more importantly, this illustrates once again the silliness of the=20

simple favor/oppose numbers that are constantly bandied about in the=20

media and charted on sites all over the web.=20

Not that I expect many in the press to take notice.=20

=20
Jan Werner=20
=20

-----=20
Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=20

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Mon, 22 Mar 2010 19:54:26 -0700
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>
Subject: web survey software recommendation
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I too am looking for some software
Would like an asp, with email management, download results to a .csv and a
formatted spss file, the usual variety of question types, an option for
their staff to build the survey. I'm willing to forgo the spss output for
software that was designed by social science researchers and not by
engineers.
Thanks
leora

Dr. Leora Lawton
TechSociety Research
"Custom Social Science and Consumer Behavior Research"
2342 Shattuck Avenue PMB 362, Berkeley, CA 94704
(510) 548-6174; fax (510) 548-6175; cell (510) 928-7572
www.techsociety.com
Yahoo Messenger: [leora_lawton](https://messenger.yahoo.com/leora_lawton)

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Mon, 22 Mar 2010 22:02:51 -0500
Reply-To: Debra Miller <millerdebra35@GMAIL.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Debra Miller <millerdebra35@GMAIL.COM>
Subject: Re: web survey software recommendation
X-To: Leora Lawton <lawton@techsociety.com>
X-cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <D248AD830C904285A0249292A10EF3D2@dell2005>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1

Leora, you might consider ConfirmIt (<http://www.confirmit.com/>). I've worked with the software and it's output across a multiple organizations over the past ten years.

Debbie Miller
Mixed Methods Consulting

On Mon, Mar 22, 2010 at 9:54 PM, Leora Lawton <lawton@techsociety.com> wrote:

> I too am looking for some software
> Would like an asp, with email management, download results to a .csv and a
> formatted spss file, the usual variety of question types, an option for
> their staff to build the survey. I'm willing to forgo the spss output for
> software that was designed by social science researchers and not by
> engineers.
> Thanks
> leora
>
> Dr. Leora Lawton
> TechSociety Research
> "Custom Social Science and Consumer Behavior Research"
> 2342 Shattuck Avenue PMB 362, Berkeley, CA 94704
> (510) 548-6174; fax (510) 548-6175; cell (510) 928-7572
> www.techsociety.com
> Yahoo Messenger: leora_lawton
>
> -----
> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
> <http://www.aapor.org>
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> signoff aapornet
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Tue, 23 Mar 2010 07:49:53 -0400
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Subject: Re: Opposition to Health Care Reform???
X-To: aapornet aapornet <aapornet@asu.edu>
In-Reply-To: <8CC984660D6FDC1-28C0-6ECF@Webmail-m104.sysops.aol.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII; format=flowed; delsp=yes
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Mime-Version: 1.0 (Apple Message framework v936)

On Mar 22, 2010, at 10:19 PM, G. Ray Funkhouser wrote:

> rammed through the legislative process solely by one political party

Rammed through? It was debated and obsessed over for a year! I'm no fan of the thing, but something that was talked about as much as this was not "rammed through."

Doug Henwood
Left Business Observer
242 Greene Ave - #1C
Brooklyn, NY 11238-1398 USA
<dhenwood@panix.com>
<<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>>
"blog": <<http://doughenwood.wordpress.com/>>

voice +1-347-599-2211
cell +1-917-865-2813

producer, Behind the News
Thursdays, 5-6 PM, WBAI, New York 99.5 FM
Saturdays, 10-11 AM, KPFA, Berkeley 94.1 FM

<<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Radio.html>>
podcast: <<http://shout.lbo-talk.org/lbo/radio-feed.php>>
iTunes:
<<http://phobos.apple.com/WebObjects/MZStore.woa/wa/viewPodcast?id=73801817>>
>
or <<http://tinyurl.com/3bsaqb>>

download my book Wall Street (for free!) at
<<http://www.wallstreetthebook.com>>

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Date: Tue, 23 Mar 2010 12:18:08 -0000

Reply-To: Iain Noble <I.Noble@WESTMINSTER.AC.UK>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Iain Noble <I.Noble@WESTMINSTER.AC.UK>

Subject: Re: Opposition to Health Care Reform???

X-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

In-Reply-To: A<64E395C3-132F-4B69-969A-C2FB3B14A6FC@panix.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Indeed. Any government in a democracy that used its majority in the legislature to get measures passed would be guilty of 'ramming through' by that definition. That's what democratic politics is about (at least some of the time). You get elected to do certain things then you do them.

Iain Noble
Research and Enterprise Service (RES)
University of Westminster
Room G1
4-12 Little Titchfield Street
London W1W 7UW

Tel: 0207 911 5000 Ext 2651

Mobile: 0753 832 8523

RIP Charlie Gillett (1942 - 2010) From Morecambe to Memphis heaven is a honky-tonk.

This e-mail and its attachments are intended for the above named only and may be confidential. If they have come to you in error you must not copy or show them to anyone, nor should you take any action based on them, other than to notify the error by replying to the sender

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

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

Sent: 23 March 2010 11:50

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: Re: Opposition to Health Care Reform???

On Mar 22, 2010, at 10:19 PM, G. Ray Funkhouser wrote:

> rammed through the legislative process solely by one political party

Rammed through? It was debated and obsessed over for a year! I'm no fan of the thing, but something that was talked about as much as this was not "rammed through."

Doug Henwood
Left Business Observer
242 Greene Ave - #1C
Brooklyn, NY 11238-1398 USA
<dhenwood@panix.com>
<<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>>
"blog": <<http://doughenwood.wordpress.com/>>

voice +1-347-599-2211
cell +1-917-865-2813

producer, Behind the News
Thursdays, 5-6 PM, WBAI, New York 99.5 FM
Saturdays, 10-11 AM, KPFA, Berkeley 94.1 FM

<<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Radio.html>>
podcast: <<http://shout.lbo-talk.org/lbo/radio-feed.php>>
iTunes:
<<http://phobos.apple.com/WebObjects/MZStore.woa/wa/viewPodcast?id=738018>
17
>
or <<http://tinyurl.com/3bsaqb>>

download my book Wall Street (for free!) at
<<http://www.wallstreetthebook.com>>

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

--
The University of Westminster is a charity and a company limited by
guarantee. Registration number: 977818 England. Registered Office:
309 Regent Street, London W1B 2UW, UK.

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Tue, 23 Mar 2010 09:25:48 -0500
Reply-To: "Houston, Brian (HSC)" <Brian-Houston@OUHSC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Houston, Brian (HSC)" <Brian-Houston@OUHSC.EDU>

Subject: Re: Opposition to Health Care Reform???
X-To: "AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
In-Reply-To: <8CC984660D6FDC1-28C0-6ECF@Webmail-m104.sysops.aol.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

The original point of Jan's email is still very interesting though. Total opposition to the health care plan may be 52%, but that opposition is not uniform, and all of that opposition is not represented by the minority party. So the minority party's claim that they are acting on behalf of a majority of the American people is not accurate, according to this poll. Instead the minority are only acting on behalf of 43% of the American people (probably about the amount of the population they represent?).

Also, this distribution of attitudes about the health care plan supports the idea that the bill is a pretty decent compromise in that a large group of respondents support the bill, while other respondents think the bill is too liberal and still others think the bill is too conservative.

Beyond this poll, it would be interesting to see what these various groups believe is actually in the plan.

--Brian Houston

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of G. Ray Funkhouser
Sent: Monday, March 22, 2010 9:19 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: Opposition to Health Care Reform???

Considering that the issue in question -- a comprehensive overhaul of the nation's health care system with major impacts on the national economy, employer/employee relations, the size of the national debt, the availability and quality of health care and many other factors that directly impact people's lives -- rammed through the legislative process solely by one political party -- perhaps the fact that 43% of the public opposes it is a significant finding? This is certainly more weighty a matter than, for example, "what do you think is the most important problem?" or "should we lengthen the period of daylight savings time?"

The triviality of the comment on the CNN poll is beneath AAPOR.

Ray Funkhouser

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

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Sent: Mon, Mar 22, 2010 8:56 pm
Subject: Opposition to Health Care Reform???

A CNN poll on health care reform conducted over the weekend was released today. Topline results are at:

<http://i2.cdn.turner.com/cnn/2010/images/03/22/rel5a.pdf>

or: <http://tinyurl.com/yfybhdh>

The poll shows 39% in favor of the HCR legislation and 59% opposed, which is in line with the conventional wisdom one reads every day in the mainstream media. But this poll followed up by asking those against whether they opposed it as being too liberal or not liberal enough.

The combined results were:

39% Favor
43% Oppose, too liberal
13% Oppose, not liberal enough
5% No opinion

So while the response to the initial question seems to support the idea that the American people don't want health care reform, the picture that emerges after the follow-up shows a majority of 52% to 43% who want at least as much, if not more, health care reform than they are being offered in this legislation.

So much for the Inside The Beltway meme that passing health care reform will cost Democrats dearly in November. Democrats may lose big for many other reasons, but it certainly won't be because of health care reform.

But more importantly, this illustrates once again the silliness of the simple favor/oppose numbers that are constantly bandied about in the media and charted on sites all over the web.

Not that I expect many in the press to take notice.

Jan Werner

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Tue, 23 Mar 2010 08:01:16 -0700
Reply-To: "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG>
Subject: Re: web survey software recommendation
X-To: Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

We used Datstat Illume and were happy with it.

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

Lynda Voigt
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center
Seattle

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

From: AAPORNET on behalf of Leora Lawton
Sent: Mon 3/22/2010 7:54 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: web survey software recommendation
=20

I too am looking for some software

Would like an asp, with email management, download results to a .csv and =
a

formatted spss file, the usual variety of question types, an option for
their staff to build the survey. I'm willing to forgo the spss output =
for

software that was designed by social science researchers and not by
engineers.

Thanks
leora

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

www.techsociety.com
Yahoo Messenger: leora_lawton

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Tue, 23 Mar 2010 11:37:09 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: A nice summary of some of the public opinion on Health Care Reform
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Health Care Reform: An Opinion Summary
<http://blogs.abcnews.com/thenumbers/2010/03/health-care-reform-an-opinion-summary.html>
or
<http://tinyurl.com/y965d3m>

It's been a simple matter for just about anyone to mischaracterize public opinion on the health care reform measure the president's about to sign. Polling results on it have depended to a large extent on what's asked - a reasonable outcome given conflicted views on the subject.

As we've reported, some elements are highly popular (e.g., doing away with limits on pre-existing conditions); others engender considerable doubts (e.g. the costs and the level of government involvement). That's a prescription for mixed emotions.

SNIP

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

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Tue, 23 Mar 2010 12:00:52 -0400
Reply-To: "Leve, Jay" <jleve@SURVEYUSA.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leve, Jay" <jleve@SURVEYUSA.COM>
Subject: Re: Opposition to Health Care Reform???
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

After the House vote on health care, SurveyUSA asked the following question (among others) in five geographies:

"Which statement best describes you:
- I want to leave the health care system alone.
- I want to change health care, but think Congress has gone too far.
- I want to change health care, but think Congress did not go far enough.
- I support the changes Congress has made to the health care system."

Research fielded in these geographies:

1. Los Angeles
2. San Diego
3. Seattle
4. Fresno
5. Tampa

| Results | LAX | SAN | SEA | FAT | TPA |
|-------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Leave the health care system alone | 21% | 16% | 14% | 21% | 24% |
| Congress has gone too far | 35% | 39% | 41% | 39% | 42% |
| Congress did not go far enough | 27% | 26% | 24% | 20% | 16% |
| I support changes Congress has made | 15% | 16% | 14% | 12% | 15% |

Full crosstabs by party and other demographics available:

<http://www.surveyusa.com/breaking.aspx>

Jay H Leve
SurveyUSA
1425 Broad Street #7
Clifton NJ 07013
973-857-8500 x 551

jleve@surveyusa.com
www.surveyusa.com

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Houston, Brian (HSC)

Sent: Tuesday, March 23, 2010 10:26 AM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: Re: Opposition to Health Care Reform???

The original point of Jan's email is still very interesting though. Total opposition to the health care plan may be 52%, but that opposition is not uniform, and all of that opposition is not represented by the minority party. So the minority party's claim that they are acting on behalf of a majority of the American people is not accurate, according to this poll. Instead the minority are only acting on behalf of 43% of the American people (probably about the amount of the population they represent?).

Also, this distribution of attitudes about the health care plan supports the idea that the bill is a pretty decent compromise in that a large group of respondents support the bill, while other respondents think the bill is too liberal and still others think the bill is too conservative.

Beyond this poll, it would be interesting to see what these various groups believe is actually in the plan.

--Brian Houston

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of G. Ray Funkhouser

Sent: Monday, March 22, 2010 9:19 PM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: Re: Opposition to Health Care Reform???

Considering that the issue in question -- a comprehensive overhaul of the nation's health care system with major impacts on the national economy, employer/employee relations, the size of the national debt, the availability and quality of health care and many other factors that directly impact people's lives -- rammed through the legislative process solely by one political party -- perhaps the fact that 43% of the public opposes it is a significant finding? This is certainly more weighty a matter than, for example, "what do you think is the most important problem?" or "should we lengthen the period of daylight savings time?"

The triviality of the comment on the CNN poll is beneath AAPOR.

Ray Funkhouser

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

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Sent: Mon, Mar 22, 2010 8:56 pm

Subject: Opposition to Health Care Reform???

A CNN poll on health care reform conducted over the weekend was released today. Topline results are at:

<http://i2.cdn.turner.com/cnn/2010/images/03/22/re15a.pdf>

or: <http://tinyurl.com/yfybhdh>

The poll shows 39% in favor of the HCR legislation and 59% opposed, which is in line with the conventional wisdom one reads every day in the mainstream media. But this poll followed up by asking those against whether they opposed it as being too liberal or not liberal enough.

The combined results were:

39% Favor

43% Oppose, too liberal

13% Oppose, not liberal enough

5% No opinion

So while the response to the initial question seems to support the idea that the American people don't want health care reform, the picture that emerges after the follow-up shows a majority of 52% to 43% who want at least as much, if not more, health care reform than they are being offered in this legislation.

So much for the Inside The Beltway meme that passing health care reform will cost Democrats dearly in November. Democrats may lose big for many other reasons, but it certainly won't be because of health care reform.

But more importantly, this illustrates once again the silliness of the simple favor/oppose numbers that are constantly bandied about in the media and charted on sites all over the web.

Not that I expect many in the press to take notice.

Jan Werner

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

aapornet-request@asu.edu

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====
Date: Tue, 23 Mar 2010 12:10:26 -0400

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

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>

Subject: Call me skeptical

X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Scary New GOP Poll

John Avlon

Tue Mar 23, 12:58 am ET

NEW YORK - On the heels of health care, a new Harris poll reveals Republican attitudes about Obama: Two-thirds think he's a socialist, 57 percent a Muslim-and 24 percent say "he may be the Antichrist."

