

=====
Date: Wed, 28 Aug 2002 11:20:27 -0700
Sender: AAPORnet American Association for Public Opinion Research
<AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@ASU.EDU>
Subject: November 1998 archive - one BIG message

This is the USC listproc archive of aapornet messages for this entire month. It is one big message, just the way the USC archive stored it. You can search within this month with your browser's search function.

Turning this into individual messages that Listserv can index and sort means a lot of reformatting. We will do this as time permits. Meanwhile, the search function works, so we have as much functionality as before. New messages are of course automatically formatted correctly--See August & September 2002.

Some of the early months have been completed. Take a look at them for an idea of how AAPORNET got started. (Thanks, Jim!)

Shap Wolf
shap.wolf@asu.edu

Begin archive:

Archive aapornet, file log9811.
Part 1/1, total size 1019718 bytes:

----- Cut here -----
>From daves@startribune.com Sun Nov 1 17:43:12 1998
Received: from firewall2.startribune.com (firewall2.startribune.com
[132.148.80.211])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id RAA28786 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 1 Nov 1998 17:43:09 -0800
(PST)
Received: by firewall2.startribune.com; id TAA26898; Sun, 1 Nov 1998 19:41:30
-
0600 (CST)
Received: from mail.startribune.com(132.148.71.49) by
firewall2.startribune.com
via smap (3.2)
id xma026879; Sun, 1 Nov 98 19:41:11 -0600
Received: from STAR-Message_Server by mail.startribune.com
with Novell_GroupWise; Sun, 01 Nov 1998 19:40:14 -0600
Message-Id: <s63cb91e.059@mail.startribune.com>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2
Date: Sun, 01 Nov 1998 19:39:46 -0600
From: "Rob Daves" <daves@startribune.com>
To: exp12@psu.edu, aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: The Minnesota Poll

Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Content-Disposition: inline

Colleagues,

Those who have some interest in the Minnesota gubernatorial race might be interested in checking the latest Minnesota Poll at <http://www.startribune.com>.

Cheers.

Rob Daves, director
The Minnesota Poll
Star Tribune
425 Portland Av.
Minneapolis MN 55488
daves@startribune.com

>From KAF@cbsnews.com Tue Nov 3 00:15:52 1998

Received: from cbsnews.com ([170.20.81.50])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
id AAA07857 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 3 Nov 1998 00:15:51 -0800
(PST)

Received: from CBSNY-Message_Server by cbsnews.com
with Novell_GroupWise; Tue, 03 Nov 1998 03:15:46 -0500

Message-Id: <s63e7562.024@cbsnews.com>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1

Date: Tue, 03 Nov 1998 03:15:19 -0500

From: Kathy Frankovic <KAF@cbsnews.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Watergate Session Announcement

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: inline

About two months ago, Sid Kraus made a suggestion on AAPORNET that AAPOR gather its resources (both intellectual and financial) and put together a conference that brought the lessons learned from polls in Watergate to the attention of those who are grappling with today's impeachment debate.

The suggestion engendered much discussion on aapornet, and Council made it a priority. We felt a short, half-day session on the subject could be a service to journalists as well as a way of

publicly staking AAPOR's claim as the appropriate source for understanding public opinion on this and other questions. Council felt strongly that in order to have an impact on the current debate, we needed to act quickly. So next Monday, November 9, as you may already know, AAPOR is co-sponsoring a breakfast discussion with the Media Studies Center. It will take place at the Newseum, just outside of Washington, and the Media Studies Center has already sent invitations to D.C. area journalists.

All AAPOR members are welcome. What follows is the official release and invitation.

This is by no means the full academic review of Watergate that many members envisioned in the aapornet discussions. But we think it is the first step necessary in order to make many of the important points about public opinion then and now to those journalists who may themselves shape elite and public opinion on the subject. We will be providing those who attend with information handouts, as well as a bibliography of public opinion reference sources then and now. Here is the press release, and information about attending.

Thanks to all for their input.

Kathy Frankovic

MONDAY, NOV. 9, 1998 BREAKFAST DISCUSSION
POLLS AND SCANDAL, FROM WATERGATE TO CLINTON

Dear Colleague:

Poll after poll chronicles the public reaction to the unfolding impeachment investigation, with the numbers studied carefully on Capitol Hill and in the nation's newsrooms. The president's pollsters sample public opinion constantly as his defenders craft the next response.

The year is 1974, the scandal is Watergate and the president is Richard Nixon.

Fast-forward to 1998. The polls once again are playing a major role in the coverage of a scandal and the possible impeachment of a president.

Please join us on Monday, Nov. 9, when the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) and the Media Studies Center will co-host a discussion that will provide new insights into the polls of Watergate and fresh analysis of the latest polls in the Clinton scandal. The session will present polling data from the scandals, current and past, and new perspectives on the interaction of polls and journalism.

Monday, Nov. 9, 1998
Breakfast 8:30 a.m.
Program 9 a.m.-12 noon
The Freedom Forum World Center
1101 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Rosslyn Metro Stop (orange line)
703-528-0800

AAPOR president Michael Kagay of The New York Times will host the discussion, which features a distinguished roster of the nation's top pollsters (a program agenda is attached). The session will provide journalists with a wealth of data, public opinion history and current information that will be crucial to informed reporting on the coming impeachment hearings.

Kindly let us know whether you will be able to attend by faxing your interest to 212 317 6572 or sending an e-mail to kcollins@mediastudies.org.

Space for the session is limited.

Sincerely,

Lawrence McGill
Media Studies Center
AAPOR President

Michael Kagay
The New York Times

POLLS AND SCANDAL, FROM WATERGATE TO CLINTON
Monday, Nov. 9, 1998

8:30 a.m. Breakfast

9 a.m.

Panel I: Polling in the Watergate Era

Pollster Harry O'Neill will talk about polling he conducted for the Nixon White House in 1973 and 1974 at Opinion Research Corporation. David Moore of The Gallup Organization will trace the history of the extensive Gallup polls on Watergate. Cliff Zukin of Rutgers University, director of the Star-Ledger/Eagleton Poll, will assess the lessons learned from polling in the Watergate era.

10:30 a.m. Panel II: Politics and Polling: What Have We Learned?

CBS News pollster and AAPOR past-president Kathy Frankovic will analyze the latest public opinion polls on Clinton and the ongoing impeachment effort. Keating Holland of CNN will examine the exit polls from the Nov. 3 election. Phil Meyer of the University of North Carolina, author of Precision Journalism and past president of AAPOR, will discuss the importance of the polls in the current scandal.

This program is co-sponsored by The Media Studies Center and the American Association for Public Opinion Research.

The Media Studies Center, an operating program of The Freedom Forum since 1985, is devoted to improving understanding between the media and the public. Center programs bring journalists, scholars, media executives and the public together to examine the media's effects on society.

The Freedom Forum is a non-partisan international foundation dedicated to free press, free speech and free spirit for all people. The foundation pursues its priorities through conferences, educational activities, publishing, broadcasting, online services, fellowships, partnerships, training, research and other programs.

AAPOR is a national professional organization of more than 1,500 individuals who are producers and users of all kinds of survey research. They come from academic and commercial organizations, foundations and voluntary groups.

>From surveys@wco.com Tue Nov 3 08:48:05 1998
Received: from mailhub2.ncal.verio.com (mailhub2.ncal.verio.com
[204.247.247.54])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id IAA29482 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 3 Nov 1998 08:48:04 -0800
(PST)
Received: from compaq (h209-21-28-222.ncal.verio.net [209.21.28.222])
by mailhub2.ncal.verio.com (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id IAA04532
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 3 Nov 1998 08:48:03 -0800 (PST)
Message-ID: <00f501be0749\$c79e4d00\$ec58fea9@compaq>
From: "Hank Zucker" <surveys@wco.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Election news sites?
Date: Tue, 3 Nov 1998 08:48:05 -0800
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Hi All

Anyone have any suggestions for election news Web sites (votes and/or exit
poll
results) for Tues.
night and after?

Thanks.

