Mime-Version: 1.0
Date: Tue, 22 Jul 1997 12:20:27 +0200
To: cemad@philadelphia.libertynet.org, blinson@aol.com
From: nejo@philadelphia.libertynet.org
Subject: Re: Sloan etc.
Cc: GGerbner@pobox.asc.upenn.edu

Sent memo to Nejat 12/8/97 "no Sloan map"

(Dr. Gerbner: I decided to CC this message to you for obvious reasons. The Sloan work is on a good track, but certain things from the past data need to be re-sculpted at a basic, i.e. code-sheet, level. This will hopefully put us on a numerically sounder and better-looking grounds. The number of characters that need to be looked up seem to be large in what follows, but since it is a very focused task, Brian will probably handle it fast.)

Brian,
Received the Fedexed program sheets this morning. Thanks.

There are certain things that make the previous 3 samples' occupation data less usable. I have been thinking... if we could re-do the following, we would gain a lot of information. - hey, aren't you glad that those sheets are nicely stacked and sorted and such!

1) there are 31 characters in 95s & 95f who are coded as "teacher, professor"... Separating professor from teacher would improve this data.

2) there are 108 "professionals" (again mainly) in 95s & 95f. How about if you re-distribute these professionals into other occupations, as was done in 96s & 96f samples. This would not only make for more uniform data, but would also give me a good idea what the previous years' (i.e. pre-1995) "professionals" consist of in terms of our current codes.

3) there are a bunch of unlabelled codes used in coding/data entry. Their total is not large, but while you're at it, it would be nice to correct them as much as possible. If there ARE codes for them, but somehow they were not included in the final list you sent me, then I (and you) would be even happier. (Due to their insignificant number, I have been re-coding them into the "other" category, but while you're at it, it is better to correct them)

I will prepare a file that shows all of the info needed for locating these characters and exactly what needs to be re-done.

What do you think? If you round up a couple of people, you could get it done pretty fast? It is only occupation, nothing else is needed.

On your observation about the non-normality of scientists: yeah, isn't it a good feeling that scientists are presented so "bad"?! ...said with an evil-scientist's maniacal grin... >:)
[Note, seriously, though, that they are not more "bad" than others in terms of our "chartype" item. They just deal with more quirky,

other-than-normal stuff, apparently....)

Nejat

>So how is it going with the Sloan thing?
>
>Are there any problems?
>
>Are there any trends?
>
>It seems to me that psychologists and therapists are somehow
>good-guys and successful, while other scientists are half-villians
>or are involved in ufos or paranormal phenomenon.
>
>I know that George is a member of the skeptics society and is
>opposed to all this paranormal stuff on tv.
>
>I think.
>
>
>
>Brian Linson

Oh, we are so cooly underwhelmed.