SNIP

These numbers all come from a brand-new Louis Harris poll, inspired in part by my new book Wingnuts.

SNIP

The full results of the poll, which will be released in greater detail tomorrow, are even more frightening:

SNIP

John Avlon's new book *Wingnuts: How the Lunatic Fringe is Hijacking America* is available now by Beast Books both on the Web and in paperback. He is also the author of *Independent Nation: How Centrists Can Change American Politics*. Previously, he served as chief speechwriter for New York City Mayor Rudy Giuliani and was a columnist and associate editor for *The New York Sun*.

--

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

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Tue, 23 Mar 2010 13:15:11 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Call me skeptical - now with URLs
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Scary New GOP Poll
John Avlon
Tue Mar 23, 12:58 am ET

http://news.yahoo.com/s/dailybeast/20100323/ts_dailybeast/7269_scarynewgoppoll
or
<http://tinyurl.com/ye42w5y>

NEW YORK - On the heels of health care, a new Harris poll reveals Republican attitudes about Obama: Two-thirds think he's a socialist, 57 percent a Muslim-and 24 percent say "he may be the Antichrist."

SNIP

These numbers all come from a brand-new Louis Harris poll, inspired in part by my new book *Wingnuts*.

SNIP

The full results of the poll, which will be released in greater detail tomorrow, are even more frightening:

SNIP

John Avlon's new book *Wingnuts: How the Lunatic Fringe is Hijacking America* is available now by Beast Books both on the Web and in paperback. He is also the author of *Independent Nation: How Centrists Can Change American Politics*. Previously, he served as chief speechwriter for New York City Mayor Rudy Giuliani and was a columnist and associate editor for *The New York Sun*.

--

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

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====

Date: Tue, 23 Mar 2010 10:35:03 -0700
Reply-To: Michael Sullivan <michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Michael Sullivan <michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM>
Subject: Re: Call me skeptical
X-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>,
"AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
In-Reply-To:
<3248A9B21DD5574785FE5E2C8E521684F9FAA5@exchange.local.artscience.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

The history of the Weimar Republic is interesting reading in light of the current situation.

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta
Sent: Tuesday, March 23, 2010 9:10 AM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Call me skeptical

Scary New GOP Poll
John Avlon
Tue Mar 23, 12:58 am ET

NEW YORK - On the heels of health care, a new Harris poll reveals Republican attitudes about Obama: Two-thirds think he's a socialist, 57 percent a Muslim-and 24 percent say "he may be the Antichrist."

SNIP

These numbers all come from a brand-new Louis Harris poll, inspired in part by my new book Wingnuts.

SNIP

The full results of the poll, which will be released in greater detail tomorrow, are even more frightening:

SNIP

John Avlon's new book Wingnuts: How the Lunatic Fringe is Hijacking America is available now by Beast Books both on the Web and in paperback. He is also the author of Independent Nation: How Centrists Can Change American Politics. Previously, he served as chief speechwriter for New York City Mayor Rudy Giuliani and was a columnist and associate editor for The New York Sun.

--

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

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Tue, 23 Mar 2010 14:08:41 -0400
Reply-To: Barry Hollander <barry@UGA.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Barry Hollander <barry@UGA.EDU>
Subject: Re: Call me skeptical - now with URLs
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; format=flowed; charset="iso-8859-1";
reply-type=original

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

While I may buy the "socialist" survey number, the "Muslim" number seems to me way out of wack. That number has drifted between 10 and 25 percent since the summer before the 2008 election. But 54 percent? I see no reason why the health care debate would have boosted this misperception, and even the recent diplomatic spat with Israel seems not enough to more than double that percentage.

And nearly a quarter believe him to be the Antichrist? Everyone knows the Antichrist's name will be Damien.

I look forward to more methodological details on this one, but it's already moving fast across the blogosphere. I haven't seen many mainstream news orgs pick up on it ... yet.

Barry Hollander
Grady College of Journalism
and Mass Communication
University of Georgia
barry@uga.edu
www.barryhollander.com
www.whatpeopleknow.com

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Tue, 23 Mar 2010 18:35:49 -0000
Reply-To: Iain Noble <I.Noble@WESTMINSTER.AC.UK>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Iain Noble <I.Noble@WESTMINSTER.AC.UK>
Subject: Re: Call me skeptical - now with URLs
X-To: Barry Hollander <barry@UGA.EDU>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: A<4E9744EC4755486C9A51117E71D9D53E@barry>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

If you Americans don't want him any longer can we have him? Seems a lot better to me than the choice we're going to be offered over here soon.

Iain Noble
Research and Enterprise Service (RES)
University of Westminster
Room G1
4-12 Little Titchfield Street
London W1W 7UW

Tel: 0207 911 5000 Ext 2651
Mobile: 0753 832 8523

RIP Charlie Gillett (1942 - 2010) From Morecambe to Memphis heaven is a honky-tonk.

This e-mail and its attachments are intended for the above named only and may be confidential. If they have come to you in error you must not copy or show them to anyone, nor should you take any action based on them, other than to notify the error by replying to the sender

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Barry Hollander
Sent: 23 March 2010 18:09
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: Call me skeptical - now with URLs

While I may buy the "socialist" survey number, the "Muslim" number seems to me way out of wack. That number has drifted between 10 and 25 percent since the summer before the 2008 election. But 54 percent? I see no reason why the health care debate would have boosted this misperception, and even the recent diplomatic spat with Israel seems not enough to more than double that percentage.

And nearly a quarter believe him to be the Antichrist? Everyone knows the Antichrist's name will be Damien.

I look forward to more methodological details on this one, but it's already moving fast across the blogosphere. I haven't seen many mainstream news orgs pick up on it ... yet.

Barry Hollander
Grady College of Journalism
and Mass Communication
University of Georgia
barry@uga.edu
www.barryhollander.com
www.whatpeopleknow.com

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

--

The University of Westminster is a charity and a company limited by

guarantee. Registration number: 977818 England. Registered Office:
309 Regent Street, London W1B 2UW, UK.

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====

Date: Tue, 23 Mar 2010 11:49:34 -0700
Reply-To: Joel Moskowitz <jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Joel Moskowitz <jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU>
Subject: Re: Opposition to Health Care Reform???
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <033131AB4310364FB652738936135D000116E4CC@exchange.hypotenu
se.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

I read the methods employed in these single day telephone surveys and have some questions. Were computerized interviews used (i.e. T-ACASI)? What were the AAPOR response rates? How might these factors affect the results?

At 3/23/2010 09:00 AM, Leve, Jay wrote:

>After the House vote on health care, SurveyUSA asked the following
>question (among others) in five geographies:

>
>"Which statement best describes you:
>- I want to leave the health care system alone.
>- I want to change health care, but think Congress has gone too far.
>- I want to change health care, but think Congress did not go far
>enough.
>- I support the changes Congress has made to the health care system."

>
>Research fielded in these geographies:

>
>1. Los Angeles
>2. San Diego
>3. Seattle
>4. Fresno
>5. Tampa

>
>
>Results LAX SAN SEA FAT TPA

>
>-----
>Leave the health care system alone 21% 16% 14% 21% 24%
>Congress has gone too far 35% 39% 41% 39% 42%
>Congress did not go far enough 27% 26% 24% 20% 16%
>I support changes Congress has made 15% 16% 14% 12% 15%

>
>

>Full crosstabs by party and other demographics available:

>
><http://www.surveyusa.com/breaking.aspx>

>
>Jay H Leve
>SurveyUSA
>1425 Broad Street #7
>Clifton NJ 07013
>973-857-8500 x 551
>jleve@surveyusa.com
>www.surveyusa.com

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

>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Houston, Brian
>(HSC)
>Sent: Tuesday, March 23, 2010 10:26 AM
>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
>Subject: Re: Opposition to Health Care Reform???

>
>The original point of Jan's email is still very interesting though.
>Total opposition to the health care plan may be 52%, but that opposition
>is not uniform, and all of that opposition is not represented by the
>minority party. So the minority party's claim that they are acting on
>behalf of a majority of the American people is not accurate, according
>to this poll. Instead the minority are only acting on behalf of 43% of
>the American people (probably about the amount of the population they
>represent?).

>
>Also, this distribution of attitudes about the health care plan supports
>the idea that the bill is a pretty decent compromise in that a large
>group of respondents support the bill, while other respondents think the
>bill is too liberal and still others think the bill is too conservative.

>
>Beyond this poll, it would be interesting to see what these various
>groups believe is actually in the plan.

>
>--Brian Houston

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

>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of G. Ray Funkhouser
>Sent: Monday, March 22, 2010 9:19 PM
>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
>Subject: Re: Opposition to Health Care Reform???

>
>Considering that the issue in question -- a comprehensive overhaul of
>the nation's health care system with major impacts on the national
>economy, employer/employee relations, the size of the national debt, the
>availability and quality of health care and many other factors that
>directly impact people's lives -- rammed through the legislative
>process solely by one political party -- perhaps the fact that 43% of
>the public opposes it is a significant finding? This is certainly more

>weighty a matter than, for example, "what do you think is the most
>important problem?" or "should we lengthen the period of daylight
>savings time?"

>
>

>The triviality of the comment on the CNN poll is beneath AAPOR.

>
>

>Ray Funkhouser

>
>
>
>
>

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

>From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>

>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

>Sent: Mon, Mar 22, 2010 8:56 pm

>Subject: Opposition to Health Care Reform???

>
>

>A CNN poll on health care reform conducted over the weekend was released
>today. Topline results are at:

>
><http://i2.cdn.turner.com/cnn/2010/images/03/22/rel5a.pdf>

>
>or: <http://tinyurl.com/yfybhdh>

>
>The poll shows 39% in favor of the HCR legislation and 59% opposed,
>which is in line with the conventional wisdom one reads every day in the
>mainstream media. But this poll followed up by asking those against
>whether they opposed it as being too liberal or not liberal enough.

>
>The combined results were:

>
>39% Favor
>43% Oppose, too liberal
>13% Oppose, not liberal enough
>5% No opinion

>
>So while the response to the initial question seems to support the idea
>that the American people don't want health care reform, the picture that
>emerges after the follow-up shows a majority of 52% to 43% who want at
>least as much, if not more, health care reform than they are being
>offered in this legislation.

>
>So much for the Inside The Beltway meme that passing health care reform
>will cost Democrats dearly in November. Democrats may lose big for many
>other reasons, but it certainly won't be because of health care reform.

>
>But more importantly, this illustrates once again the silliness of the
>simple favor/oppose numbers that are constantly bandied about in the
>media and charted on sites all over the web.

>

>Not that I expect many in the press to take notice.

>

>Jan Werner

>

>-----

>Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

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

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

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

>signoff aapornet

>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>

>

>

>

>-----

>Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

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

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

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

>signoff aapornet

>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>

>-----

>Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

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

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

>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

>aapornet-request@asu.edu

>

>-----

>Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

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

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

>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====
Date: Tue, 23 Mar 2010 14:30:26 -0400

Reply-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>

Subject: Re: Call me skeptical

X-To: aapornet aapornet <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

In-Reply-To: <28CCEB02B0B64D4091ED6FD17DF571691837CE7B4B@EX-BE-024-SV1.shared.themessagecenter.com>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Mime-Version: 1.0 (Apple Message framework v936)

On Mar 23, 2010, at 1:35 PM, Michael Sullivan wrote:

> The history of the Weimar Republic is interesting reading in light
> of the current situation.

Yes, except that there were actual socialists around, and not just
phantasmic ones, in the Weimar Republic.

Doug Henwood
Left Business Observer
242 Greene Ave - #1C
Brooklyn, NY 11238-1398 USA
<dhenwood@panix.com>
<<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>>
"blog": <<http://doughenwood.wordpress.com/>>

voice +1-347-599-2211
cell +1-917-865-2813

producer, Behind the News
Thursdays, 5-6 PM, WBAI, New York 99.5 FM
Saturdays, 10-11 AM, KPFA, Berkeley 94.1 FM

<<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Radio.html>>
podcast: <<http://shout.lbo-talk.org/lbo/radio-feed.php>>
iTunes:
<<http://phobos.apple.com/WebObjects/MZStore.woa/wa/viewPodcast?id=73801817>
>
or <<http://tinyurl.com/3bsaqb>>

download my book Wall Street (for free!) at
<<http://www.wallstreetthebook.com>>

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Tue, 23 Mar 2010 15:06:23 -0400
Reply-To: Jon Cohen <CohenJ@WASHPOST.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jon Cohen <CohenJ@WASHPOST.COM>
Subject: "The government is watching me, because I'm so ordinary"
X-To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0

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

A respondent's view in today's Washington Post ...

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/03/22/AR2010032202847.html>

OR

<http://tinyurl.com/yguwbt4>

Paper hede: "The government is watching me, because I'm so ordinary"

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Date: Tue, 23 Mar 2010 12:33:12 -0700

Reply-To: Michael Sullivan <michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Michael Sullivan <michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM>

Subject: Re: Call me skeptical

X-To: "jwerner@jwdp.com" <jwerner@jwdp.com>,
"AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

In-Reply-To: <4BA90C54.1030007@jwdp.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Inflation was one of many issues that caused the disaffected masses of German society to elect Herr Hitler. The rest as they say is history. Our economy has been stagnant for almost a decade now and increasing numbers of formerly lower middle class people are having to reset their expectations for the future. Without pretty profound change in the situation they are going to join the ranks of the poor, if they haven't already.

I fear that as this comes about these people will be looking for solutions -- solutions offered by all kinds of parties who can provide simple answers to complex questions. It is fairly easy to explain to the poorly educated masses, that the problems in their lives are being created by illegal aliens, African Americans, liberals, Jews, socialists, or Muslims and thereby to attract an ignorant crowd of potential brown shirts to make racket and bully other citizens into submission. American democracy is not healthy right now (maybe never was) and I don't think it would take much to get large crowds into the streets trying to somehow make it better by shouting and burning.

As a member of the American aristocracy I am deeply worried about this

situation. But maybe I'm overreacting. Perhaps we should just let them eat cake and see how that works out.

MS

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

From: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com]

Sent: Tuesday, March 23, 2010 11:46 AM

To: Michael Sullivan

Subject: Re: Call me skeptical

You mean I can expect to pay \$5 billion for a macchiato at Starbucks?

Jan Werner

Michael Sullivan wrote:

> The history of the Weimar Republic is interesting reading in light of the current situation.

>

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta

> Sent: Tuesday, March 23, 2010 9:10 AM

> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

> Subject: Call me skeptical

>

> Scary New GOP Poll

> John Avlon

> Tue Mar 23, 12:58 am ET

>

> NEW YORK - On the heels of health care, a new Harris poll reveals

> Republican attitudes about Obama: Two-thirds think he's a socialist, 57

> percent a Muslim-and 24 percent say "he may be the Antichrist."