Hank Zucker
Creative Research Systems
makers of The Survey System: Survey Software that Makes You Look Good
<http://www.surveysystem.com>
<mailto:surveys@wco.com>

>From rshalpern@mindspring.com Tue Nov 3 08:57:54 1998
Received: from dewdrop2.mindspring.com (dewdrop2.mindspring.com
[207.69.200.82])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id IAA03687 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 3 Nov 1998 08:57:53 -0800
(PST)
Received: from default (user-37kb58g.dialup.mindspring.com [207.69.149.16])
by dewdrop2.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id LAA19724
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 3 Nov 1998 11:57:52 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3.0.5.32.19981103115720.0082f440@pop.mindspring.com>
X-Sender: rshalpern@pop.mindspring.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.5 (32)
Date: Tue, 03 Nov 1998 11:57:20 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: "richard s. halpern" <rshalpern@mindspring.com>
Subject: Re: Election news sites?
In-Reply-To: <00f501be0749\$c79e4d00\$ec58fea9@compaq>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

In response to Hans Zucker:

Try <http://www.cnn.com>

They will cover most everything one can think of. Also the NY TIMES or Washington Post.

Dick Halpern

At 08:48 AM 11/3/1998 -0800, you wrote:

>Hi All

>

>Anyone have any suggestions for election news Web sites (votes and/or
>exit poll results) for Tues. night and after?

>

>Thanks.

>

>Hank Zucker

>Creative Research Systems

>makers of The Survey System: Survey Software that Makes You Look Good

><http://www.surveysystem.com> <mailto:surveys@wco.com>

>

>

>

>From caspar@rti.org Tue Nov 3 09:04:59 1998

Received: from cscnts3.rti.org (cscnts3.rti.org [152.5.128.49])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id JAA07165 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 3 Nov 1998 09:04:58 -0800

(PST)

Received: by cscnts3.rti.org with Internet Mail Service (6.0.2102.0)

id <SGX02LCR>; Tue, 3 Nov 1998 12:04:28 -0500

Message-ID: <363A185194EDD111889C0000F81E597F6982F7@cscnts3.rti.org>

From: "Caspar, Rachel A." <caspar@rti.org>

To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>

Cc: "Pate, D. Kirk" <dkp@rti.org>

Subject: Job openings at RTI

Date: Tue, 3 Nov 1998 12:04:22 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (6.0.2102.0)

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

Experienced Survey Specialists

The Research Triangle Institute, a leading contract research organization with offices located in the Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, the Washington, D.C., and Chicago, Illinois, areas currently has openings for mid- and senior-level Survey Specialists. These individuals will perform various survey research duties in accordance with their level of experience.

Mid-level Position - requires a B.S. or B.A. degree with a background in social science research methods, and 3+ years of post-graduate experience in survey research, research design, client interaction, budget development, cost control, data collection, report writing, presentation, and task management. Experience with sample surveys involving field or telephone data collection and with managing day-to-day activities of ongoing research studies is required. Activities include working with study collaborators to develop, implement, and monitor research designs; overseeing data collection operations (field or phone); documenting study procedures; implementing quality control procedures; scheduling and delegating of study tasks; preparing and presenting research reports to clients. Strong writing and oral communications, interpersonal, word processing, organizing, and computer spreadsheet skills are required. Periodic overnight travel is required. Marketing and business proposal experience are a plus.

Senior-Level Position - requires B.S. or B.A. degree with a background in social science research methods, plus 10+ years of experience serving as a project director, principal investigator, or in other senior management or scientific roles on research contracts with Federal agencies. Must also have experience in contract research and program management and have a demonstrated ability to deal with clients and manage field study staff, other survey researchers, and computer applications and design staff. Should also be experienced in working closely with staff across a wide variety of substantive and technical fields (epidemiologists, survey

methodologists, statisticians).

Experience in managing day-to-day activities of ongoing research studies. Activities include working with study collaborators to develop, implement, and monitor research designs; overseeing data collection operations (field or phone); documenting study procedures; implementing quality control procedures; scheduling and delegating of study tasks; preparing and presenting research reports to clients.

Regularly make positive contributions to business development and marketing activities, including planning for research programs, generating research in existing and new market and technical areas, marketing multi-disciplinary concepts. Contribute to and direct the preparation, presentation, and follow-up of research proposals.

Apply on a broad basis principles, theories, and concepts to a scientific field or specialty, and apply a working knowledge of related disciplines. Work on a wide range of problems requiring the use of creative and imaginative thinking. Have gained recognition from peers and clients for technical expertise. Frequently author articles published in peer-reviewed scientific journals. Initiate and carry out appropriate self-development efforts.

Strong oral and written communications skills, project management, administrative abilities, ability to work collaboratively on large project teams, and the ability to manage multiple tasks are essential. Periodic overnight travel is required.

RTI offers competitive salary and excellent benefits.

Interested applicants may submit resume by email to dkp@rti.org, or by mail to:

Mr. Kirk Pate
Research Triangle Institute
PO Box 12194
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

RTI is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer

>From mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu Tue Nov 3 09:27:06 1998

Received: from asa1.asan.com (asa1.asan.com [206.20.111.11])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP

id JAA15612 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 3 Nov 1998 09:27:04 -0800

(PST)

Received: from ppp33-2.asan.com (ppp33-2.asan.com [207.113.83.33]) by

asa1.asan.com (NTMail

3.03.0017/1.aehb) with ESMTMP id ha068725 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 3 Nov

1998 12:27:01 -0500

X-Sender: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.2

Date: Tue, 03 Nov 1998 12:26:34 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Manfred Kuechler <mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>

Subject: Re: Election news sites?

In-Reply-To: <00f501be0749\$c79e4d00\$ec58fea9@compaq>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Message-Id: <17270126170713@asan.com>

At 08:48 AM 11/3/98 -0800, Hank Zucker wrote:

...

>Anyone have any suggestions for election news Web sites (votes and/or

>exit poll results) for Tues. night and after?

>

If you want to follow on the web, here are a few links:

<http://www.cnn.com/ELECTION/1998/>

<http://www.nytimes.com/library/politics/camp/>

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

<http://www.pbs.org/election98/> <http://www.nga.org/HotTopics/1998Elections.htm>

<http://www.ncsl.org/statevote98/>

Enjoy, M.

>From mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu Tue Nov 3 09:47:28 1998

Received: from asa1.asan.com (asa1.asan.com [206.20.111.11])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP

id JAA24844 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 3 Nov 1998 09:47:27 -0800

(PST)

Received: from ppp33-2.asan.com (ppp33-2.asan.com [207.113.83.33]) by

asa1.asan.com (NTMail

3.03.0017/1.aehb) with ESMTMP id oa068758 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 3 Nov

1998 12:47:23 -0500

X-Sender: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.2

Date: Tue, 03 Nov 1998 12:46:56 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Manfred Kuechler <mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>

Subject: Re: Election news sites? (PS)

Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Message-Id: <17472396470945@asan.com>

At 08:48 AM 11/3/98 -0800, Hank Zucker wrote:

...

>Anyone have any suggestions for election news Web sites (votes and/or
>exit poll results) for Tues. night and after?
>

And don't forget: <http://www.harrisblackintl.com/electionpollresults/>

This is the experimental web poll (an availability sample of sorts). Results for the first two waves October 19-21 and October 29-31 are already available. The third wave is currently running and data collection will end "Tuesday, Nov 4, 11:59pm" -- whenever this may be. Maybe they get it right, who knows. Currently, in the second wave, they have Schumer over d'Amato (50.4 to 46.2 percent) in the NY Senate race. "Statistically significant" with about 2,200 respondents -- if it was a random sample.

In Germany, "Wahlstreet" (a mock stock exchange for trading parties, capital limited to DM 10 per participant) did better than most professional organizations in predicting the final low result for the CDU Not that this approach makes any (conceptual) sense to me, but maybe scientific sampling has run its course with respect to voting behavior these days.