>

> SNIP

>

> These numbers all come from a brand-new Louis Harris poll, inspired in

> part by my new book Wingnuts.

>

> SNIP

>

> The full results of the poll, which will be released in greater detail

> tomorrow, are even more frightening:

>

> SNIP

>

> John Avlon's new book Wingnuts: How the Lunatic Fringe is Hijacking

> America is available now by Beast Books both on the Web and in

> paperback. He is also the author of Independent Nation: How Centrists

> Can Change American Politics. Previously, he served as chief

> speechwriter for New York City Mayor Rudy Giuliani and was a columnist

> and associate editor for The New York Sun.

>

> --
> Leo G. Simonetta
> Director of Research
> Art& Science Group
> 6115 Falls Road, Suite 101
> Baltimore, MD 21209
>
> -----
> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
> <http://www.aapor.org>
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>
> -----
> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
> <http://www.aapor.org>
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>
>

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Tue, 23 Mar 2010 16:05:39 -0400
Reply-To: howard schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: howard schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>
Subject: Re: Call me skeptical
X-To: aapor <aapornet@asu.edu>
In-Reply-To: <28CCEB02B0B64D4091ED6FD17DF571691837CE7BAB@EX-BE-024-SV1.shared.themessagecenter.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

This is an important posting, a reminder to view poll data in a larger context of past and future, drawing seriously on history where relevant. The long-term impact of unemployment, underemployment, loss of homes--not only on adults but on their children as well--does have serious implications beyond the immediate popularity of the president, the 2010 election, or a fight over a particular issue. There are of course a lot of differences between the U.S. at present (including our cross-cutting racial and ethnic diversity) and the situation and changes in Germany at the time of the rise of Hitler. But it's something we do need to think about. hs

Michael Sullivan wrote:

> Inflation was one of many issues that caused the disaffected masses of German society to elect Herr Hitler. The rest as they say is history. Our economy has been stagnant for almost a decade now and increasing numbers of formerly lower middle class people are having to reset their expectations for the future. Without pretty profound change in the situation they are going to join the ranks of the poor, if they haven't already.

>

> I fear that as this comes about these people will be looking for solutions - solutions offered by all kinds of parties who can provide simple answers to complex questions. It is fairly easy to explain to the poorly educated masses, that the problems in their lives are being created by illegal aliens, African Americans, liberals, Jews, socialists, or Muslims and thereby to attract an ignorant crowd of potential brown shirts to make racket and bully other citizens into submission. American democracy is not healthy right now (maybe never was) and I don't think it would take much to get large crowds into the streets trying to somehow make it better by shouting and burning.

>

> As a member of the American aristocracy I am deeply worried about this situation. But maybe I'm overreacting. Perhaps we should just let them eat cake and see how that works out.

>

> MS

>

>

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

> From: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com]

> Sent: Tuesday, March 23, 2010 11:46 AM

> To: Michael Sullivan

> Subject: Re: Call me skeptical

>

> You mean I can expect to pay \$5 billion for a macchiato at Starbucks?

>

> Jan Werner

> _____

>

> Michael Sullivan wrote:

>> The history of the Weimar Republic is interesting reading in light of the current situation.

>>

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

>> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta

>> Sent: Tuesday, March 23, 2010 9:10 AM

>> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

>> Subject: Call me skeptical

>>

>> Scary New GOP Poll

>> John Avlon

>> Tue Mar 23, 12:58 am ET

>>

>> NEW YORK - On the heels of health care, a new Harris poll reveals

>> Republican attitudes about Obama: Two-thirds think he's a socialist, 57

>> percent a Muslim-and 24 percent say "he may be the Antichrist."

>>

>> SNIP

>>
>> These numbers all come from a brand-new Louis Harris poll, inspired in
>> part by my new book Wingnuts.

>>
>> SNIP

>>
>> The full results of the poll, which will be released in greater detail
>> tomorrow, are even more frightening:

>>
>> SNIP

>>
>> John Avlon's new book Wingnuts: How the Lunatic Fringe is Hijacking
>> America is available now by Beast Books both on the Web and in
>> paperback. He is also the author of Independent Nation: How Centrists
>> Can Change American Politics. Previously, he served as chief
>> speechwriter for New York City Mayor Rudy Giuliani and was a columnist
>> and associate editor for The New York Sun.

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

>>
>> -----
>> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
>> <http://www.aapor.org>
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

>>
>> -----
>> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
>> <http://www.aapor.org>
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

>>
>>
>
> -----
> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
> <http://www.aapor.org>
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

>
>

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Date: Tue, 23 Mar 2010 15:52:23 -0500

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

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Woody Carter <wcarter@UCHICAGO.EDU>

Subject: Re: Call me skeptical

X-To: howard schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

In-Reply-To: <4BA91F13.6040602@umich.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

When I was in grad school, my roommate's family criticized him for majoring in religious studies. "When the pogroms start, you'll want to be a doctor." They were still planning for the 1930s and the need to emigrate ... to Australia? There is a flavor of that kind of thinking in these comments. Like always fighting the last war, we are always looking for parallels from bad times. I have no doubt "it could happen here" but the "it" will not be what happened before, but some new thing. We will likely not know what it is going to be any more than they knew in the 1920s. But the way to be ready for it is clear: fight for education that teaches people to evaluate rhetoric and warring statistics and draw better conclusions. We are far from that right now, and it is very scary indeed.

---- Original message ----

>Date: Tue, 23 Mar 2010 16:05:39 -0400

>From: howard schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>

>Subject: Re: Call me skeptical

>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

>

>This is an important posting, a reminder to view poll data in a larger

>context of past and future, drawing seriously on history where relevant.

>The long-term impact of unemployment, underemployment, loss of

>homes--not only on adults but on their children as well--does have

>serious implications beyond the immediate popularity of the president,

>the 2010 election, or a fight over a particular issue. There are of

>course a lot of differences between the U.S. at present (including our

>cross-cutting racial and ethnic diversity) and the situation and changes

>in Germany at the time of the rise of Hitler. But it's something we do

>need to think about. hs

>

>Michael Sullivan wrote:

>> Inflation was one of many issues that caused the disaffected masses of German society to elect Herr Hitler. The rest as they say is history. Our economy has been stagnant for almost a decade now and increasing numbers of formerly lower middle class people are having to reset their expectations for the future. Without pretty profound change in the situation they are going to join the ranks of the poor, if they haven't already.

>>

>> I fear that as this comes about these people will be looking for solutions -- solutions offered by all kinds of parties who can provide simple answers to complex questions. It is fairly easy to explain to the poorly educated masses, that the problems in their lives are being created by illegal aliens, African Americans, liberals, Jews, socialists, or Muslims and thereby to attract an ignorant crowd of potential brown shirts to make racket and bully other citizens into submission. American democracy is not healthy right now (maybe never was) and I don't think it would take much to get large crowds into the streets trying to somehow make it better by shouting and burning.

>>

>> As a member of the American aristocracy I am deeply worried about this situation. But maybe I'm overreacting. Perhaps we should just let them eat cake and see how that works out.

>>

>> MS

>>

>>

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

>> From: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com]

>> Sent: Tuesday, March 23, 2010 11:46 AM

>> To: Michael Sullivan

>> Subject: Re: Call me skeptical

>>

>> You mean I can expect to pay \$5 billion for a macchiato at Starbucks?

>>

>> Jan Werner

>> _____

>>

>> Michael Sullivan wrote:

>>> The history of the Weimar Republic is interesting reading in light of the current situation.

>>>

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

>>> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta

>>> Sent: Tuesday, March 23, 2010 9:10 AM

>>> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

>>> Subject: Call me skeptical

>>>
>>> Scary New GOP Poll
>>> John Avlon
>>> Tue Mar 23, 12:58 am ET
>>>
>>> NEW YORK - On the heels of health care, a new Harris poll reveals
>>> Republican attitudes about Obama: Two-thirds think he's a socialist, 57
>>> percent a Muslim-and 24 percent say "he may be the Antichrist."
>>>
>>> SNIP
>>>
>>> These numbers all come from a brand-new Louis Harris poll, inspired in
>>> part by my new book Wingnuts.
>>>
>>> SNIP
>>>
>>> The full results of the poll, which will be released in greater detail
>>> tomorrow, are even more frightening:
>>>
>>> SNIP
>>>
>>> John Avlon's new book Wingnuts: How the Lunatic Fringe is Hijacking
>>> America is available now by Beast Books both on the Web and in
>>> paperback. He is also the author of Independent Nation: How Centrists
>>> Can Change American Politics. Previously, he served as chief
>>> speechwriter for New York City Mayor Rudy Giuliani and was a columnist
>>> and associate editor for The New York Sun.
>>>
>>> --
>>> Leo G. Simonetta
>>> Director of Research
>>> Art& Science Group
>>> 6115 Falls Road, Suite 101
>>> Baltimore, MD 21209
>>>
>>> -----
>>> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
>>> <http://www.aapor.org>
>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>>> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu
>>>
>>> -----
>>> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
>>> <http://www.aapor.org>

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

>>>
>>>
>>

>> -----
>> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
>> <http://www.aapor.org>
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

>>
>>
>

>-----
>Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
><http://www.aapor.org>
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Tue, 23 Mar 2010 14:06:19 -0700
Reply-To: Michael Sullivan <michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Michael Sullivan <michaelsullivan@FSCGROUP.COM>
Subject: Re: Call me skeptical
X-To: Woody Carter <wcarter@UCHICAGO.EDU>,
"AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
In-Reply-To: <20100323155223.CBN76258@m4500-03.uchicago.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Meaning no disrespect, fighting for education to solve the problems I am describing seems like ordering fire extinguishers when the building is on fire.

MS

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Woody Carter
Sent: Tuesday, March 23, 2010 1:52 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: Re: Call me skeptical

When I was in grad school, my roommate's family criticized him for majoring in religious studies. "When the pogroms start, you'll want to be a doctor." They were still planning for the 1930s and the need to emigrate ... to Australia? There is a flavor of that kind of thinking in these comments. Like always fighting the last war, we are always looking for parallels from bad times. I have no doubt "it could happen here" but the "it" will not be what happened before, but some new thing. We will likely not know what it is going to be any more than they knew in the 1920s. But the way to be ready for it is clear: fight for education that teaches people to evaluate rhetoric and warring statistics and draw better conclusions. We are far from that right now, and it is very scary indeed.

----- Original message -----

>Date: Tue, 23 Mar 2010 16:05:39 -0400

>From: howard schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>

>Subject: Re: Call me skeptical

>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

>

>This is an important posting, a reminder to view poll data in a larger

>context of past and future, drawing seriously on history where relevant.

>The long-term impact of unemployment, underemployment, loss of homes--not only on adults but on their children as well--does have

>serious implications beyond the immediate popularity of the president,

>the 2010 election, or a fight over a particular issue. There are of

>course a lot of differences between the U.S. at present (including our

>cross-cutting racial and ethnic diversity) and the situation and changes

>in Germany at the time of the rise of Hitler. But it's something we do

>need to think about. hs

>

>Michael Sullivan wrote:

>> Inflation was one of many issues that caused the disaffected masses of German society to elect Herr Hitler.

The rest as they say is history. Our economy has been stagnant for almost a decade now and increasing numbers of formerly lower middle class people are having to reset their expectations for the future. Without pretty profound change in the situation they are going to join the ranks of the poor, if they haven't already.

>>

>> I fear that as this comes about these people will be looking for solutions -- solutions offered by all kinds of

parties who can provide simple answers to complex questions. It is fairly easy to explain to the poorly educated masses, that the problems in their lives are being created by illegal aliens, African Americans, liberals, Jews, socialists, or Muslims and thereby to attract an ignorant crowd of potential brown shirts to make racket and bully other citizens into submission. American democracy is not healthy right now (maybe never was) and I don't think it would take much to get large crowds into the streets trying to somehow make it better by shouting and burning.

>>> As a member of the American aristocracy I am deeply worried about this situation. But maybe I'm overreacting. Perhaps we should just let them eat cake and see how that works out.

>>> MS

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

>>> From: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com]
>>> Sent: Tuesday, March 23, 2010 11:46 AM
>>> To: Michael Sullivan
>>> Subject: Re: Call me skeptical

>>> You mean I can expect to pay \$5 billion for a macchiato at Starbucks?

>>> Jan Werner

>>> _____
>>> Michael Sullivan wrote:

>>>> The history of the Weimar Republic is interesting reading in light of the current situation.

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

>>>> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta
>>>> Sent: Tuesday, March 23, 2010 9:10 AM
>>>> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
>>>> Subject: Call me skeptical

>>>> Scary New GOP Poll

>>>> John Avlon
>>>> Tue Mar 23, 12:58 am ET

>>>> NEW YORK - On the heels of health care, a new Harris poll reveals

>>>> Republican attitudes about Obama: Two-thirds think he's a socialist, 57

>>>> percent a Muslim-and 24 percent say "he may be the Antichrist."

>>>> SNIP

>>>>

>>> These numbers all come from a brand-new Louis Harris poll,
inspired in
>>> part by my new book Wingnuts.

>>>
>>> SNIP

>>>
>>> The full results of the poll, which will be released in
greater detail
>>> tomorrow, are even more frightening:

>>>
>>> SNIP

>>>
>>> John Avlon's new book Wingnuts: How the Lunatic Fringe is
Hijacking
>>> America is available now by Beast Books both on the Web and in
>>> paperback. He is also the author of Independent Nation:
How Centrists
>>> Can Change American Politics. Previously, he served as chief
>>> speechwriter for New York City Mayor Rudy Giuliani and was
a columnist
>>> and associate editor for The New York Sun.

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

>>>
>>> -----
>>> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
>>> <http://www.aapor.org>
>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>>> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

>>>
>>> -----
>>> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
>>> <http://www.aapor.org>
>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>>> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

>>>
>>>
>>
>> -----
>> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
>> <http://www.aapor.org>
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

>>
>>
>

>-----
>Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
><http://www.aapor.org>
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Tue, 23 Mar 2010 16:32:02 -0500
Reply-To: "Reifman, Alan" <Alan.Reifman@TTU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Reifman, Alan" <Alan.Reifman@TTU.EDU>
Subject: health care polling blog goes into semi-retirement
X-To: "AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
In-Reply-To:
<3248A9B21DD5574785FE5E2C8E521684F9FA95@exchange.local.artscience.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

As some of you know, I have maintained a blog from August 2009 to the present, in which I attempted to document and analyze polls pertaining to health care reform that came out during that time. With today's signing of the main piece of the legislation, I have put the blog into semi-retirement. All the postings I did (with occasional reader comments) over the past eight months serve as one observer's historical record of the polling pertaining to this high-profile issue. I invite everyone to visit by clicking on:

<http://healthcarepolls.blogspot.com/>

Alan Reifman, Ph.D., Professor
Human Development & Family Studies
Texas Tech University

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>

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

Date: Tue, 23 Mar 2010 14:36:38 -0700
Reply-To: Paul Gurwitz <pgurwitz@RENAISS.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Paul Gurwitz <pgurwitz@RENAISS.COM>
Subject: Re: Call me skeptical
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

"It" might be something we'd never thought of, but I doubt that it would =
be
totally unrelated to what happened in Depression-era Europe (and what ver=
y
well could have happened here, absent the New Deal!). IMHO, the problem =
is
the opposite one -- a tendency to think that everything happens for the
first time, and therefore to habitually repeat the mistakes of history.=20=

Where's George Santayana when we need him?

Paul Gurwitz

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Tue, 23 Mar 2010 18:19:27 -0400
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing
Subject: Opinions turn favorable on health care plan???
X-To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

A USA Today/Gallup poll to appear in tomorrow's edition of the paper
shows a substantial plurality supporting the health care reform bill
that passed this weekend. Advance information available today at:

http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2010-03-23-health-poll-favorable_N.htm

or: <http://tinyurl.com/y8bh6tj>

From today's article:

.....

By 49%-40% those surveyed say it was "a good thing" rather than a bad one that Congress passed the bill. Half describe their reaction in positive terms, as "enthusiastic" or "pleased," while about four in 10 describe it in negative ways, as "disappointed" or "angry."

The largest single group, 48%, calls the bill "a good first step" that should be followed by more action on health care. An additional 4% also have a favorable view, saying the bill makes the most important changes needed in the nation's health care system.

...

No one gets overwhelmingly positive ratings on the issue, but Obama fares the best: 46% say his work has been excellent or good; 31% call it poor. Congressional Democrats get an even split: 32% call their efforts good or excellent; 33% poor.

The standing of congressional Republicans is more negative. While 26% rate their work on health care as good or excellent, a larger group, 34%, say it has been poor.

.....

I find it hard to believe that opinions change instantly like this.

So, if these results are confirmed by other polls conducted since the passage of HCR, it raises the question of just what exactly people were responding to in all those polls conducted before the bill's enactment.

If anything, it indicates yet again that simple favorable/unfavorable polling does not necessarily measure what pollsters think it does.

Jan Werner

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====

Date: Wed, 24 Mar 2010 09:59:24 -0400
Reply-To: Joe Lenski <jlenski@EDISONRESEARCH.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Joe Lenski <jlenski@EDISONRESEARCH.COM>
Subject: Web Survey Design Short Course with Mick Couper - offered by
NYAAPOR on Thursday, April 22, 2010
X-To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Web Survey Design Short Course with Mick Couper - offered by NYAAPOR on Thursday, April 22, 2010

New York Chapter - American Association for Public Opinion Research=20

Web Survey Design Short Course With Mick Couper=20

Thursday, April 22, 2010 - 9 am to 5 pm=20

The New York Times, 620 Eighth Avenue (40th and 41st Streets)=20

15th Floor=20

The Program=20

This one-day workshop focuses on the effective design of web surveys to maximize data quality. The workshop will cover various aspects of instrument design for Web surveys, including the appropriate use of widgets (e.g., radio buttons, check boxes, drop boxes), general formatting and layout issues (e.g., alignment, font, color), movement through the instrument (e.g., action buttons, navigation, error messages), and so on. The workshop will draw on empirical results from experiments on alternative design approaches as well as practical experience in the design and implementation of Web surveys. The workshop will not address the technical aspects of Web survey implementation (such as hardware, software or programming), and will also not focus on question wording, sampling or recruitment issues. The workshop will have a practical emphasis, examining many different examples of good and bad design. Participants are encouraged to bring their own Web survey designs and instruments for discussion.=20

The Instructor=20

Mick P. Couper is a Research Professor in the Survey Research Center at the Institute for Social Research and in the Joint Program in Survey Methodology at the University of Maryland. He has authored, co-authored or edited several books on survey methodology, including Nonresponse in Household Interview Surveys (1998), Computer Assisted Survey Information Collection (1998), Survey Methodology (2nd edition, 2009), and Designing Effective Web Surveys (2009). His research interests focus on aspects of technology use in surveys, whether by interviewers or respondents. He has conducted extensive research on Web survey design over the past 10 years.=20

Registration=20

\$100 for members=20

\$150 for non-members=20

\$75 for students.=20

A copy of Couper's book on the topic, Designing Effective Web Surveys, can be added to your registration for an additional \$65.=20

Morning and afternoon coffee breaks are included. You may bring your own lunch, or purchase it at The Times cafeteria or local restaurant.=20

Sorry, no refunds - but you can send someone in your place!=20

Walk-in registration is \$10 extra if space is available.=20

Please send a check (payable to NYAAPOR) to:=20
Rosemarie Sharpe, NYAAPOR Secretariat=20
152 Madison Avenue - Suite 801, NY, NY 10016=20
You may also register at (212) 684-0542, info@nyaapor.org or
http://www.nyaapor.org
<http://www.linkedin.com/redirect?url=3Dhttp%3A%2F%2Fwww%2Enyaapor%2Eorg&=
u
rlhash=3DRa8C> =20

*****=20
Visit our website, www.nyaapor.org to learn about upcoming events.=20

=20

-----=20

Joe Lenski

Executive Vice President

edison research

Tel: 908.707.4707 / Fax: 908.707.4740=20

www.edisonresearch.com

=20

Check out our newly redesigned web site @ www.edisonresearch.com
<http://www.edisonresearch.com/>=20

=20

Preliminary conference program available: http://bit.ly/9kGhO7

http://www.aapor.org

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Date: Wed, 24 Mar 2010 13:10:28 -0400

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

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>

Subject: More on that Wingnuts poll

X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Harris's press release

<http://news.harrisinteractive.com/profiles/investor/ResLibraryView.asp?BzID=1963&ResLibraryID=37050&Category=1777>
or
<http://tinyurl.com/yoacqx>

Gary Langer's take on the survey

<http://blogs.abcnews.com/thenumbers/2010/03/polling-on-presidential-pejo-ratives-.html>
or
<http://tinyurl.com/y93c22u>

Michael Scherer from Time

<http://swampland.blogs.time.com/2010/03/23/the-challenge-of-measuring-the-right-wing-fringe/>
or
<http://tinyurl.com/yem22qo>

--

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

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Wed, 24 Mar 2010 20:36:49 -0400
Reply-To: howard schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: howard schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>
Subject: p.s. on Milgram
X-To: aapor <aapornet@asu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

One string was left untied in the aapornet discussion of Milgram's research on obedience: the message below from Joseph Graf recommending an article with a "skeptical view of the generalizability of Milgram's findings." I was not able to locate the Granta article in libraries I use, but a friend in AAPOR has now sent me a copy of the article.

It seemed to me a well-written piece, providing a brief summary of Milgram's research and a review of the various criticisms, both ethical and scientific, leveled at it by others. However, I did not see anything in the article that has not been available elsewhere for many years. Furthermore, the article ends with Lee Ross's classic 1977 statement of the "fundamental attribution error"--the human propensity to overestimate the importance personal dispositional factors relative to situational influences, an interpretation quite compatible with Milgram's own views and those of many other social psychologists.

For those who do survey research, Ross's statement also applies to the tendency to take single variable distributions (the marginals) too literally, forgetting the extent to which responses are shaped by the questions we frame and by the setting and other aspects of the question-answer process. hs

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

Subject: Re: Re Milgram and Burger
Date: Thu, 18 Mar 2010 14:48:04 -0400
From: Joseph Graf <jgraf2002@YAHOO.COM>
Reply-To: Joseph Graf <jgraf2002@YAHOO.COM>
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
References: <4BA2511A.3040507@csuohio.edu>
<28CCEB02B0B64D4091ED6FD17DF571691837C48BBE@EX-BE-024-SV1.shared.themessagecenter.com>

A skeptical view of the generalizability of Milgram's findings is found in this excellent article on the subject. It is well worth assigning in a research methods class.

"Obedience," by Ian Parker, *Granta*, vol. 71, autumn 2000. pp. 99-125

Joseph Graf
Assistant Professor
American University
School of Communication
graf@american.edu, (202) 885-2147

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Date: Thu, 25 Mar 2010 16:29:45 -0400

Reply-To: "Wolf, Jim" <jamwolf@IUPUI.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Wolf, Jim" <jamwolf@IUPUI.EDU>

Subject: Word Clouds

X-To: "AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Having trouble deciding how best to process your most recent batch of open = ended responses?

Want to send the client something to buy yourself a little more time?

Cut and paste the text responses from one of the questions into this handy = little gizmo and be amazed!

<http://www.wordle.net/>

Of course, this has absolutely no scientific value of which I'm aware, but = it is truly a beautiful gift to those of us who crunch data! I expect we'l= l be seeing a lot of word clouds in PowerPoints from this point on.

(Many thanks to Jonathan Feinberg for putting this together, and to IBM Res= earch for allowing him to write the code on their dime.)

Jim

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

Jim Wolf jamwolf@iupui.edu<<mailto:jamwolf@iupui.edu>>

Director, Survey Research Center at IUPUI

Clinical Associate Professor of Sociology

Indiana University School of Liberal Arts

425 University Blvd - Cavanaugh 133

Indianapolis, IN 46202

Voice: (317) 278-9230 Fax: (317) 278-2383

<http://src.iupui.edu>

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

<http://www.aapor.org>

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Fri, 26 Mar 2010 07:29:30 -0400
Reply-To: "David B. Nolle" <dbnolle@FRONTIERNET.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "David B. Nolle" <dbnolle@FRONTIERNET.NET>
Subject: AAPOR's Chart on MOSE
X-To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; format=flowed; charset="iso-8859-1";
reply-type=original
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

In the course of my preparation for a recent presentation on measuring the margin of sampling error (MOSE) in complex survey designs, I took the opportunity to check the AAPOR website on its approach to MOSE. I expected that any explanations would be simple but accurate and that any illustrations would be carefully crafted. For the most part, I was pleased with AAPOR's presentation but was concerned about the way that the primary chart relating MOSE to sample size is handled (see http://www.aapor.org/Margin_of_Sampling_Error.htm).

I think that the chart clearly demonstrates that sample size has a powerful influence on MOSE. In addition, the chart implicitly suggests that MOSE is typically more dependent on sample size than on the fraction of the population sampled.

However, the number for each MOSE in the chart is more indicative of a MOSE generated by a simple random sample from a list (or by an RDD telephone survey in which the effects of the clustering of telephone banks and any weighting for non-response are ignored or perhaps counterbalanced by stratification) rather than a MOSE created by a typical complex sampling design. Consequently, the number for a given MOSE at a given sample size (e.g. +/- 3% for 1,000 interviews in this chart) is (very) misleading for most surveys that involve a complex design such as an area probability sample leading to face-to-face interviews with randomly selected respondents from randomly selected households. Moreover, the text associated with the chart fails to mention that the chart does not reflect the MOSE of typical complex sampling designs used in many surveys.

In other words, I fear that AAPOR's chart reinforces the myth that public opinion surveys are typically based on simple random samples which have no design effects engendered by weighting or clustering. (We seem to have returned to an era that predates Hansen, Hurwitz, and Madow, Kish, Lohr, and a host of other survey samplers.)

I am particularly sensitive to the foregoing issue because the public opinion research with which I work is global in scope and is typically based on random probability samples derived from multi-stage (cluster) sample designs which usually require some form of weighting. Thus, I encounter design effects (measured by DEFT's) which are larger than 1.0 and might be in the range of 1.5 to 2.0. Consequently, for a sample size of approximately 1,000, I might have a MOSE of +/- 4.5% rather +/-3.0% because it is not

IG11c3QgYmUgcmVjZWl2ZWQgYnkgTWF5IDEsIDIwMTAuIFVwIHRvDQp0aHJlZSBjYXNoIHByaXpl
cyB3aWxsIGJlIGF3YXJkZWQsIHdpdGggdGhlIHdpbm5lcnMgYmVpbmcgY2hvc2VuIGJ5IE1heSAx
NSwNCjIwMTAuIFRoZSBmaXJzdCBwcm16ZSB3aWxsIGJlIGF3YXJkZWQsIHdpdGggdGhlIHdpbm5lcnMgYmVpbmcgY2hvc2VuIGJ5IE1heSAx
ICQxNTAwLCBhbmQgdGhlIHRoaXJkDQokNTAwLiBjdBpY2lYXRlZCB0aGF0IHRoZSBwcm16ZSB3aWxsIGJlIGF3YXJkZWQgYmllbm5pYWxsS4gRW50cmllcw0KY29uc2lzdCBvZiAxKSBh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Vu
dOKAmXMgYWR2aXNvciBvciBvdGhlciBvZmZpY2lhbA0KZnJvbSB0aGUgc3RlZGVuZGVudOKAmXMg
IGRlcGFydG1lbnQgYXR0ZXN0aW5nIHRvIGhpcy9oZXIgc3RlZGVudCBzdGF0dXMuICBGB3INCmZl
bGwgaW5mb3JtYXRpb24gYW5kIHRvIHN1Ym1pdCBtYXRlcmlhbCBmb3IgdGhlIGNvbRnRlc3QsIHBs
ZWZzZSBnbyB0bW0KaHR0cDovL3JhY2h1bHRhbnVybWVtb3JpYWxwcm16ZS5jb20uDQoNCihTZWUg
YXR0YWN0ZWQgZmlsZTogYW5ub3VuY2VtZW50IDIwMTAuZG9jKQ==

Date: Fri, 26 Mar 2010 07:52:13 -0400
Reply-To: scheuren@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Fritz Scheuren <scheuren@AOL.COM>
Subject: Re: AAPOR's Chart on MOSE
X-To: dbnolle@FRONTIERNET.NET, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <FA600FFA190242208EF0BC33B8D4FACE@DCTZN8B1>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

I agree. I definitely feel a chart that took, say, a design effect into =
account to deal with adjustments for nonresponse, clustering, and stratif=
ication would be better. The chart could remain as is but be put in terms=
of "effective sample size," where effective sample size had been adjusted=
for the complexities of survey operations.