>From altschul@Oswego.EDU Tue Nov 3 12:47:15 1998
Received: from oswego-gw.oswego.edu (oswego-g1.oswego.edu [129.3.22.1])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id MAA02069 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 3 Nov 1998 12:47:06 -0800
(PST)
From: altschul@Oswego.EDU
Received: from Altschul.oswego.edu (altschul.oswego.edu [129.3.50.36])
by oswego-gw.oswego.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id PAA04775
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 3 Nov 1998 15:46:51 -0500 (EST)
Date: Tue, 3 Nov 1998 15:48:47 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Election news sites?
In-Reply-To: <00f501be0749\$c79e4d00\$ec58fea9@compaq>
Message-ID: <Pine.WNT.3.96.981103154704.-346993B-100000@Altschul.oswego.edu>
X-X-Sender: altschul@oswego.oswego.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

All the networks have websites with updates on election news and polls. I found today's on ABC particularly interesting as they included (if you have Real Player software) a selection of campaign commercials. Bruce Altschuler SUNY Oswego

On Tue, 3 Nov 1998, Hank Zucker wrote:

> Hi All
>
> Anyone have any suggestions for election news Web sites (votes and/or
> exit poll results) for Tues. night and after?
>
> Thanks.
>
> Hank Zucker
> Creative Research Systems
> makers of The Survey System: Survey Software that Makes You Look Good
> <http://www.surveysystem.com> <mailto:surveys@wco.com>
>
>

>From DRouner@vines.ColoState.EDU Tue Nov 3 16:06:09 1998
Received: from yuma.ACNS.ColoState.EDU (yuma.ACNS.ColoState.EDU [129.82.100.64])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id QAA27825 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 3 Nov 1998 16:06:07 -0800
(PST)
Received: from vines.ColoState.EDU (vines.ColoState.EDU [129.82.100.101]) by
yuma.ACNS.ColoState.EDU
(AIX4.3/UCB 8.8.8/8.7) with SMTP id RAA40998; Tue, 3 Nov 1998 17:05:57 -0700
Received: by vines.ColoState.EDU with VINES-ISMTMP; Tue, 3 Nov 98 17:07:15 -
0700
Date: Tue, 3 Nov 98 17:08:28 -0700
Message-ID: <vines.BY2E+vftDqA@vines.ColoState.EDU>
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
From: "Donna Rouner" <DRouner@vines.ColoState.EDU>
Reply-To: <DRouner@vines.ColoState.EDU>
Subject: re: ... no subject ...
X-Incognito-SN: 204
X-Incognito-Version: 4.11.7
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Can't come this year. Sorry. Me and family are fine. Hope all is well with you. Have fun; I'll miss seeing you and I'll miss MAPOR. Let me know how it

goes;how you are, etc. Donna

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

--

Leo G. Simonetta
UNH Survey Center

leos@christa.unh.edu

- - - - - End of Original Message - - - - -

>From sgoold@unm.edu Tue Nov 3 19:29:23 1998
Received: from kitsune.swcp.com (swcp.com [198.59.115.2])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTTP
id TAA11193 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 3 Nov 1998 19:29:22 -0800
(PST)
Received: from [204.134.5.194] (dpm4-28.swcp.com [204.134.5.221]) by
kitsune.swcp.com (8.8.8/1.2.3)
with SMTP id UAA27658 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 3 Nov 1998 20:29:17 -0700
(MST)
Message-Id: <v02130503b2657c8d5ec0@[204.134.5.194]>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Tue, 3 Nov 1998 20:46:52 -0700
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: sgoold@unm.edu (Scott Goold)
Subject: a bit of humor

Spread this around to everyone except for John Glenn:

When John Glenn returns from space, everybody dress in ape costumes.

Pass it on.

Stan Glantz

Scott Goold, Ph.D. (abd)
University of New Mexico
505.293.2504
Web page @ < www.unm.edu/~sgoold >

"I Can't Accept Not Trying"

>From mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu Wed Nov 4 07:49:12 1998
Received: from asa1.asan.com (asa1.asan.com [206.20.111.11])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP

id HAA04715 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 4 Nov 1998 07:49:08 -0800
(PST)
Received: from ppp17-2.asan.com (ppp17-2.asan.com [207.113.83.17]) by
asa1.asan.com (NTMail
3.03.0017/1.aehb) with ESMTP id ta070011 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 4 Nov
1998 10:48:58 -0500
X-Sender: mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.2
Date: Wed, 04 Nov 1998 10:48:46 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Manfred Kuechler <mkuechle@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>
Subject: Elections 98: Web polls
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Message-Id: <15485890383143@asan.com>

Now that the results are in, it's even more interesting to look at how the
web
polls did. Check the
Harris/Excite polls at: <http://www.harrisblackintl.com/electionpollresults/>

I think the second round (collected October 29-31) is the most interesting.
As
of this morning, the
results for the third round are not posted yet, but since this mixes
responses
from before and after
voting it will be difficult to draw conclusion anyway.

Their score card does not look bad, they got all the critical races right
(using the standard
difference of proportions test -- if you go with the "hypothetical universe"
(Hagood 1942) defense of
using it with non-random
samples):
Schumer in NY, Boxer in CA, Moseley-Brown (def) in IL, Faircloth (def) in NC

All conventional polls I have seen did not call at least the first two races
("too close"). On the
other, Moseley-Brown did better (relatively
speaking) than what the web poll suggested. Also Harris/Excite did not get
enough volunteers in a
number of states, so the close Senate races in Kentucky and Nevada are not
included.

Still, not a bad score -- given how much cheaper web polls are (especially
after procedural routines
are developed). Certainly disconcerting for the statistical purist. But,
then,
Prof. Noelle-Neumann

claims that her institute has provided the best election predictions in Germany (ever since WW II) -- as someone on this list recently reminded us -- and the IfD has used quota sampling for the most part.

Quo vadis, political polling?

>From abider@earthlink.net Wed Nov 4 13:56:48 1998
Received: from avocet.prod.itd.earthlink.net (avocet.prod.itd.earthlink.net [207.217.120.50])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id NAA12967 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 4 Nov 1998 13:56:46 -0800 (PST)
Received: from alvbysy (sdn-ar-002dcwashP274.dialsprint.net [168.191.22.75])
by avocet.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.8.7/8.8.5) with SMTP id NAA27431
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 4 Nov 1998 13:56:40 -0800 (PST)
Message-ID: <000d01be083e\$28411120\$4b16bfa8@alvbysy>
Reply-To: "Albert Biderman" <abider@earthlink.net>
From: "Albert Biderman" <abider@earthlink.net>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Blair Students Predict
Date: Wed, 4 Nov 1998 16:57:43 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="-----_NextPart_000_000A_01BE0814.3D6BDDC0"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.2106.4
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----_NextPart_000_000A_01BE0814.3D6BDDC0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64

SSBoZWfYzCB0aGF0IE1vbnRnb21lcngKE1EKSBCbGFpciBzdHVkZW50cyBhZ2FpbiBiZXN0ZWQg
cHJvcyBieSBwcmVkaWN0aW5nIERlbW9jcmF0aWwSG91c2UgZ2Fpbi4gIFNpbmNlIG10IHdhcyBv
biBteSBjYXJgcmFkaW8gd2hpbGUgSSBoYWQgYSB0cmFmZmljIHByb2JsZW0gdG8gZGVhbCB3aXR0
LCBJJ20gbm90IHN1cmUgb2YgdGhlIGRldGFpbHMgYW5kIEkgZm91bmQgbm90aGluZyBwZXJ0aW5l
bnQgb24gdGhlIHNjaG9vbCdzIFdlYnNpdGUuICBEb2VzIGFueW9uZSBoYXZlIG1vcuUgaw5mbyBi
ZWNhdXNlIG1heWJlIHRob3NlIHN0dWRlbnRzIHNob3VsZCBiZSBoYXZlIG1vcuUgaw5mbyBi
ZXJlbnNlIHRvIGdpdmUgc29tZSBwb2ludGVycy4NCKFsIEJpZGVybyBFuZDQphYm1kZXJAYW11cm1j
YW4uZWR1DQo=