Bless all, Fritz

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

From: David B. Nolle <dbnolle@FRONTIERNET.NET>
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Sent: Fri, Mar 26, 2010 7:29 am
Subject: AAPOR's Chart on MOSE

In the course of my preparation for a recent presentation on measuring the=
=20
margin of sampling error (MOSE) in complex survey designs, I took the=20
opportunity to check the AAPOR website on its approach to MOSE. I expected=

=20
that any explanations would be simple but accurate and that any=20
illustrations would be carefully crafted. For the most part, I was pleased=
=20
with AAPOR's presentation but was concerned about the way that the primary=
=20
chart relating MOSE to sample size is handled (see=20
http://www.aapor.org/Margin_of_Sampling_Error.htm).=20
=20
I think that the chart clearly demonstrates that sample size has a powerfu=
l=20
influence on MOSE. In addition, the chart implicitly suggests that MOSE is=
=20
typically more dependent on sample size than on the fraction of the=20
population sampled.=20
=20
However, the number for each MOSE in the chart is more indicative of a MOS=
E=20
generated by a simple random sample from a list (or by an RDD telephone=20
survey in which the effects of the clustering of telephone banks and any=
=20
weighting for non-response are ignored or perhaps counterbalanced by=20
stratification) rather than a MOSE created by a typical complex sampling=
=20
design. Consequently, the number for a given MOSE at a given sample size=
=20
(e.g. +/- 3% for 1,000 interviews in this chart) is (very) misleading for=
=20
most surveys that involve a complex design such as an area probability=20
sample leading to face-to-face interviews with randomly selected responden=
ts=20
from randomly selected households. Moreover, the text associated with the=
=20
chart fails to mention that the chart does not reflect the MOSE of typical=
=20
complex sampling designs used in many surveys.=20
=20
In other words, I fear that AAPOR's chart reinforces the myth that public=
=20
opinion surveys are typically based on simple random samples which have no=
=20
design effects engendered by weighting or clustering. (We seem to have=20
returned to an era that predates Hansen, Hurwitz, and Madow, Kish, Lohr,=
and=20
a host of other survey samplers.)=20
=20
I am particularly sensitive to the foregoing issue because the public=20
opinion research with which I work is global in scope and is typically bas=
ed=20
on random probability samples derived from multi-stage (cluster) sample=20
designs which usually require some form of weighting. Thus, I encounter=20
design effects (measured by DEFT's) which are larger than 1.0 and might be=
=20
in the range of 1.5 to 2.0. Consequently, for a sample size of approximate=

ly=20
1,000, I might have a MOSE of +/- 4.5% rather +/-3.0% because it is not=20
possible to use simple random sampling techniques to select individual=20
respondents from a national list of adults in most countries and RDD=20
telephone surveys are not an appropriate data collection mode in some=20
countries.=20
=20
To avoid the perpetuation of this myth symbolized by this chart (which is=
=20
seen by survey researchers and general publics around the world), I think=
=20
that AAPOR needs to add a note beneath its chart to indicate that the char=
t=20
ignores the effects of complex sampling designs which typically increase=
the=20
MOSE, depending on the types of random selection procedures required to=20
reach the selected respondents and depending on the weighting that might=
be=20
required to address unequal probabilities of selection as well as matters=
of=20
coverage and non-response.=20
=20
I welcome your opinions on this matter.=20
=20
David=20
=20

-----=20
Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>=20
<http://www.aapor.org>=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.e](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)=
[du](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)=20

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Fri, 26 Mar 2010 13:11:32 -0000
Reply-To: "Spagat, M" <M.Spagat@RHUL.AC.UK>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Spagat, M" <M.Spagat@RHUL.AC.UK>
Subject: Re: AAPOR's Chart on MOSE
X-To: scheuren@AOL.COM, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: A<8CC9AF1E897279A-2998-FC2E@webmail-d101.sysops.aol.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I think that this discussion is closely related to the disclosure issue.

AAPOR is taking a position that people doing surveys should disclose their sample designs. Many people might wonder why this is necessary if sample size maps as neatly into MOSE as the picture in question suggests. Why isn't AAPOR satisfied just to see sample size or MOSE, which is apparently equivalent?

Of course, there is the non-MOSE-related answer that the sampling scheme could be biased. But the other answer is that there isn't such a simple relationship between sample size and MOSE as is suggested by the picture on the AAPOR web site.

The basic point is that if AAPOR wants to make a convincing case that sample designs should be disclosed then it should also make a clear case on why sample design is important.

Mike Spagat

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

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Fritz Scheuren
Sent: 26 March 2010 11:52
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: AAPOR's Chart on MOSE

I agree. I definitely feel a chart that took, say, a design effect into account to deal with adjustments for nonresponse, clustering, and stratification would be better. The chart could remain as is but be put in terms of "effective sample size," where effective sample size had been adjusted for the complexities of survey operations.

Bless all, Fritz

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

From: David B. Nolle <dbnolle@FRONTIERNET.NET>
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Sent: Fri, Mar 26, 2010 7:29 am
Subject: AAPOR's Chart on MOSE

In the course of my preparation for a recent presentation on measuring the margin of sampling error (MOSE) in complex survey designs, I took the opportunity to check the AAPOR website on its approach to MOSE. I expected that any explanations would be simple but accurate and that any illustrations would be carefully crafted. For the most part, I was pleased with AAPOR's presentation but was concerned about the way that the primary chart relating MOSE to sample size is handled (see http://www.aapor.org/Margin_of_Sampling_Error.htm).

I think that the chart clearly demonstrates that sample size has a powerful influence on MOSE. In addition, the chart implicitly suggests that MOSE is typically more dependent on sample size than on the fraction of the population sampled.

However, the number for each MOSE in the chart is more indicative of a MOSE generated by a simple random sample from a list (or by an RDD telephone survey in which the effects of the clustering of telephone banks and any weighting for non-response are ignored or perhaps counterbalanced by stratification) rather than a MOSE created by a typical complex sampling design. Consequently, the number for a given MOSE at a given sample size (e.g. +/- 3% for 1,000 interviews in this chart) is (very) misleading for most surveys that involve a complex design such as an area probability sample leading to face-to-face interviews with randomly selected respondents from randomly selected households. Moreover, the text associated with the chart fails to mention that the chart does not reflect the MOSE of typical complex sampling designs used in many surveys.

In other words, I fear that AAPOR's chart reinforces the myth that public opinion surveys are typically based on simple random samples which have no design effects engendered by weighting or clustering. (We seem to have returned to an era that predates Hansen, Hurwitz, and Madow, Kish, Lohr, and a host of other survey samplers.)

I am particularly sensitive to the foregoing issue because the public opinion research with which I work is global in scope and is typically

based
on random probability samples derived from multi-stage (cluster) sample designs which usually require some form of weighting. Thus, I encounter design effects (measured by DEFT's) which are larger than 1.0 and might be
in the range of 1.5 to 2.0. Consequently, for a sample size of approximately
1,000, I might have a MOSE of +/- 4.5% rather +/-3.0% because it is not possible to use simple random sampling techniques to select individual respondents from a national list of adults in most countries and RDD telephone surveys are not an appropriate data collection mode in some countries.

To avoid the perpetuation of this myth symbolized by this chart (which is
seen by survey researchers and general publics around the world), I think
that AAPOR needs to add a note beneath its chart to indicate that the chart
ignores the effects of complex sampling designs which typically increase the
MOSE, depending on the types of random selection procedures required to reach the selected respondents and depending on the weighting that might be
required to address unequal probabilities of selection as well as matters of
coverage and non-response.

I welcome your opinions on this matter.

David

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET. Unsubscribe?-don't
reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Fri, 26 Mar 2010 08:54:25 -0500
Reply-To: Martha Van Haitsma <mvh@UCHICAGO.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Martha Van Haitsma <mvh@UCHICAGO.EDU>
Subject: Fewer minutes vs More Incentive Dollars
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <LISTSERV%200910160603440120.295F@LISTS.ASU.EDU>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I seem to recall a presentation at MAPOR - 2008 I think - in which a side comment to a presentation about something else was that a shorter survey brought a bigger bump to response rate than a more costly incentive payment. However, in reviewing the program I am unable to identify which presenter it might have been.

Does anyone out there know of any research on the relative effectiveness of fewer minutes vs more dollars on response rates?

Does anyone have any anecdotal evidence about this?

I appreciate all input.

Thanks,

Martha

Martha Van Haitsma, Director
University of Chicago Survey Lab
6030 S. Ellis Avenue
Chicago IL 60637

email: mvh@uchicago.edu
FAX: 773 - 834-7412
Phone: 773 - 834-3674
Survey Lab toll free line: 866 - 523-4435

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Fri, 26 Mar 2010 10:42:10 -0400
Reply-To: Ward R Kay <wkay1@GMU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Ward R Kay <wkay1@GMU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Word Clouds
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <62661625119C1E4F8F5329FD4A6EBDB245CE3A7AB5@iu-mssg-mbx01.ads.iu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Content-disposition: inline

For those who did see what FiveThirtyEight.com did with word clouds on the Health Care debate, you can click on the link below

<http://bit.ly/a067Ru>

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

From: "Wolf, Jim" <jamwolf@IUPUI.EDU>
Date: Thursday, March 25, 2010 4:29 pm
Subject: Word Clouds

> Having trouble deciding how best to process your most recent batch
> of open ended responses?

>
> Want to send the client something to buy yourself a little more time?

>
> Cut and paste the text responses from one of the questions into
> this handy little gizmo and be amazed!

>
> <http://www.wordle.net/>

>
> Of course, this has absolutely no scientific value of which I'm
> aware, but it is truly a beautiful gift to those of us who crunch
> data! I expect we'll be seeing a lot of word clouds in
> PowerPoints from this point on.

>
> (Many thanks to Jonathan Feinberg for putting this together, and
> to IBM Research for allowing him to write the code on their dime.)

>
> Jim

>
> =====
> Jim Wolf jamwolf@iupui.edu<mailto:jamwolf@iupui.edu>

> Director, Survey Research Center at IUPUI
> Clinical Associate Professor of Sociology
> Indiana University School of Liberal Arts
> 425 University Blvd - Cavanaugh 133
> Indianapolis, IN 46202
> Voice: (317) 278-9230 Fax: (317) 278-2383
> <http://src.iupui.edu>

>
>
> -----
> Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>

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

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Fri, 26 Mar 2010 17:13:36 -0400
Reply-To: Michael P McDonald <mmcdon@GMU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Michael P McDonald <mmcdon@GMU.EDU>
Subject: Realtime Census Bureau form returns
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Content-disposition: inline

The Census Bureau has created this very cool tool that maps census form returns at the lowest level of the census tract. Check out how your neighborhood is doing here:

<http://2010.census.gov/2010census/take10map/>

Michael P. McDonald
Associate Professor
George Mason University
<http://elections.gmu.edu>

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Sun, 28 Mar 2010 18:38:43 -0400
Reply-To: Joe Lenski <jlenski@EDISONRESEARCH.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Joe Lenski <jlenski@EDISONRESEARCH.COM>
Subject: NYAAPOR Event: "Measuring Cell Phone Use in the National Health Interview Survey" with Stephen Blumberg on April 13th
X-To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

=20

New York Chapter - American Association for Public Opinion Research

=20

=20

=20

Measuring Cell Phone Use in the National Health Interview Survey=20

=20

=20

Tuesday, April 13, 2010 at 6 pm

The New York Times, 620 Eighth Avenue (40th and 41st Streets)

=20

Stephen J. Blumberg of the National Center for Health Statistics will present findings from NCHS studies on the characteristics of cell phone users and how the growing prevalence of cell-phone only users may be affecting telephone survey sampling accuracy. Methods for addressing concerns about sample bias will be discussed.=20

=20

This program is jointly sponsored by NYAAPOR and the Mailman School of Public Health at Columbia University.

=20

=20

This event is Free to NYAAPOR members and student members

Non-members - \$20.00

=20

You MUST RSVP to NYAAPOR so we can get a list of names to New York Times security.

=20

PLEASE RSVP TO: info@nyaapor.org or you can call (212) 684-0542

=20

Visit our website, info@nyaapor.org to learn about upcoming events.

=20

Prefer we reach you at another e-mail address? Click,
<<mailto:info@nyaapor.org>> info@nyaapor.org,=20

to request a change in your e-mail address.

=20

Voting, Early Registration deadlines approaching: <http://www.aapor.org/>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Mon, 29 Mar 2010 10:10:07 +0200
Reply-To: peter.mohler@uni-mannheim.de
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Peter Mohler <peter.mohler@UNI-MANNHEIM.DE>
Organization: =?ISO-8859-1?Q?Universit=E4t_Mannheim_?=
Subject: Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann deceased
X-To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Dear AAPOR members,

last Thursday Elisabeth Noell deceased in Allensbach at Lake Constance, Germany, at the age of 93.

Public opinion research and survey methodology lost a great and strong mind.

She was among the first introducing survey research to post WWII Germany. Right after the war she founded the Allensbach Institute. She was also a professor for public opinion research at the University of Mainz.

Among her many achievements I would like to name but a few:

Her "spiral of silent" is up to date a very influential contribution to public opinion research.

Her institute is noted for its precise prediction of federal election outcomes

(they were the only institute predicting Chancellor Kohl's defeat).

Together with T. Peterson she published one of the few hands on textbooks on survey methods in German.

She implemented experiments in almost any standard/commercial survey.

Data from such surveys helped N. Schwarz & HJ Hippler (then at ZUMA, Mannheim)

a great deal in their research on cognitive judgment. In fact it was their publication together with Elisabeth Noelle, were for the first time large scale survey data have been used for cognitive judgment research.

We will miss her.

Peter Mohler
Mannheim University

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

Date: Mon, 29 Mar 2010 10:31:16 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Declare 'Confederate Southern American' on Census forms,
group says
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Declare 'Confederate Southern American' on Census forms, group says
<http://www.ajc.com/news/declare-confederate-southern-american-405738.htm>

1
or
<http://tinyurl.com/y9xtv5s>

By Rhonda Cook

The Atlanta Journal-Constitution

1:04 p.m. Friday, March 26, 2010

The Southern Legal Resource Center is calling on self-proclaimed "Confederates" to declare their heritage when they are counted in the 2010 Census.

The organization is urging Southerners to declare their "heritage and culture" by classifying themselves as "Confederate Southern Americans" on the line on the form, question No. 9, that asks for race. Check "other" and write "Confed Southern Am" on the line beside it, the group says on its Facebook page and on two YouTube videos.

"A significant number of Southerners identifying themselves as Confederate Southern Americans on the Census form could finally spell

the beginning of the end for the discrimination that has been running rampant, especially for the last 20 years or so, against all things Confederate, and for that matter against Southern heritage and identity in general," SLRC executive director Roger McCredie said in a written statement.

SNIP

<http://www.ajc.com/news/declare-confederate-southern-american-405738.htm>

1

Print this page Close .

--

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

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

=====
Date: Mon, 29 Mar 2010 14:39:18 -0500
Reply-To: Peter Miller <p-miller@NORTHWESTERN.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Peter Miller <p-miller@NORTHWESTERN.EDU>
Subject: AAPOR/ASA Webinar -- Register this week
X-To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=windows-1252
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Fellow AAPOR Members --

The deadline to register for the next AAPOR/ASA webinar is this Friday, April 2. AAPOR members can sign up for the same rate as ASA members. The registration (\$75) is based on the computer connection, so as many people as can view the feed at your site are welcome to attend for the flat fee. Sign up for your class or for a group of colleagues.