-----_NextPart_000_000A_01BE0814.3D6BDDC0
Content-Type: text/html;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64

```
PCFET0NUWBFIEhUTUwgUFVCTEldICItLy9XM0MvL0RURCBXMyBIVE1MLy9FTiI+DQo8SFRN
PCFET0NUWBFIEhUTUwgUFVCTEldICItLy9XM0MvL0RURCBXMyBIVE1MLy9FTiI+TD4N
CjxIRUFEPg0KDQo8TUVUQSBjb250ZW50PXRleHQvaHRtbDdtjaGFyc2V0PWlzbj04ODU5LTEgaHR0
cC1lcXVpdj1Db250ZW50LVR5cGU+DQo8TUVUQSBjb250ZW50PSciTVNIVE1MIDQuNzIuMjEw
cC1lcXVpdj1Db250ZW50LVR5cGU+Ni42
IicgbmFtZT1HRU5FUKFUT1I+DQo8L0hfFQUQ+DQo8Qk9EWSBiZ0NvbG9yPSNmZmZmZmY+DQo8
IicgbmFtZT1HRU5FUKFUT1I+DQo8L0hfFQUQ+DQo8Qk9EWSBiZ0NvbG9yPSNmZmZmZmY+RElW
PjxGT05UIGNvbG9yPSMwMDAwMDAgZmFjZT0iRnV0dXJhIE1kIEJUIiBzaXp1PTI+SSBoZWYy
PjxGT05UIGNvbG9yPSMwMDAwMDAgZmFjZT0iRnV0dXJhIE1kIEJUIiBzaXp1PTI+ZCB0
aGF0IE1vbnRnb21lcnkKE1EKSANCKjsYwlyIHN0dWRlbnRzIGFnYWluIGJlZC3RlZCBwcm9zIGJ5
IHByZWVpY3RpbmcmRGVtb2NyYXRpYyBib3VzZSBnYWluLiZuYnNwOyANC1NpbmNlIGl0IHdhcyBv
biBteSBjYXJgcmFkaW8gd2hpbGUgSSBoYWQgYSB0cmFmZmljIHByb2JscZW0gdG8gZGVhbCB3aXR0
LCBjJ20gbm90IA0Kc3VyZSBvZiB0aGUgZGV0YWlscyBhbmQgSSBmb3VuZCBub3Roaw5nIHBlcnRp
bmVudCBvbiB0aGUgc2Nob29sJ3MgV2Vic2l0ZS4mbmJzcDsgDQpEb2VzIGFueW9uZSB0eXZlIG1v
cmUgaW5mbyBiZW5hdXNlIG1hewJlIHRob3NlIHh0dWRlbnRzIHNob3VsZCBiZSBpbnpdGvKIHRv
IHRoZSANCKNvbmlcmVUy2UgdG8gZ2l2ZSBzb21lIHbvaW50ZXJzLjwvRk90VD48L0RJVj4NCjxE
SVY+PEZPTlQgY29sb3I9IzAwMDAwMCMwYWNlPSJGdXR1cmEgTWQgQlQiIHNpemU9Mj5BbCBC
SVY+aWRl
cm1hbJwvRk90VD48L0RJVj4NCjxEsvY+PEZPTlQgY29sb3I9IzAwMDAwMCMwYWNlPSJGdXR1
cm1hbJwvRk90VD48L0RJVj4NCjxEsvY+cmEg
TWQgQlQiIA0Kc2l6ZT0yPmFiaWRlckBhbWVyaWNhbi5lZHU8L0ZPTlQ+PC9ESVY+PC9CT0RZ
TWQgQlQiIA0Kc2l6ZT0yPmFiaWRlckBhbWVyaWNhbi5lZHU8L0ZPTlQ+PC9ESVY+Pjwv
SFRNTD4NCg==
```

-----_NextPart_000_000A_01BE0814.3D6BDDC0--

```
>From kbogen@erols.com Wed Nov 4 20:41:14 1998
Received: from smtp3.erols.com (smtp3.erols.com [207.172.3.236])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id UAA02904 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 4 Nov 1998 20:41:14 -0800
(PST)
Received: from uymfdlvk (207-172-130-238.s238.tnt3.col.erols.com
[207.172.130.238])
    by smtp3.erols.com (8.8.8/8.8.5) with SMTP id XAA27177
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 4 Nov 1998 23:41:11 -0500 (EST)
From: "Karen Bogen" <kbogen@erols.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: job opening at Johns Hopkins University
Date: Wed, 4 Nov 1998 23:37:41 -0500
Message-ID: <01be0876$067756c0$ee82accf@uymfdlvk>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.71.1712.3
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.71.1712.3
```


Position Announcement

Organization:
The Johns Hopkins University

Position Title:
Project Manager/Associate Research Scientist

Position Description:
Manage key aspects of a four-year study of the effects of welfare reform laws on children and families.

Monitor on-going household surveys by Research Triangle Institute. Assist in

questionnaire development and revision, preparation of reports, and presentation of study findings at meetings and conferences. Knowledge of the following: welfare policy, survey research methods, collection and statistical analysis of survey research data, interviewing low-income families and service providers.

Travel to field sites in Boston, Chicago, and San Antonio, and to RTI's headquarters in North Carolina.

Project Manager/Associate Research Scientist will work closely with Professors

Andrew Cherlin and Robert Moffitt, Johns Hopkins University, with project based in Baltimore, MD.

Ph.D. or M.A.. Salary range is low to mid-40's, depending upon experience. Johns Hopkins University is an Equal Opportunity, Affirmative Action employer. We actively encourage women and minorities to apply. Submit application, including letter of interest and a current resume, to Dr. Andrew Cherlin, Department of Sociology, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD 21218.

Department of Sociology
Mergenthaler Hall
Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, Maryland 21218

Phone: 410 516 7632
Fax: 410 516 7590
cherlin@jhu.edu

>From Krosnick.1@osu.edu Thu Nov 5 07:39:37 1998
Received: from mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (root@mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu [128.146.214.33])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id HAA12595 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 5 Nov 1998 07:39:36 -0800
(PST)
Received: from PC342.psy.ohio-state.edu (pc342.psy.ohio-state.edu

[128.146.254.42])

by mail4.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id KAA01461
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 5 Nov 1998 10:39:31 -0500 (EST)

Message-Id: <4.1.19981105103254.01199760@pop.service.ohio-state.edu>

X-Sender: krosnick@pop.service.ohio-state.edu

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.1

Date: Thu, 05 Nov 1998 10:40:02 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Jon Krosnick <Krosnick.1@osu.edu>

Subject: Columbus Dispatch Mail Poll Accuracy

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

For those interested, the Columbus Dispatch mail poll again out-performed its competitors in forecasting the Ohio Senate and Governor's races (and all other races as well). Here are the average errors for the two major races:

Columbus Dispatch: 0.5%

Ohio State University Survey Research Unit Telephone Poll: 3.5% Harris/Excite

Internet Poll: 2.4%

Here are the average errors for all races predicted by the organizations' final polls (6 for the Dispatch, 4 for OSU, 2 for Harris/Excite):

Columbus Dispatch: 1.8%

Ohio State University Survey Research Unit Telephone Poll: 5.3% Harris/Excite

Internet Poll: 2.4%

>From p-miller@nwu.edu Thu Nov 5 08:59:57 1998

Received: from casbah.acns.nwu.edu (casbah.acns.nwu.edu [129.105.16.52])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTMP

id IAA12601 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 5 Nov 1998 08:59:56 -0800

(PST)

Received: (from mailnull@localhost)

by casbah.acns.nwu.edu (8.8.7/8.8.7) id KAA01701

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 5 Nov 1998 10:59:55 -0600 (CST)

Received: from pmiller.medill.nwu.edu(129.105.249.129) by casbah.acns.nwu.edu via smap (V2.0)

id xma001257; Thu, 5 Nov 98 10:59:06 -0600

Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19981105110701.006d2660@casbah.acns.nwu.edu>

X-Sender: pvm@casbah.acns.nwu.edu

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (32)

Date: Thu, 05 Nov 1998 11:07:01 -0600

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Peter Miller <p-miller@nwu.edu>

Subject: Re: Columbus Dispatch Mail Poll Accuracy

In-Reply-To: <4.1.19981105103254.01199760@pop.service.ohio-state.edu>

Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

With reference to Mitofsky's poll review in this summer's POQ, how are these errors calculated? Best.
Peter

At 10:40 AM 11/5/98 -0500, you wrote:

>For those interested, the Columbus Dispatch mail poll again
>out-performed its competitors in forecasting the Ohio Senate and
>Governor's races (and all other races as well). Here are the average
>errors for the two major
races:

>

>Columbus Dispatch: 0.5%

>Ohio State University Survey Research Unit Telephone Poll: 3.5%

>Harris/Excite Internet Poll: 2.4%

>

>Here are the average errors for all races predicted by the
>organizations' final polls (6 for the Dispatch, 4 for OSU, 2 for
>Harris/Excite):

>

>Columbus Dispatch: 1.8%

>Ohio State University Survey Research Unit Telephone Poll: 5.3%

>Harris/Excite Internet Poll: 2.4%

>

>

Peter V. Miller
Department of Communication Studies
Northwestern University
1881 Sheridan Road, Room 12
Evanston, IL 60208

847-491-5835

847-467-1171 (FAX)

p-miller@nwu.edu

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Nov 5 11:16:12 1998

Received: from almaak.usc.edu (almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id LAA13441 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 5 Nov 1998 11:16:11 -0800

(PST)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

by almaak.usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP

id LAA16582 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 5 Nov 1998 11:16:11 -0800

(PST)

Date: Thu, 5 Nov 1998 11:16:11 -0800 (PST)

From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: TECHNICAL DIRECTOR FOR EPIDEMIOLOGICAL STUDIES (fwd)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.02.9811051113510.905-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Date: Thu, 5 Nov 1998 11:13:44 EST
From: CODA89@AOL.COM
Subject: TECHNICAL DIRECTOR FOR EPIDEMIOLOGICAL STUDIES IN RDU AREA

CODA, Inc., has a position in its Durham, NC office for a Technical Director for a 7-year support services contract with the Epidemiology Branch (EB) of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS). Candidates must have Ph.D. or equivalent in epidemiology or related field of health research and minimum 5 years of post-doctoral experience in conduct & management of complex health studies. Must be knowledgeable in all aspects of applied research methodology, including study design, field methodology, data mgt. & data analysis. Exp. in collecting interview and questionnaire data is essential, as is familiarity with state-of-the-art software for survey data collection and data mgt. Exp. in collecting biologic & environmental specimen data is highly desirable.

This is a senior-level mgt. position involving day-to-day technical direction of multiple projects with staff of 20 plus persons providing technical and managerial support to EB staff in all aspects of epi field work: study design; data collection through interviews, specimen collection and record abstracting; data handling and processing; and transporting and processing of biologic and environmental specimens. Individual will also provide general oversight to subcontractor staff of 10 to 12 programmers who provide data management and analysis support on projects conducted under the contract. FAX resume to ATT: Dept KS at 301 588 0417 or send to CODA, 1100 Wayne Avenue, Suite 750, Silver Spring, MD, 20910, ATT: DEPT KS.

Doris Northrup

President, CODA, Inc.
coda89@aol.com or northrup@codares.com

>From rhickson@monmouth.com Thu Nov 5 15:06:32 1998
Received: from shell.monmouth.com (shell.monmouth.com [205.231.236.9])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id PAA14307 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 5 Nov 1998 15:06:29 -0800
(PST)
Received: from rachel (tr-ppp13.monmouth.com [209.191.24.45]) by
shell.monmouth.com (8.8.5/8.7.3) with
SMTP id SAA26054 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 5 Nov 1998 18:05:46 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <36423083.127D@monmouth.com>
Date: Thu, 05 Nov 1998 18:10:59 -0500
From: Rachel Hickson <rhickson@monmouth.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.01 (Win95; I)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: [Fwd: job opening at Johns Hopkins University]
Content-Type: message/rfc822
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Disposition: inline

Received: from usc.edu (usc.edu [128.125.253.136]) by shell.monmouth.com
(8.8.5/8.7.3) with ESMTP id
XAA25911 for <rhickson@monmouth.com>; Wed, 4 Nov 1998 23:40:59 -0500 (EST)
Received: from usc.edu (localhost [127.0.0.1])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
id UAA02947; Wed, 4 Nov 1998 20:41:20 -0800 (PST)
Received: from smtp3.erols.com (smtp3.erols.com [207.172.3.236])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id UAA02904 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 4 Nov 1998 20:41:14 -0800
(PST)
Received: from uymfdlvk (207-172-130-238.s238.tnt3.col.erols.com
[207.172.130.238])
by smtp3.erols.com (8.8.8/8.8.5) with SMTP id XAA27177
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 4 Nov 1998 23:41:11 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <01be0876\$067756c0\$ee82accf@uymfdlvk>
Date: Wed, 4 Nov 1998 23:37:41 -0500
Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu
Sender: owner-aapornet@usc.edu
Precedence: bulk
From: "Karen Bogen" <kbogen@erols.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: job opening at Johns Hopkins University
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.71.1712.3
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.71.1712.3
X-Listprocessor-Version: 8.1 -- ListProcessor(tm) by CREN
X-UIDL: 089330202148ab8a6f092d43b83455ea
X-Mozilla-Status: 0000

Position Announcement

Organization:
The Johns Hopkins University

Position Title:
Project Manager/Associate Research Scientist

Position Description:
Manage key aspects of a four-year study of the effects of welfare reform laws on children and families.
Monitor on-going household surveys by Research Triangle Institute. Assist in questionnaire development and revision, preparation of reports, and presentation of study findings at meetings and conferences. Knowledge of the following: welfare policy, survey research methods, collection and statistical analysis of survey research data, interviewing low-income families and service providers.
Travel to field sites in Boston, Chicago, and San Antonio, and to RTI's headquarters in North Carolina.
Project Manager/Associate Research Scientist will work closely with Professors Andrew Cherlin and Robert Moffitt, Johns Hopkins University, with project based in Baltimore, MD.
Ph.D. or M.A.. Salary range is low to mid-40's, depending upon experience. Johns Hopkins University is an Equal Opportunity, Affirmative Action employer. We actively encourage women and minorities to apply. Submit application, including letter of interest and a current resume, to Dr. Andrew Cherlin, Department of Sociology, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD 21218.

Department of Sociology
Mergenthaler Hall
Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, Maryland 21218

Phone: 410 516 7632
Fax: 410 516 7590
cherlin@jhu.edu

>From SIMMONRO@osd.pentagon.mil Thu Nov 5 15:59:41 1998
Received: from ddsmttayz003.osd.mil (ddsmttayz003.osd.mil [134.152.184.7])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id PAA06032 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 5 Nov 1998 15:59:39 -0800
(PST)
Received: by ddsmttayz003 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2232.9)
id <V72AFQ1S>; Thu, 5 Nov 1998 18:59:13 -0500

Message-ID:
<91EE98CFD032D211B85600805FBBC02404A8D6@DDSMITTAYZ066.dmdc.osd.mil>
From: "Simmons, Robert O., ,DMDCEAST" <SIMMONRO@osd.pentagon.mil>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Watergate Event Monday Morning
Date: Thu, 5 Nov 1998 18:58:52 -0500
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2232.9)

The posting announcing the time and place of this event mentioned two
slightly
different locations near
the Rosslyn Metro station in Arlington,
Virginia: the Newseum and the Freedom Forum. As far as I know, the correct
location is the Freedom
Forum, on the 22nd floor of 1101 Wilson Boulevard,

Rob Simmons
DMDC
1600 Wilson Blvd., Suite 400
Arlington, VA 22209

>From rhickson@monmouth.com Thu Nov 5 16:22:57 1998
Received: from shell.monmouth.com (shell.monmouth.com [205.231.236.9])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id QAA18062 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 5 Nov 1998 16:22:55 -0800
(PST)
Received: from rachel (tr-ppp29.monmouth.com [209.191.24.61]) by
shell.monmouth.com (8.8.5/8.7.3) with
SMTP id TAA01068 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 5 Nov 1998 19:22:12 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <3642426F.3D2C@monmouth.com>
Date: Thu, 05 Nov 1998 19:27:27 -0500
From: Rachel Hickson <rhickson@monmouth.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.01 (Win95; I)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: [Fwd: Job Opening - State of Delaware]
References: <36422FC3.595B@monmouth.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

> The following is brought to you courtesy of the Washington Evaluators
> and the Eastern Evaluation Research Society.

> *****
> State of Delaware
> Delaware Health and Social Services
>
>
> There is an immediate opening for an evaluator (Planner IV) in
> Delaware Health and Social Services' Division of Management Services.
>
> The employee will provide training and practical skills development in
> conducting program evaluation to a small group of Department program
> managers. The training will combine both class sessions (on the topics
> of evaluation design, sampling methods, data collection, survey design
> and implementation, cost analysis, data analysis using statistical
> packages, and performance
> measurement) and hands-on technical assistance to staff who are evaluating
> health and social programs.
>
> The ideal candidate will have skills in evaluation methodology and
> training, and knowledge of governmental programs.
>
> This is a part-time (22.5 hours per week), temporary position
> (December 1, 1998 through June 30, 1999). The salary will be
> approximately \$20.00 per hour. Since it is a temporary, part-time
> position, no benefits are included.
>
> For more information, potential applicants should call Celeste
>Anderson at
> (302) 577-4633 or e-mail her at Canderson@State.de.us.
>From jwerner@jwdp.com Thu Nov 5 18:34:16 1998
Received: from vger.vgernet.net (root@vgernet.net [205.219.186.1])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTTP
id SAA25471 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 5 Nov 1998 18:34:15 -0800
(PST)
Received: from jwdp.com (plpm3-13.vgernet.net [207.51.117.13])
by vger.vgernet.net (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTTP id BAA07174
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 6 Nov 1998 01:23:45 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <36426025.EBB47550@jwdp.com>
Date: Thu, 05 Nov 1998 21:34:13 -0500
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: It only counts if you call it BEFORE the election
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Today's (11/5) NY Times special section on Tuesday's elections contains an article discussing the lack

of accuracy of the polls in predicting the NY Senate race titled: "The Polling: The Experts Examine Their Miscalculations" which may be read online at: <http://www.nytimes.com/library/politics/camp/110598ny-polls.html>

The article contains the following statement:

One of the final polls in the race, by Quinnipiac College, came closest to predicting the outcome, showing Schumer ahead by eight percentage points. Its pollsters credited the survey's accuracy to the fact that they were able to detect the late movement of undecided voters.