Webinar Description:

=93Human Resources in Science and Technology: Surveys, Data, and Indicators

from the National Science Foundation=94 will be presented by Nirmala Kannankutty on Tuesday, April 6, 2010, 1:00 PM - 3:00 PM Eastern time.

The Division of Science Resources Statistics (SRS) is a federal statistical agency housed at the National Science Foundation (NSF). SRS's role within NSF is to "provide a central clearinghouse for the collection, interpretation, and analysis of data on scientific and engineering resources, and to provide a source of information for policy formulation by other agencies of the Federal Government..." Within this mandate SRS is involved in collecting and disseminating information on R&D expenditures and activities and on human capital issues. The United States is unique among major industrialized nations in that it has directly invested in collecting detailed data from a variety of sources on the entire science and engineering pipeline. Each of the data sources came about from U.S. federal administrative needs. The sources have evolved into important elements for the study of higher education and the scientific workforce. In this webinar, these surveys and data sources are described. Key indicators regarding trends in U.S. science and engineering degree production, enrollments, and workforce are defined and described. The =93Science and Engineering Indicators: 2010 and =93Women, Minorities and Persons with Disabilities in Science and Engineering=94 reports will be used as examples for these indicators. At the end of the webinar participants should be aware of data sources and how data are collected, indicators and reports from the NSF, and where to find more information from the NSF.

To register, please visit the SRMS web site at:
<http://www.amstat.org/sections/SRMS/webinar.cfm>

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Rick Peterson at ASA: rick@amstat.org

Peter Miller

President

American Association for Public Opinion Research

p-miller@northwestern.edu

<<http://www.amstat.org/sections/SRMS/webinar.cfm>>

<<http://www.amstat.org/sections/SRMS/webinar.cfm>>

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

Date: Tue, 30 Mar 2010 10:10:20 -0400
Reply-To: "Kropf, Martha" <mekropf@UNCC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Kropf, Martha" <mekropf@UNCC.EDU>
Subject: Re: 2010 Census -- Myths and Misconceptions
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: A<OFF72370BB.ED5C23D6-ON852576EB.005AAC95-852576EB.005B86B9@census.gov>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

AAPOR Colleagues:
Just wondering--why isn't there the option to go on-line and enter your
Census data?

Is it a security thing or worry that the Census won't get the proper
geographic information connected to the data?

Thanks!

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Jeffrey C. Moore
Sent: Friday, March 19, 2010 12:40 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: 2010 Census -- Myths and Misconceptions

The following arrived in my in-box this morning -- nicely timed, given
the
recent AAPORnet postings. It's a stretch to think of AAPORnet as my
"stakeholders and constituents," but I almost always try to do as I'm
told.

-- Jeff Moore --

From the Desk of Steve Jost, Associate Director, Communications...

The 2010 Census is now in full gear. As with any operation this large,
there is bound to be misleading information circulated about nature and
goals of the endeavor. Your office or your constituents may be

receiving
emails or inquiries about misconceptions on the Census.

The independent website Factcheck.org , has today posted a point by point rebuttal of this video. I draw your attention to it as it represents an independent defense of the Census Bureau and a comprehensive explanation of the 2010 Census, and its relationship with the other surveys conducted by the Census Bureau. This post is helpful in debunking many of the myths about the Census currently making the rounds, and I urge you to share it with your stakeholders and constituents.

<http://factcheck.org/2010/03/census-nonsense/>

You may also find the blog of Census Director Robert Groves on our website useful to answer other questions. You can find it on our homepage at www.2010census.gov.

Additionally, you may be hearing questions about the constitutional origins of the census or where in law the census questionnaire is authorized. For more information on these questions, we have created a page on our website here:

<http://2010.census.gov/2010census/why/constitutional.php>

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Date: Tue, 30 Mar 2010 10:26:17 -0400
Reply-To: James Bason <jbason@UGA.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: James Bason <jbason@UGA.EDU>
Subject: Question
X-To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Dear AAPORites,

I have a graduate student who is doing a survey in which he is asking respondents to tally up 12 different tasks into percentage of time, and the final tally has to equal 100%. Having done some items like this before, I know how difficult a task this is for respondents.

Does anyone know of literature on how respondents accomplish such tasks? You can respond privately and I'll re-post responses to the list.

Thanks in advance for your help.

Sincerely,

Jim Bason

Director and Associate Research Scientist

Survey Research Center

University of Georgia

Athens, GA 30602

706-542-9082

706-425-3029 Fax

jbason@uga.edu

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

Date: Tue, 30 Mar 2010 10:46:29 -0400
Reply-To: Yasamin Miller <yd17@CORNELL.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Yasamin Miller <yd17@CORNELL.EDU>
Subject: Programmer positions at Cornell
X-To: "AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Cornell's Survey Research Institute has two positions open currently. Please see below.

Provide high-level applications development, emphasis on CATI (Computer-Assisted Telephone Interview) System, WEB programming, and development and maintenance for all databases for the Survey Research Institute. Assist with a wide range of web and proprietary application development. Program web surveys in ColdFusion and/or other web survey instruments in support of SRI data collection. Develop Teleform scannable surveys. Document and create reports and codebooks, and provide data cleaning support. Applicant should have advanced knowledge of database architecture and management in daily support of operational systems, including a strong knowledge of writing SQL queries. Provide project management experience and support all existing SRI instruments. Support SRI's web site.

Bachelors in the fields of information science, computer information systems, instructional design, or related field, with 1-2 years experience with database and Web applications development and other database content development or equivalent combination. 1 year experience with database design, human-computer interaction/design, and technical/instructional writing.

- * Excellent organizational skills. Ability to multi-task and work on tight deadlines a must.
- * Demonstrated database technology skills, multimedia design and production, and network technology.
- * Knowledge of DOS. Knowledge of, and experience with: Web tools and programming languages such as ColdFusion, Java, JavaScript, HTML, CGI, C/C++, PHP, Visual Basic and Access.
- * Experience with Microsoft SQL Server or similar backend databases and coding SQL to create dynamic and individualized Web Data collection and information delivery.
- * Knowledge of Windows Server 2003 networks.

Preferred:

- * Survey research background and/or experience a plus.

No relocation assistance is provided for this position.

To apply:

Go to <http://www.hr.cornell.edu/jobs/positions.html>

Regular ongoing position: Requisition 12371

One year term position: Requisition 12185

Cornell University, located in Ithaca, New York, is an inclusive, dynamic, and innovative Ivy League university and New York's land-grant institution. Its staff, faculty, and students impart an uncommon sense of larger purpose and contribute creative ideas and best practices to further the university's mission of teaching, research, and outreach.

Cornell University is an equal opportunity, affirmative action educator and employer.

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

=====
Date: Tue, 30 Mar 2010 11:19:38 -0400
Reply-To: "J. Ann Selzer" <jannselzer@AOL.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "J. Ann Selzer" <jannselzer@AOL.COM>
Subject: Tea Party or tea party?
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

I'm noting a mix of capitalization strategies when referring to this group. Initially, it seems it was always capitalized. Now I see more incidents of lower case. Any thoughts on the rationale? JAS

=20

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D
Selzer & Company
Des Moines, Iowa 50309

For purposes of this list, use JAnnSelzer@aol.com

For other purposes, use JASelzer@SelzerCo.com

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

Date: Tue, 30 Mar 2010 16:06:25 +0000
Reply-To: "nickp@marketsharescorp.com" <mkshares@COMCAST.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "nickp@marketsharescorp.com" <mkshares@COMCAST.NET>
Subject: Re: Tea Party or tea party?
X-To: "J. Ann Selzer" <jannselzer@AOL.COM>
X-cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To:
<1974584639.7418971269965087494.JavaMail.root@sz0107a.emeryville.ca.mail.comcast.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=utf-8
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I googled "tea party" on Google News.

The style seems to be mixed with "Tea Party" outnumbering "tea party" by about 3:1.

Nick
----- Original Message -----
From: "J. Ann Selzer" <jannselzer@AOL.COM>
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Sent: Tuesday, March 30, 2010 10:19:38 AM GMT -06:00 US/Canada Central
Subject: Tea Party or tea party?

I'm noting a mix of capitalization strategies when referring to this group. Initially, it seems it was always capitalized. Now I see more incidents of lower case. Any thoughts on the rationale? JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D
Selzer & Company
Des Moines, Iowa 50309

For purposes of this list, use JAnnSelzer@aol.com
For other purposes, use JASelzer@SelzerCo.com

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

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

Date: Tue, 30 Mar 2010 12:53:40 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Analysis and Critique of Tea Party Supporters
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

The Pulse of Politics by Louis Harris
Analysis and Critique of Tea Party Supporters

You might be surprised to learn this, but the Tea Party movement was actually born during the 2008 election. The movement consisted of people who were anti-establishment toward Washington, D.C. They felt that those in power should be changed and they, of course, were not alone. Barack Obama, too, took advantage of anti-Washington sentiment to fashion his majority victory. His new base would be found in the anti-Washington sentiment that had swept the land. Left behind were the Tea Party advocates who were upset when they helped elect Barack Obama - the first African-American president.

For the purposes of this release, Tea Party Supporters are defined as those who say they would vote for Sarah Palin as the Tea Party candidate in a three-way race against Mitt Romney, the Republican and Barack Obama, the Democrat which was the subject of my previous column. Looking at how these current Tea Party supporters view the president, a lopsided 77% of the Tea Party followers are solidly negative about Barack Obama as a person. It would be a vast mistake not to conclude that many of the Tea Party supporters are anything but hostile to the notion that a black, no matter how qualified, should ever serve as president of the United States. The recent outbreaks of the stream of racial epithets that emanated from the thousands of Tea Party followers as they greeted

civil rights legend Representative John L. Lewis on his way inside the U.S. Capitol seem to confirm that potential Tea Party voters are loaded with anti-black sentiment.

<http://news.harrisinteractive.com/profiles/investor/ResLibraryView.asp?BzID=1963&ResLibraryID=37137&Category=1777>

or

<http://tinyurl.com/ycns87o>

(I'd love to see the demographic crosstabs on this)

--

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

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

=====

Date: Tue, 30 Mar 2010 10:21:24 -0700
Reply-To: Hank Zucker <hank@SURVEYSYSTEM.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Hank Zucker <hank@SURVEYSYSTEM.COM>
Subject: Re: Question
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; format=flowed; charset="iso-8859-1";
reply-type=original
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi Jim,

I do not have any data to cite, but the data collection method surely plays a major role. Dividing 100% into 12 tasks is probably close to impossible over the phone and rather difficult on a paper survey. It would be much easier on a Web page survey using software that displays a running total as respondents enter and edit the percentages.

Regards,

Hank Zucker
Creative Research Systems
(707) 765-1001
hank@surveysystem.com

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

From: "James Bason" <jbason@UGA.EDU>

To: <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

Sent: Tuesday, March 30, 2010 7:26 AM

Subject: Question

> Dear AAPORites,

>
>
>

> I have a graduate student who is doing a survey in which he is asking
> respondents to tally up 12 different tasks into percentage of time, and
> the
> final tally has to equal 100%. Having done some items like this before, I
> know how difficult a task this is for respondents.

>
>
>

> Does anyone know of literature on how respondents accomplish such tasks?

> You

> can respond privately and I'll re-post responses to the list.

>
>
>

> Thanks in advance for your help.

>
>
>

> Sincerely,

>
>
>

> Jim Bason

>
>
>

> Director and Associate Research Scientist

>
>
>

> Survey Research Center

>
>
>

> University of Georgia

>
>
>

> Athens, GA 30602

>
>
>

> 706-542-9082

>
>

> 706-425-3029 Fax

>
>

> jbason@uga.edu

>
>

>

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

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

Date: Tue, 30 Mar 2010 11:02:51 -0700
Reply-To: Nancy Bates <nancy.a.bates@CENSUS.GOV>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nancy Bates <nancy.a.bates@CENSUS.GOV>
Subject: Re: 2010 Census -- Myths and Misconceptions
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU, mekropf@UNCC.EDU
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Based on previous Census tests, the Bureau decided not to offer an option of completing the 2010 Census online. Earlier in the decade, we researched an Internet option for 2010 and found that it didn't provide enough protection for individual Census responses. We also concluded at the time that an Internet option didn't increase the response rate. We currently provide an Internet response option for the Economic Census and are planning to test such an option for the American Community Survey. We will test options during the coming decade that should allow us to offer an

Internet option for the 2020 Census.

Nancy Bates
U.S. Census Bureau

Voting, Early Registration deadlines approaching: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Date: Tue, 30 Mar 2010 14:32:11 -0400

Reply-To: Juliana Horowitz <jhorowitz@PEWRESEARCH.ORG>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Juliana Horowitz <jhorowitz@PEWRESEARCH.ORG>

Subject: IDB looking for internet survey consultant

X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

I am posting the job announcement below on behalf of an acquaintance at the Inter-American Development Bank. If anyone is interested or know of someone who might be, please contact Elcior directly.=20

=20

Thanks,

Juliana

=20

Juliana Menasce Horowitz, Ph.D.

Senior Researcher | Pew Global Attitudes Project | 202.419.4424

=20

Request for a consultant:

=20

We are in search of a consultant to help analyze responses from an internet survey of a list-based sample of 2200 professionals from 26 countries in Latin America conducted by the Inter-American Development Bank. This person will help to evaluate the sampling frame and will analyze the effects of unit and item nonresponse (including breakoffs). In addition, this person will provide assistance with more advanced statistical analysis of the data for the report as needed. It is expected that this will involve 80 hours of work. This person should have a strong quantitative background and experience with internet surveys, especially using list-based sample frames. Ability to read Spanish would be helpful but is not necessary. If you are interested, please contact Elcior Ferreira De Santana directly at elciors@iadb.org or 202 6233390.

=20

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

Date: Tue, 30 Mar 2010 15:30:24 -0400
Reply-To: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Susan Losh <slosh@FSU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Question
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <003601cad014\$f61a1bf0\$e24e53d0\$@edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Disposition: inline
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

When one of my grad students and I had a similar project a few years back, we received estimated totals ranging from 50-300%. On future teachers no less, too. We created a "percentage of the total" new set of variables using their own total percent tally as the denomination. Works well for k-1 slots (the kth is linearly dependent on the first k-1).

Susan

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

From: James Bason <jbason@UGA.EDU>
Date: Tuesday, March 30, 2010 10:40 am
Subject: Question
ATo: APORNET@ASU.EDU

> Dear AAPORites,

>

>

>

> I have a graduate student who is doing a survey in which he is asking
> respondents to tally up 12 different tasks into percentage of time,
> and the
> final tally has to equal 100%. Having done some items like this
> before, I
> know how difficult a task this is for respondents.