This sounds impressive, but the day before the election, Maurice Carroll, director of the Quinnipiac poll, was interviewed by Albany public radio station WAMC and was asked to call various state contests. With respect to the NY senate race, he said:

"That one is just too close to call. If you put a gun to my head and told me to pick D'Amato or Schumer, I'd just have to say: 'Go ahead and pull the trigger.'"

Bang!

```
>From altschul@Oswego.EDU Fri Nov 6 05:18:27 1998
Received: from oswego-gw.oswego.edu (oswego-g1.oswego.edu [129.3.22.1])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTTP
    id FAA01810 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 6 Nov 1998 05:18:26 -0800
(PST)
From: altschul@Oswego.EDU
Received: from Altschul.oswego.edu (altschul.oswego.edu [129.3.50.36])
    by oswego-gw.oswego.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id IAA10415
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 6 Nov 1998 08:18:23 -0500 (EST)
Date: Fri, 6 Nov 1998 08:20:24 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: NY Preelection Polls
In-Reply-To: <36426025.EBB47550@jwdp.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.WNT.3.96.981106081117.-316051A-100000@Altschul.oswego.edu>
X-X-Sender: altschul@oswego.oswego.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
```

The NY Times article on the predictive value of preelection polls in NY raises the question of evaluation of results again. Although the polls were on target for Governor Pataki's big win, they were

far less accurate for the Senate and Attorney General races. Most picked Vacco by a big margin (the result was a virtual tie with Spitzer slightly ahead at the moment) while claiming that the Schumer-D'Amato race was too close to call. From the Times article and my own observations I would suggest some of the following reasons which people might wish to discuss:

1. One problem was less with the data than with the analysis. As another post mentioned, the Quinnipiac Poll came closest to the actual results but its analysis discounted the 8 point margin, stating it was too close to call. Other polls with smaller Schumer leads made the same statement.

2. Turnout seems to have confounded many of these surveys. Most apparently used some kind of filter but this year's results appear not wholly consistent with the past. Turnout in NY City, especially among minority voters was higher than expected, confounding filters based on past turnout. This is hard to judge as the polls rarely discussed their filter methods.

3. Many of the polls showed about 20% undecided. Clearly during the last week, especially after D'amato's "putzhead" remark, the undecided broke Schumer's way. It would be interesting to hear any suggestions for dealing with this issue in general.

Bruce Altschuler
SUNY Oswego

>From Krosnick.1@osu.edu Fri Nov 6 07:24:52 1998
Received: from mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu (root@mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu [128.146.214.32])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id HAA28305 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 6 Nov 1998 07:24:51 -0800 (PST)
Received: from PC342.psy.ohio-state.edu (pc342.psy.ohio-state.edu [128.146.254.42])
by mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id KAA17463
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 6 Nov 1998 10:24:37 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <4.1.19981106094513.01163740@pop.service.ohio-state.edu>
X-Sender: krosnick@pop.service.ohio-state.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.1
Date: Fri, 06 Nov 1998 10:25:11 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Jon Krosnick <Krosnick.1@osu.edu>

Subject: Columbus Dispatch Mail Poll Accuracy
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="====_3890382==_ALT"

--====_3890382==_ALT
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

An update on the Columbus Dispatch mail poll's performance in Ohio:

Adding additional results that were not published by the news media (and therefore not available to me when I sent yesterday's message), here are the average errors for various polls, all attempting to forecast the outcomes of the same 7 races:

Columbus Dispatch mail poll (20% response rate): 1.9% average error
The Ohio Poll (telephone): 6.1%
The Ohio State University Survey Research Unit Poll (telephone, undecideds dropped): 5.3%
The Ohio State University Survey Research Unit Poll (telephone, undecideds allocated): 5.4%

Another interesting result: The polls yielded biased predictions, just as we have seen previously: they overestimated the winner's margin of victory. Across the six races for public office, the winner's actual margin of victory was 14%. The telephone polls predicted the winner's margin of victory to be 21% on average (over-predicting by 7%), and the Dispatch predicted the winner's margin of victory to be 17% (over-predicting by 3%).

Because the winners of these races were all Republicans, this might appear to be a bias in favor of Republicans in these polls. But our own research on past election forecasting polling shows that the winner's margin of victory is usually over-predicted, regardless of whether the winner is a Republican or a Democrat.

If you're curious about why the Dispatch poll works so well, see our 1996 POQ article on the Dispatch poll.

And for those interested: I have never had anything to do with designing or running any of these polls.

I'm just a fascinated observer who wonders why more organizations don't follow the Dispatch's lead if we're all really pursuing accuracy in this game.

PS - The average errors shown above are calculated the same way we calculated average errors in our 1996 POQ article on the Dispatch poll: For each race, I subtracted the actual percentage of votes each candidate received from the percentage he/she was predicted to receive by the poll. Then I took the absolute value of that number. Then I averaged the resulting numbers for all candidates in a race to get an average error for that race. Then I averaged all the race average errors to yield an overall average error for each polling method.

-----_3890382==_.ALT
Content-Type: text/html; charset="us-ascii"

```
<html>
<font size=3>An update on the Columbus Dispatch mail poll's performance in
Ohio:<br> <br> Adding
additional results that were not published by the news media (and therefore
not
available to me when I
sent yesterday's message), here are the average errors for various polls, all
attempting to forecast
the outcomes of the same 7 races:<br> <br> Columbus Dispatch mail poll (20%
response rate): 1.9%
average error<br> The Ohio Poll (telephone): 6.1%<br> The Ohio State
University
Survey Research Unit
Poll (telephone, undecideds dropped): 5.3% <br> The Ohio State University
Survey Research Unit Poll
(telephone, undecideds allocated): 5.4%<br> <br> Another interesting result:
The polls yielded biased
predictions, just as we have seen previously: they overestimated the winner's
margin of victory.&nbsp;
Across the six races for public office, the winner's actual margin of victory
was 14%.&nbsp; The
telephone polls predicted the winner's margin of victory to be 21% on average
(over-predicting by 7%),
and the Dispatch predicted the winner's margin of victory to be 17% (over-
predicting by 3%).&nbsp; <br>
<br> Because the winners of these races were all Republicans, this might
appear
to be a bias in favor
of Republicans in these polls.&nbsp; But our own research on past election
```

forecasting polling shows that the winner's margin of victory is usually over-predicted, regardless of whether the winner is a Republican or a Democrat.

 If you're curious about why the Dispatch poll works so well, see our 1996 POQ article on the Dispatch poll.

 And for those interested: I have never had anything to do with designing or running any of these polls. I'm just a fascinated observer who wonders why more organizations don't follow the Dispatch's lead if we're all really pursuing accuracy in this game.

 PS - The average errors shown above are calculated the same way we calculated average errors in our 1996 POQ article on the Dispatch poll: For each race, I subtracted the actual percentage of votes each candidate received from the percentage he/she was predicted to receive by the poll. Then I took the absolute value of that number. Then I averaged the resulting numbers for all candidates in a race to get an average error for that race. Then I averaged all the race average errors to yield an overall average error for each polling method.

 </html>

-----_3890382==_.ALT--

>From M.SCHULMAN@srbi.com Fri Nov 6 09:11:56 1998
Received: from srbi.com ([12.14.34.4])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
id JAA04253 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 6 Nov 1998 09:11:55 -0800
(PST)
Received: from SRBI_NEW_YORK-Message_Server by srbi.com
with Novell_GroupWise; Fri, 06 Nov 1998 12:08:29 -0500
Message-Id: <s642e6bd.001@srbi.com>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2
Date: Fri, 06 Nov 1998 12:08:44 -0500
From: "MARK SCHULMAN " <M.SCHULMAN@srbi.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Comparisons of Poll Accuracy
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Content-Disposition: inline

We all know that the Literary Digest Poll had a great track record = too...until 1936. I'm not sure why we're examining the so-called = "accuracy" of polls that use flawed methods. Why not compare our polls to = the pre-election gleanings of political commentators make as well?

This = would make just
as much sense!

>>> Jon Krosnick <Krosnick.1@osu.edu> 11/06/98 10:25AM >>>
An update on the Columbus Dispatch mail poll's performance in Ohio:

Adding additional results that were not published by the news media (and
therefore not available to me
when I sent yesterday's message), here are = the average errors for various
polls, all attempting to
forecast the outcomes = of the same 7 races:

Columbus Dispatch mail poll (20% response rate): 1.9% average error
The Ohio Poll (telephone): 6.1%
The Ohio State University Survey Research Unit Poll (telephone, undecideds
dropped): 5.3%
The Ohio State University Survey Research Unit Poll (telephone, undecideds
allocated): 5.4%

Another interesting result: The polls yielded biased predictions, just as =
we
have seen previously:
they overestimated the winner's margin of victory.=20=

Across the six races for public office, the winner's actual margin of =
victory
was 14%. The telephone
polls predicted the winner's margin of victory to = be 21% on average (over-
predicting by 7%), and the
Dispatch predicted the = winner's margin of victory to be 17% (over-
predicting
by 3%). =20

Because the winners of these races were all Republicans, this might appear =
to
be a bias in favor of
Republicans in these polls. But our own research on = past election
forecasting polling shows that the
winner's margin of victory is usually over-predicted, regardless of whether
the
winner is a Republican
= or a Democrat. =20

If you're curious about why the Dispatch poll works so well, see our 1996 =
POQ
article on the Dispatch
poll.

And for those interested: I have never had anything to do with designing = or

running any of these
polls. I'm just a fascinated observer who wonders = why more organizations
don't follow the Dispatch's
lead if we're all really pursuing accuracy in this game.

PS - The average errors shown above are calculated the same way we =
calculated
average errors in our
1996 POQ article on the Dispatch poll: For each = race, I subtracted the
actual
percentage of votes
each candidate received from the percentage he/she was predicted to receive
by
the poll. Then I took
the absolute value of that number. Then I averaged the resulting numbers for
=
all candidates in a
race to get an average error for that race. Then I = averaged all the race
average errors to yield an
overall average error for each = polling method.

>From mitofsky@mindspring.com Fri Nov 6 09:26:03 1998
Received: from camel8.mindspring.com (camel8.mindspring.com [207.69.200.58])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id JAA09812 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 6 Nov 1998 09:26:01 -0800
(PST)
Received: from default (user-38ld1dk.dialup.mindspring.com [209.86.133.180])
by camel8.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id MAA05191
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 6 Nov 1998 12:26:00 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <199811061726.MAA05191@camel8.mindspring.com>
X-Sender: mitofsky@pop.mindspring.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.2
Date: Fri, 06 Nov 1998 12:26:08 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
Subject: Re: Comparisons of Poll Accuracy
In-Reply-To: <s642e6bd.001@srbi.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

I am not sure I agree with Mark. When a polling method consistently estimates
elections accurately we
should have enough curiosity to learn if there is an underlying reason. The
Columbus Dispatch has been
too right for too long to dismiss its work even though it does not use
recognized scientific methods of
polling. If we ignore their work we run the risk of missing something
important. I would not put the

Literary Digest Poll in the same class. There was a pretty good article in POQ on the subject.

warren mitofsky

At 12:08 PM 11/6/98 -0500, Mark Schulman wrote:

>We all know that the Literary Digest Poll had a great track record too...until 1936. I'm not sure why we're examining the so-called "accuracy" of

polls that use flawed methods. Why not compare our polls to the pre-election gleanings of political commentators make as

well? This would make just as much sense!

>

>

>>>> Jon Krosnick <Krosnick.1@osu.edu> 11/06/98 10:25AM >>>

>An update on the Columbus Dispatch mail poll's performance in Ohio:

>

>Adding additional results that were not published by the news media >(and therefore not available to me when I sent yesterday's message), >here are the average errors for various polls, all attempting to >forecast the outcomes of the same 7 races:

>

>Columbus Dispatch mail poll (20% response rate): 1.9% average error The

>Ohio Poll (telephone): 6.1% The Ohio State University Survey Research

>Unit Poll (telephone, undecideds

>dropped): 5.3%

>The Ohio State University Survey Research Unit Poll (telephone, undecideds

>allocated): 5.4%

>

>Another interesting result: The polls yielded biased predictions, just >as we have seen previously: they overestimated the winner's margin of >victory. Across the six races for public office, the winner's actual >margin of victory was 14%. The telephone polls predicted the winner's >margin of victory to be 21% on average (over-predicting by 7%), and the >Dispatch predicted the

winner's

>margin of victory to be 17% (over-predicting by 3%).

>

>Because the winners of these races were all Republicans, this might >appear to be a bias in favor of Republicans in these polls. But our >own research on

past

>election forecasting polling shows that the winner's margin of victory

>is usually over-predicted, regardless of whether the winner is a

>Republican or a Democrat.

>

>If you're curious about why the Dispatch poll works so well, see our

>1996 POQ article on the Dispatch poll.

>
>And for those interested: I have never had anything to do with
>designing or running any of these polls. I'm just a fascinated
>observer who wonders why more organizations don't follow the Dispatch's
>lead if we're all really pursuing accuracy in this game.
>
>PS - The average errors shown above are calculated the same way we
>calculated average errors in our 1996 POQ article on the Dispatch poll:
>For each race, I subtracted the actual percentage of votes each
>candidate received from the percentage he/she was predicted to receive
>by the poll. Then I took the absolute value of that number. Then I
>averaged the resulting numbers for all candidates in a race to get an
>average error for that race. Then I averaged all the race average
>errors to yield an overall average error for each
polling
>method.
>

Mitofsky International
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
New York, NY 10022

212 980-3031 Phone
212 980-3107 FAX
mitofsky@mindspring.com

>From david@lha.gsbc.com Fri Nov 6 09:38:35 1998
Received: from vserver1.gsbc.com (vserver1.gsbc.com [206.1.46.4])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
id JAA16705 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 6 Nov 1998 09:38:01 -0800
(PST)
Received: by vserver1.gsbc.com with VINES-ISMTMP; Fri, 6 Nov 98 12:37:16 -0500
Date: Fri, 6 Nov 98 12:36:07 -0500
Message-ID: <vines.Utk8+5CnEqB@vserver1.gsbc.com>
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
From: "David Krane" <david@lha.gsbc.com>
Reply-To: <david@lha.gsbc.com>
Subject: Re: Comparisons of Poll Accuracy
X-Incognito-SN: 788
X-Incognito-Version: 4.11.23
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Can anyone point to a good description of the Columbus Dispatch's
methodology?

Original Text

From: "Warren Mitofsky" <mitofsky@mindspring.com>, on 11/6/98 12:26 PM: I am
not sure I agree with
Mark. When a polling method consistently estimates elections accurately we

should have enough curiosity
to learn if there is an underlying reason. The Columbus Dispatch has been too
right for too long to
dismiss its work even though it does not use recognized scientific methods of
polling. If we ignore
their work we run the risk of missing something important. I would not put
the
Literary Digest Poll in
the same class. There was a pretty good article in POQ on the subject.
warren mitofsky

At 12:08 PM 11/6/98 -0500, Mark Schulman wrote:

>We all know that the Literary Digest Poll had a great track record
too...until 1936. I'm not sure why we're examining the so-called "accuracy"
of
polls that use flawed
methods. Why not compare our polls to the pre-election gleanings of
political
commentators make as
well? This would make just as much sense!

>

>

>>>> Jon Krosnick <Krosnick.1@osu.edu> 11/06/98 10:25AM >>>

>An update on the Columbus Dispatch mail poll's performance in Ohio:

>

>Adding additional results that were not published by the news media
>(and therefore not available to me when I sent yesterday's message),
>here are

the

>average errors for various polls, all attempting to forecast the

>outcomes

of

>the same 7 races:

>

>Columbus Dispatch mail poll (20% response rate): 1.9% average error The

>Ohio Poll (telephone): 6.1% The Ohio State University Survey Research

>Unit Poll (telephone, undecideds

>dropped): 5.3%

>The Ohio State University Survey Research Unit Poll (telephone, undecideds

>allocated): 5.4%

>

>Another interesting result: The polls yielded biased predictions, just

>as

we

>have seen previously: they overestimated the winner's margin of

>victory.