>

>

>

> Does anyone know of literature on how respondents accomplish such
> tasks? You

> can respond privately and I'll re-post responses to the list.

>

>

>

> Thanks in advance for your help.

>

>

>

> Sincerely,

>

>

>

> Jim Bason

>

>

>

> Director and Associate Research Scientist

>

> Survey Research Center

>

> University of Georgia

>

> Athens, GA 30602

>

> 706-542-9082

>

> 706-425-3029 Fax

>

> jbason@uga.edu

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

> -----
> Voting, Early Registration deadlines approaching:

> [http://www.aapor.org/Archives:](http://www.aapor.org/Archives)

> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> Vacation hold? Send

> email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:

> set aapornet nomail

> On your return send this: set aapornet mail

> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

> request@asu.edu

I try to take one day at a time but sometimes several days attack me all at once. Anonymous.

Susan Carol Losh, PhD

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>

Voting, Early Registration deadlines approaching: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====
Date: Tue, 30 Mar 2010 16:39:22 -0400

Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>

Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing

Subject: Re: Analysis and Critique of Tea Party Supporters

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

X-cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

In-Reply-To:

<3248A9B21DD5574785FE5E2C8E521684F9FE2A@exchange.local.artscience.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Aside from the fact that this poll comes from a HarrisInteractive online panel, and even if one agrees with the thrust of the message, how can one believe anyone who could emit a sentence like this:

> It would be a vast mistake not to conclude that many of the
> Tea Party supporters are anything but hostile to the notion that a
> black, no matter how qualified, should ever serve as president of the
> United States.

Jan Werner

Voting, Early Registration deadlines approaching: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====
Date: Tue, 30 Mar 2010 16:56:45 EDT

Reply-To: AGage95526@AOL.COM

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Andrew Gage <AGage95526@AOL.COM>
Subject: Re: Analysis and Critique of Tea Party Supporters
X-To: jwerner@jwdp.com, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Wow that is really something. I will put it right out there that I support the Tea Party movement and much of what they stand for. I will add to this that if Alan Keyes were to run again I would support that man with every fiber of my being.

For those of you who might not know who he is he is very conservative and very black. He wins just about every debate he is in but is considered unelectable by the "mainstream." Blanket statements like that are usually wrong and show as much intolerance as the groups they are attacking for the same.

Andrew Gage
Owner
Gage Research
20006 Lindenhurst Court
Hagerstown, MD 21742
Phone 301-393-3841
Email _agage@gageresearch.com (mailto:[agage@gageresearch.com](mailto:_agage@gageresearch.com))

In a message dated 3/30/2010 4:43:41 P.M. Eastern Daylight Time, jwerner@JWDP.COM writes:

Aside from the fact that this poll comes from a HarrisInteractive online panel, and even if one agrees with the thrust of the message, how can one believe anyone who could emit a sentence like this:

> It would be a vast mistake not to conclude that many of the
> Tea Party supporters are anything but hostile to the notion that a
> black, no matter how qualified, should ever serve as president of the
> United States.

Jan Werner

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

Voting, Early Registration deadlines approaching: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Date: Tue, 30 Mar 2010 16:58:22 -0400
Reply-To: Jim Ellis <jme2ce@VIRGINIA.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jim Ellis <jme2ce@VIRGINIA.EDU>
Subject: Re: Question
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <f64d8b22129ee.4bb21910@fsu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

When I was with my previous employer we did one of those time breakouts on a statewide mail survey of college faculty many years ago. It was difficult for them, too. We ended up considering anything that added up to 95-105% as being clean. For fun I looked at those who were farther off base by discipline. Math and science professors -- not so bad, but far from perfect. Arts and literature? Noticeably worse.

You will definitely need a strategy to handle answers that do not add to 100%. A web survey with a calculated total might be a better approach but the task itself is not easy for a lot of people.

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 Susan Losh
Sent: Tuesday, March 30, 2010 3:30 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: Question

When one of my grad students and I had a similar project a few years back, we received estimated totals ranging from 50-300%. On future teachers no less, too. We created a "percentage of the total" new set of variables using their own total percent tally as the denomination. Works well for k-1 slots (the kth is linearly dependent on the first k-1).

Susan

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

From: James Bason <jbason@UGA.EDU>
Date: Tuesday, March 30, 2010 10:40 am

Subject: Question
ATo: APORNET@ASU.EDU

> Dear AAPORites,

>
>
>
>

> I have a graduate student who is doing a survey in which he is asking
> respondents to tally up 12 different tasks into percentage of time,
> and the
> final tally has to equal 100%. Having done some items like this
> before, I
> know how difficult a task this is for respondents.

>
>
>

> Does anyone know of literature on how respondents accomplish such
> tasks? You
> can respond privately and I'll re-post responses to the list.

>
>
>

> Thanks in advance for your help.

>
>
>

> Sincerely,

>
>
>

> Jim Bason

>
>
>

> Director and Associate Research Scientist

>
>

> Survey Research Center

>
>

> University of Georgia

>
>

> Athens, GA 30602

>
>

> 706-542-9082

>
>

> 706-425-3029 Fax

>
>

> jbason@uga.edu

>

> -----

- > Voting, Early Registration deadlines approaching:
- > <http://www.aapor.org/Archives>:
- > <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> Vacation hold? Send
- > email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
- > set aapornet nomail
- > On your return send this: set aapornet mail
- > Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
- > Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)
- > 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

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>

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

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

Date: Tue, 30 Mar 2010 17:04:02 -0400
Reply-To: "Butterworth, Michael" <MXB@CBSNEWS.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Butterworth, Michael" <MXB@CBSNEWS.COM>
Subject: Re: Analysis and Critique of Tea Party Supporters
X-To: AGage95526@AOL.COM, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: <29676.3cd336b.38e3bf8d@aol.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I was more impressed by the quadruple negative.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Andrew Gage
Sent: Tuesday, March 30, 2010 4:57 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: Analysis and Critique of Tea Party Supporters

Wow that is really something. I will put it right out there that I support the Tea Party movement and much of what they stand for. I will add to this that if Alan Keyes were to run again I would support that man with every fiber of my being.

For those of you who might not know who he is he is very conservative and very black. He wins just about every debate he is in but is considered unelectable by the "mainstream." Blanket statements like that are usually wrong and show as much intolerance as the groups they are attacking for the same.

Andrew Gage
Owner
Gage Research
20006 Lindenhurst Court
Hagerstown, MD 21742
Phone 301-393-3841
Email _agage@gageresearch.com (mailto:agage@gageresearch.com)

In a message dated 3/30/2010 4:43:41 P.M. Eastern Daylight Time, jwerner@JWDP.COM writes:

Aside from the fact that this poll comes from a HarrisInteractive online panel, and even if one agrees with the thrust of the message, how can one believe anyone who could emit a sentence like this:

> It would be a vast mistake not to conclude that many of the
> Tea Party supporters are anything but hostile to the notion that a
> black, no matter how qualified, should ever serve as president of the
> United States.

Jan Werner

Voting, Early Registration deadlines approaching: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapor.net.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:

set aapornet nomail
On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

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

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

Date: Tue, 30 Mar 2010 22:06:45 +0100
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: Analysis and Critique of Tea Party Supporters
X-To: "AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
In-Reply-To: <29676.3cd336b.38e3bf8d@aol.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Perhaps someone could do a poll on this - do you agree or disagree that it would be a vast mistake not to conclude that many of the Tea Party supporters are anything but hostile to the notion that a black, no matter how qualified, should ever serve as president of the United States.

Cognitive testing would be fun
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
245 Blackfriars Road
London
SE1 9UL

Place of registration: England and Wales

Company number: 2512551

Registered office: GfK NOP Limited, Ludgate House, 245 Blackfriars Road, London, SE1 9UL

Voting, Early Registration deadlines approaching: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====
Date: Tue, 30 Mar 2010 17:19:38 -0400

Reply-To: Rich Clark <clark@CVIOG.UGA.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Rich Clark <clark@CVIOG.UGA.EDU>

Subject: Re: Question

X-To: Jim Ellis <jme2ce@VIRGINIA.EDU>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

In-Reply-To: <[003f01cad04b\\$bb9c0790\\$32d416b0\\$@edu](mailto:003f01cad04b$bb9c0790$32d416b0$@edu)>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

IMHO, Chapter 4 of Tourangeau et al ("The Psychology of Survey Response") is a must read before designing a question like this, especially where the authors discuss the cognitive process of answering temporal questions. If nothing else, it will give your student pause before putting too much faith in the response set, whether you use paper or phone (with obvious additional errors) or a web program that helps the respondent total 100.

--Rich Clark

On 3/30/2010 4:58 PM, Jim Ellis wrote:

> When I was with my previous employer we did one of those time breakouts on a
> statewide mail survey of college faculty many years ago. It was difficult

> for them, too. We ended up considering anything that added up to 95-105% as
> being clean. For fun I looked at those who were farther off base by
> discipline. Math and science professors -- not so bad, but far from perfect.
> Arts and literature? Noticeably worse.

>
> You will definitely need a strategy to handle answers that do not add to
> 100%. A web survey with a calculated total might be a better approach but
> the task itself is not easy for a lot of people.

>
> 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 Susan Losh
> Sent: Tuesday, March 30, 2010 3:30 PM
> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
> Subject: Re: Question

>
> When one of my grad students and I had a similar project a few years back,
> we received estimated totals ranging from 50-300%. On future teachers no
> less, too. We created a "percentage of the total" new set of variables using
> their own total percent tally as the denomination. Works well for k-1 slots
> (the kth is linearly dependent on the first k-1).

>
> Susan
>
> ----- Original Message -----
> From: James Bason<jbason@UGA.EDU>
> Date: Tuesday, March 30, 2010 10:40 am
> Subject: Question
> ATo: APORNET@ASU.EDU

>
>
>> Dear AAPORites,
>>
>>
>>
>> I have a graduate student who is doing a survey in which he is asking
>> respondents to tally up 12 different tasks into percentage of time,
>> and the
>> final tally has to equal 100%. Having done some items like this
>> before, I
>> know how difficult a task this is for respondents.
>>
>>
>>
>> Does anyone know of literature on how respondents accomplish such
>> tasks? You
>> can respond privately and I'll re-post responses to the list.

>>
>>
>>
>> Thanks in advance for your help.

>>
>>
>>
>> Sincerely,

>>
>>
>>
>> Jim Bason

>>
>>
>>
>> Director and Associate Research Scientist

>>
>> Survey Research Center
>>
>> University of Georgia

>>
>> Athens, GA 30602
>>
>> 706-542-9082

>>
>> 706-425-3029 Fax
>>
>> jbason@uga.edu

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

>> Voting, Early Registration deadlines approaching:
>> <http://www.aapor.org/Archives>:
>> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> Vacation hold? Send
>> email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
>> set aapornet nomail
>> On your return send this: set aapornet mail
>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)
>> 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
>
> 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>
>
> -----
> Voting, Early Registration deadlines approaching: <http://www.aapor.org/>
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> set aapornet nomail
> On your return send this: set aapornet mail
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>
> -----
> Voting, Early Registration deadlines approaching: <http://www.aapor.org/>
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> set aapornet nomail
> On your return send this: set aapornet mail
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>

--

Richard L. Clark, Ph.D
Division of Government Services& Research
Carl Vinson Institute of Government
University of Georgia
201 N. Milledge Avenue
Athens, GA 30602

Office phone: (706) 542-9404
Email address: clark@cviog.uga.edu

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

Date: Tue, 30 Mar 2010 17:22:49 -0400
Reply-To: kenneth.steve@DOT.GOV
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: kenneth.steve@DOT.GOV
Subject: Re: Question
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
In-Reply-To: A<[003f01cad04b\\$bb9c0790\\$32d416b0\\$@edu](mailto:003f01cad04b$bb9c0790$32d416b0$@edu)>

MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Not having specifics on the phenomena being measured, I would first question the underlying assumption that these 12 tasks should add up to 100% of something. Regardless, adding a math problem (calculating percentages) to the question(s), by nature, reduces the construct validity of the question(s). Doing this is asking the respondent to perform two different cognitive tasks. Simply asking the individual to report how often they perform a given task will produce a cleaner self report as you are not asking them to do two different things at once. If you believe the individual tasks are different examples of some 'generic' set of tasks, first ask how often they perform the 'generic' task. Then ask how often the 'generic' task takes a specific form. The generic question becomes a source for validating responses as well as a denominator for computing percentages.

The bottom line is that if it seems complicated to you, it will seem more complicated the respondent and you will have no way of controlling how they react. By breaking the construct down into its component parts, you regain some measure of control and reduce cognitive burden.

Ken

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jim Ellis
Sent: Tuesday, March 30, 2010 4:58 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: Question

When I was with my previous employer we did one of those time breakouts on a statewide mail survey of college faculty many years ago. It was difficult for them, too. We ended up considering anything that added up to 95-105% as being clean. For fun I looked at those who were farther off base by discipline. Math and science professors -- not so bad, but far from perfect. Arts and literature? Noticeably worse.

You will definitely need a strategy to handle answers that do not add to 100%. A web survey with a calculated total might be a better approach but the task itself is not easy for a lot of people.

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 Susan Losh
Sent: Tuesday, March 30, 2010 3:30 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: Question

When one of my grad students and I had a similar project a few years back, we received estimated totals ranging from 50-300%. On future teachers no less, too. We created a "percentage of the total" new set of variables using their own total percent tally as the denomination. Works well for k-1 slots (the kth is linearly dependent on the first k-1).

Susan

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

From: James Bason <jbason@UGA.EDU>
Date: Tuesday, March 30, 2010 10:40 am
Subject: Question
ATo: APORNET@ASU.EDU

> Dear AAPORites,

>

>

>

> I have a graduate student who is doing a survey in which he is asking
> respondents to tally up 12 different tasks into percentage of time,
> and the
> final tally has to equal 100%. Having done some items like this
> before, I
> know how difficult a task this is for respondents.

>

>

>

> Does anyone know of literature on how respondents accomplish such
> tasks? You
> can respond privately and I'll re-post responses to the list.

>

>

>

> Thanks in advance for your help.

>

>

>

> Sincerely,

>

>

>

> Jim Bason

>

>
>
> Director and Associate Research Scientist
>
> Survey Research Center
>
> University of Georgia
>
> Athens, GA 30602
>
> 706-542-9082
>
> 706-425-3029 Fax
>
> jbason@uga.edu
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> -----
> Voting, Early Registration deadlines approaching:
> <http://www.aapor.org/Archives>:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> Vacation hold? Send
> email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> set aapornet nomail
> On your return send this: set aapornet mail
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-
> request@asu.edu

I try to take one day at a time but sometimes several days attack me all
at
once. Anonymous.

Susan Carol Losh, PhD

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>

Voting, Early Registration deadlines approaching: <http://www.aapor.org/Archives>:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail

On your return send this: set aapornet mail
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

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

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

Date: Wed, 31 Mar 2010 06:50:19 -0700
Reply-To: Michael Larsen <mlarsen@BSC.GWU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Michael Larsen <mlarsen@BSC.GWU.EDU>
Subject: ASA SRMS/AAPOR webinar, April 6, 2010, 1-3pm Eastern
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Final announcement

The deadline to register for the next SRMS/AAPOR webinar is this Friday, April 2. ** AAPOR members get a special rate. ** Multiple people at one=

site can watch the webinar with a single registration.=20

=E2=80=9CHuman Resources in Science and Technology: Surveys, Data, and In= dicators

from the National Science Foundation=E2=80=9D will be presented by Nirmal= a

Kannankutty on Tuesday, April 6, 2010, 1:00 PM - 3:00 PM Eastern time.=20=

Webinar Description: The Division of Science Resources Statistics (SRS) i= s a

federal statistical agency housed at the National Science Foundation (NSF=).

SRS's role within NSF is to "provide a central clearinghouse for the collection, interpretation, and analysis of data on scientific and engineering resources, and to provide a source of information for policy

formulation by other agencies of the Federal Government..." Within this mandate SRS is involved in collecting and disseminating information on R&D expenditures and activities and on human capital issues. The United States is unique among major industrialized nations in that it has directly invested in collecting detailed data from a variety of sources on the entire science and engineering pipeline. Each of the data sources came about from U.S. federal administrative needs. The sources have evolved into important elements for the study of higher education and the scientific workforce. In this webinar, these surveys and data sources are described. Key indicators regarding trends in U.S. science and engineering degree production, enrollments, and workforce are defined and described. The Science and Engineering Indicators: 2010 and Women, Minorities and Persons with Disabilities in Science and Engineering reports will be used as examples for these indicators. At the end of the webinar participants should be aware of data sources and how data are collected, indicators and reports from the NSF, and where to find more information from the NSF.

To register, please visit the SRMS web site at:
<http://www.amstat.org/sections/SRMS/webinar.cfm>

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Rick Peterson at the ASA office using the below information.
Rick Peterson
Education Programs Associate
American Statistical Association
732 North Washington Street
Alexandria, VA 22153
(703) 684-1221 ext. 1864 FAX: (703) 684-3768

Voting, Early Registration deadlines approaching: <http://www.aapor.org/>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Wed, 31 Mar 2010 11:36:47 -0400
Reply-To: colleen_porter@COX.NET
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Colleen Porter <colleen_porter@COX.NET>

Subject: (unimportant) comfort zone of survey data
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=UTF-8; format=flowed; delp=no
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Disposition: inline

I am amused at how often I take something that has NOTHING to do with surveys, and somehow find a way to link it to surveys or percentages or data or something along those lines that makes me more comfortable.

Recently I was invited to give a talk at a League of Women Voters event in honor of Women's History Month. They had asked me to speak about women in the US military. My mom was an Army nurse during World War II--she and dad were married in uniform. I was a WAC during the Vietnam era. And I've researched the issue a lot for various Fourth of July and Veteran's Day editorials and columns.

But I find out something new every time. This time I learned that FDR called for women to be drafted during his 1945 state of the union address, and a Gallup poll conducted that year found that 72% of Americans supported the idea.

Thanks to the Presidency Project at UC Santa Barbara, it is easy to read the text of that January, 1945 address:

"One of the most urgent immediate requirements of the armed forces is more nurses. Recent estimates have increased the total number needed to 60,000. That means that 18,000 more nurses must be obtained for the Army alone and the Navy now requires 2,000 additional nurses."

Later he says,

"The inability to get the needed nurses for the Army is not due to any shortage of nurses; 280,000 registered nurses are now practicing in this country."

I find myself wondering where he got those numbers, because I've conducted surveys of nurses using state licensing data, and the fact is, a lot of nurses who keep their credentials current choose to work part-time or take some years off from employment for family needs, so that defining a sample can be a messy challenge.

Another quote,

"The present shortage of Army nurses is reflected in undue strain on the existing force. More than a thousand nurses are now hospitalized, and part of this is due to overwork."

I am sure this is true; military nurses served valiantly. They landed on the beach in Italy with the main contingent, with six died during attacks in the early days. They arrived on Normandy beach four days after that invasion. And 67 of them were captured on the Bataan peninsula in 1942 and spent the rest of the war in a Japanese prisoner of war camp.

But my mother explained her reasons for joining the Army in a videotaped interview I conducted in the last years of her life. She confessed, "It

was the only place there was any cigarettes, booze, or men." So I have to wonder if a minor percentage of those incapacitated nurses might actually have been hung over?

Roosevelt continued,

"Since volunteering has not produced the number of nurses required, I urge that the Selective Service Act be amended to provide for the induction of nurses into the armed forces. The need is too pressing to await the outcome of further efforts at recruiting."

As we all know, that war ended before the draft of women became necessary. But interesting that Gallup found 72% of Americans in favor, considering that this issue raised its head in the 2008 election as well.

The question originally came up during the 2007 Democratic debates, and then in mid-October 2008, various commentators resurrected those quotes as a key difference between Obama (who favored including women should the draft ever be reinstated) versus McCain, who favored keeping current restrictions on women in combat roles. This is a more straightforward report

<http://www.post-gazette.com/pg/08287/919582-470.stm?cmpid=elections.xml>

but a lot of conservative commentators and bloggers tried to make much of it. I got calls from people worried about this, and one said it was the last thing that caused her to vote for McCain. It was also used in some push polling.

So there is some kind of link between military women and polling, but mostly I am chagrined at my inability to do anything without making (forcing?) that kind of connection, because it is a more comfortable place to be. Anyone else do that?

Colleen Porter
Gainesville, FL

Voting, Early Registration deadlines approaching: <http://www.aapor.org/>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Wed, 31 Mar 2010 08:36:23 -0700
Reply-To: Jane Traub <JTraub@SCARBOROUGH.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jane Traub <JTraub@SCARBOROUGH.COM>
Subject: Re: Question
X-To: Rich Clark <clark@cviog.uga.edu>,
"AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
In-Reply-To: <4BB26AEA.6010201@cviog.uga.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I totally agree, it is an excellent book and I refer to it all the time. His concept of respondents mapping answers to questions, and the steps people go through to give an accurate and thoughtful answer to a question are quite revealing.

On another note, I saw a presentation at the ARF conference last week that showed some very innovative web questioning techniques from GMI, Global Market Insight, you may want to check them out. It was in the specific context of a study done on perceptions of musical artists for Sony Music. There may be a solution there for you.

-Jane Traub

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Rich Clark
Sent: Tuesday, March 30, 2010 5:20 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: Question

IMHO, Chapter 4 of Tourangeau et al ("The Psychology of Survey Response") is a must read before designing a question like this, especially where the authors discuss the cognitive process of answering temporal questions. If nothing else, it will give your student pause before putting too much faith in the response set, whether you use paper or phone (with obvious additional errors) or a web program that helps the respondent total 100.

--Rich Clark

On 3/30/2010 4:58 PM, Jim Ellis wrote:

> When I was with my previous employer we did one of those time breakouts on a
> statewide mail survey of college faculty many years ago. It was difficult
> for them, too. We ended up considering anything that added up to 95-105% as
> being clean. For fun I looked at those who were farther off base by
> discipline. Math and science professors -- not so bad, but far from perfect.
> Arts and literature? Noticeably worse.

>
> You will definitely need a strategy to handle answers that do not add to
> 100%. A web survey with a calculated total might be a better approach but
> the task itself is not easy for a lot of people.

>
> 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 Susan Losh
> Sent: Tuesday, March 30, 2010 3:30 PM

> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

> Subject: Re: Question

>

> When one of my grad students and I had a similar project a few years back,

> we received estimated totals ranging from 50-300%. On future teachers no

> less, too. We created a "percentage of the total" new set of variables using

> their own total percent tally as the denomination. Works well for k-1 slots

> (the kth is linearly dependent on the first k-1).

>

> Susan

>

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

> From: James Bason<jbason@UGA.EDU>

> Date: Tuesday, March 30, 2010 10:40 am

> Subject: Question

> ATo: APORNET@ASU.EDU

>

>

>> Dear AAPORites,

>>

>>

>>

>>

>> I have a graduate student who is doing a survey in which he is asking

>> respondents to tally up 12 different tasks into percentage of time,

>> and the

>> final tally has to equal 100%. Having done some items like this

>> before, I

>> know how difficult a task this is for respondents.

>>

>>

>>

>> Does anyone know of literature on how respondents accomplish such

>> tasks? You

>> can respond privately and I'll re-post responses to the list.

>>

>>

>>

>> Thanks in advance for your help.

>>

>>

>>

>> Sincerely,

>>

>>

>>

>> Jim Bason

>>

>>

>>

>> Director and Associate Research Scientist

>>

>> Survey Research Center

>>

>> University of Georgia

>>
>> Athens, GA 30602
>>
>> 706-542-9082
>>
>> 706-425-3029 Fax
>>
>> jbason@uga.edu
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>> -----

>> Voting, Early Registration deadlines approaching:
>> <http://www.aapor.org/Archives>:
>> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> Vacation hold? Send
>> email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
>> set aapornet nomail
>> On your return send this: set aapornet mail
>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)
>> 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

>
> 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>

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

>
> -----
> Voting, Early Registration deadlines approaching: <http://www.aapor.org/>
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:

> set aapornet nomail
> On your return send this: set aapornet mail
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>

--

Richard L. Clark, Ph.D
Division of Government Services& Research
Carl Vinson Institute of Government
University of Georgia
201 N. Milledge Avenue
Athens, GA 30602

Office phone: (706) 542-9404
Email address: clark@cviog.uga.edu

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

Voting, Early Registration deadlines approaching: <http://www.aapor.org/>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Wed, 31 Mar 2010 11:58:39 -0400
Reply-To: Jeanette Janota <JJanota@ASHA.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jeanette Janota <JJanota@ASHA.ORG>
Subject: Re: Question
X-To: "AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
In-Reply-To: <003601cad014\$f61a1bf0\$e24e53d0\$@edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I currently have a 35 question, 5 page mail survey in the field. Recipients are all professionals with at least a master's degree. A set of questions asks for numeric responses.

Q 20 -- a single count
Q 21 -- %, up to 4 items must total 100%
Q 22 -- 16 items, each a separate count
Q 23 -- %, up to 6 items must total 100%

Q 24 -- a single %

Q 26 -- hours in a work week, divided across up to 7 activities

Problems:

1. Percents (Qs. 21 & 23) do not total 100%
2. Response set is leading Rs to answer Q 26 as percents instead of as hours

Using an electronic survey would provide more control over the first problem, but the best solution to the second is probably to change question order.

Jeanette Janota

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of James Bason

Sent: Tuesday, March 30, 2010 10:26 AM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: Question

Dear AAPORites,

I have a graduate student who is doing a survey in which he is asking respondents to tally up 12 different tasks into percentage of time, and the final tally has to equal 100%. Having done some items like this before, I know how difficult a task this is for respondents.

Does anyone know of literature on how respondents accomplish such tasks? You can respond privately and I'll re-post responses to the list.

Thanks in advance for your help.

Sincerely,

Jim Bason

Director and Associate Research Scientist

Survey Research Center

University of Georgia

Athens, GA 30602

706-542-9082

706-425-3029 Fax

jbason@uga.edu

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

Voting, Early Registration deadlines approaching: <http://www.aapor.org/>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Wed, 31 Mar 2010 12:03:59 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Census Day Is Near, Carrying a Weight Far Beyond the Raw Numbers
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Census Day Is Near, Carrying a Weight Far Beyond the Raw Numbers
By KATE ZERNIKE and JIM RUTENBERG
<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/03/31/us/31census.html?emc=tnt&tntemail1=y>
or
<http://tinyurl.com/yfgf2mx>

Thursday is Census Day - the date when Americans are urged to fill out their census forms if they want to avoid a visit from a federal worker - and the deadline will put to test a months-long campaign by antigovernment activists who are encouraging people not to complete the questionnaires.

The census has been subject to boycott efforts before, but officials fear that participation rates will be particularly low this year, as a wave of sentiment against the establishment has been stoked by Tea Party

groups and politicians who court them.

SNIP

A version of this article appeared in print on March 31, 2010, on page A12 of the New York edition.

--

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

Voting, Early Registration deadlines approaching: <http://www.aapor.org/>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Wed, 31 Mar 2010 13:55:44 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Cell phone use soars, forcing pollsters to change methods
X-To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

South Florida Sun-Sentinel.com
Cell phone use soars, forcing pollsters to change methods
Consumers who opt not to have land line may get political polling calls
on cell
By Anthony Man, Sun Sentinel

<http://www.sun-sentinel.com/news/politics/elections/fl-cell-phone-polling-20100330,0,3906906.story>
or
<http://tinyurl.com/ya7b2x8>

March 31, 2010

Cell phone users beware: There's a growing chance you'll be enraged as the 2010 political season heats up. More and more pollsters are starting to call cell phone numbers, asking questions about issues, political candidates and whom you're planning to vote for -- their questions, your minutes.

It's caused by the rapidly accelerating trend of people dumping their old-fashioned land lines. With more than one in five Americans now

living in wireless-only households -- and almost half of people ages 25 to 29 living without land lines -- pollsters can't get accurate results without including cell phones.

SNIP

--

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

Voting, Early Registration deadlines approaching: <http://www.aapor.org/>
<http://www.aapor.org>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Wed, 31 Mar 2010 15:03:22 -0400
Reply-To: "Murray, Patrick" <pdmurray@MONMOUTH.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Murray, Patrick" <pdmurray@MONMOUTH.EDU>
Subject: Re: Realtime Census Bureau form returns
X-To: "AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
In-Reply-To: <f662835d39ce2.4baceb40@gmu.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Thanks Michael! I've been checking it on and off.

And in case anyone's wondering, the Census return rate in Michele Bachman's congressional district is running ABOVE the national average.

Patrick Murray
Monmouth University Polling Institute

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>] On Behalf Of Michael P McDonald
Sent: Friday, March 26, 2010 5:14 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Realtime Census Bureau form returns

The Census Bureau has created this very cool tool that maps census form returns at the lowest level of the census tract. Check out how your neighborhood is doing here:

<http://2010.census.gov/2010census/take10map/>

=====

Michael P. McDonald
Associate Professor
George Mason University
<http://elections.gmu.edu>

Preliminary conference program available: <http://bit.ly/9kGhO7>
<http://www.aapor.org>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Voting, Early Registration deadlines approaching: <http://www.aapor.org/>
<http://www.aapor.org>

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.