>Across the six races for public office, the winner's actual margin of

victory

>was 14%. The telephone polls predicted the winner's margin of victory

>to

be
>21% on average (over-predicting by 7%), and the Dispatch predicted the
>winner's
>margin of victory to be 17% (over-predicting by 3%).
>
>Because the winners of these races were all Republicans, this might
>appear
>to
>be a bias in favor of Republicans in these polls. But our own research
>on
>past
>election forecasting polling shows that the winner's margin of victory
>is usually over-predicted, regardless of whether the winner is a
>Republican
or a
>Democrat.
>
>If you're curious about why the Dispatch poll works so well, see our
>1996
POQ
>article on the Dispatch poll.
>
>And for those interested: I have never had anything to do with
>designing
or
>running any of these polls. I'm just a fascinated observer who wonders
why
>more organizations don't follow the Dispatch's lead if we're all really
>pursuing accuracy in this game.
>
>PS - The average errors shown above are calculated the same way we
calculated
>average errors in our 1996 POQ article on the Dispatch poll: For each
>race,
I
>subtracted the actual percentage of votes each candidate received from
>the percentage he/she was predicted to receive by the poll. Then I
>took the absolute value of that number. Then I averaged the resulting
>numbers for
all
>candidates in a race to get an average error for that race. Then I
averaged
>all the race average errors to yield an overall average error for each
polling
>method.
>

Mitofsky International
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
New York, NY 10022

212 980-3031 Phone
212 980-3107 FAX
mitofsky@mindspring.com

David Krane
Louis Harris and Associates
111 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10003
(Tel) 212-539-9648
(Fax)212-539-9669
(Email) david@lha.gsbc.com

>From hkassarj@ucla.edu Fri Nov 6 10:08:01 1998

Received: from theta2.ben2.ucla.edu (theta2.ben2.ucla.edu [164.67.131.36])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id KAA03302 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 6 Nov 1998 10:07:59 -0800
(PST)

Received: from kassarjian-dell (comserv2-4.anderson.ucla.edu [164.67.166.94])
by theta2.ben2.ucla.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id KAA42668;
Fri, 6 Nov 1998 10:07:45 -0800

Message-Id: <2.2.32.19981106180934.00690a38@pop.ben2.ucla.edu>

X-Sender: hkassarj@pop.ben2.ucla.edu

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.2 (32)

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Date: Fri, 06 Nov 1998 10:09:34 -0800

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: "H. H. Kassarjian" <hkassarj@ucla.edu>

Subject: Re: Comparisons of Poll Accuracy

In Response to Schulman re: Literary Digest accuracy. It seems to me that the
quota control polls that
emerged in 1936 also had a pretty good track record until 1948. In
actuality,
the best predictor has
always been height. At least in presidential elections, throughout the
history
of this country, the
taller candidate has always won (although I have not yet checked the
elections
in the past 20-25 years,
I am confident it would hold up then
also.). Schulman's point is well taken! Nevertheless, off-beat methods
can be sorta right some of the time, according to statistics course I once
taught. And that's the
stuff that's fun to compare. And Bill is taller than Newt, ... afterall... I
think! Hal Kassarjian

At 12:08 PM 11/6/98 -0500, you wrote:

>We all know that the Literary Digest Poll had a great track record too...until 1936. I'm not sure why we're examining the so-called "accuracy" of polls that use flawed methods. Why not compare our polls to the pre-election gleanings of political commentators make as well? This would make just as much sense!

>
>
>>> Jon Krosnick <Krosnick.1@osu.edu> 11/06/98 10:25AM >>>
>An update on the Columbus Dispatch mail poll's performance in Ohio:
>
>Adding additional results that were not published by the news media >(and therefore not available to me when I sent yesterday's message), >here are the average errors for various polls, all attempting to >forecast the outcomes of the same 7 races:
>
>Columbus Dispatch mail poll (20% response rate): 1.9% average error
>Ohio Poll (telephone): 6.1%
>The Ohio State University Survey Research Unit Poll (telephone, undecideds >dropped): 5.3%
>The Ohio State University Survey Research Unit Poll (telephone, undecideds >allocated): 5.4%
>
>Another interesting result: The polls yielded biased predictions, just >as we have seen previously: they overestimated the winner's margin of >victory. Across the six races for public office, the winner's actual >margin of victory was 14%. The telephone polls predicted the winner's >margin of victory to be 21% on average (over-predicting by 7%), and the >Dispatch predicted the winner's margin of victory to be 17% (over-predicting by 3%).
>
>Because the winners of these races were all Republicans, this might >appear to be a bias in favor of Republicans in these polls. But our >own research on past election forecasting polling shows that the >winner's margin of victory is usually over-predicted, regardless of >whether the winner is a Republican or a Democrat.
>
>If you're curious about why the Dispatch poll works so well, see our >1996 POQ article on the Dispatch poll.
>
>And for those interested: I have never had anything to do with >designing or running any of these polls. I'm just a fascinated >observer who wonders why more organizations don't follow the Dispatch's >lead if we're all really pursuing accuracy in this game.
>
>PS - The average errors shown above are calculated the same way we >calculated average errors in our 1996 POQ article on the Dispatch poll:
>For each race, I subtracted the actual percentage of votes each

>candidate received from the percentage he/she was predicted to receive
>by the poll. Then I took the absolute value of that number. Then I
>averaged the resulting numbers for all candidates in a race to get an
>average error for that race. Then I averaged all the race average
>errors to yield an overall average error for each polling method.

>
>
>

Hal Kassarjian
hkassarj@ucla.edu
Phone 1-818 784-5669
FAX 1-818 784-3325

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Fri Nov 6 10:50:09 1998
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id KAA17633 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 6 Nov 1998 10:50:06 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
id KAA22327 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 6 Nov 1998 10:50:07 -0800
(PST)
Date: Fri, 6 Nov 1998 10:50:06 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Comparisons of Poll Accuracy
In-Reply-To: <199811061726.MAA05191@camel8.mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.GS0.4.02.9811061022030.25238-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Although I agree with Warren on the Columbus Dispatch polling record, which
does seem interesting
enough to warrant further investigation, I also agree with Mark Schulman's
larger point (implied
earlier by Al Biderman in his report on the poll of high school students)
about
the folly of working
backward from successes in a stochastic world.

Consider: If all lawyers were *equally* good (i.e., had precisely a .5
probability of winning any
given case against any other lawyer), 1 lawyer out of every 1,024 lawyers
would
win 10 cases in a
row--a stunning record. What folly it would be, however, to study only these
particular lawyers in the

hope of learning the secrets of courtroom success. As folk wisdom makes the same point: Even the stopped clock is correct twice each day.

Until a few days ago, I thought everyone in AAPOR had long ago learned the lessons of the Literary Digest. Now, like Al and Mark, perhaps, I am getting just a little nervous...

-- Jim Beniger

On Fri, 6 Nov 1998, Warren Mitofsky wrote:

> I am not sure I agree with Mark. When a polling method consistently
> estimates elections accurately we should have enough curiosity to
> learn if there is an underlying reason. The Columbus Dispatch has been
> too right for too long to dismiss its work even though it does not use
> recognized scientific methods of polling. If we ignore their work we
> run the risk of missing something important. I would not put the
> Literary Digest Poll in the same class. There was a pretty good article in
POQ on the subject.
> warren mitofsky

>From pmeyer@email.unc.edu Fri Nov 6 13:32:33 1998
Received: from listserv.oit.unc.edu (listserv.oit.unc.edu [152.2.25.17])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id NAA15828 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 6 Nov 1998 13:32:31 -0800
(PST)
Received: from root@login6.isis.unc.edu (port 1368 [152.2.25.136]) by
listserv.oit.unc.edu with ESMTP
id <222445-23623>; Fri, 6 Nov 1998 16:30:14 -0500
Received: by email.unc.edu id <9242-68170>; Fri, 6 Nov 1998 16:31:23 -0500
Date: Fri, 6 Nov 1998 16:31:11 -0500 (EST)
Sender: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>
X-Sender: pmeyer@login6.isis.unc.edu
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Comparisons of Poll Accuracy
In-Reply-To: <Pine.GS0.4.02.9811061022030.25238-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Message-ID: <Pine.A41.3.95L.981106162213.5322B-100000@login6.isis.unc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

I, too, was skeptical about the Dispatch poll. In fact, in 1982, if memory serves, I advised them to drop it. But there are some theoretical justifications that we may have overlooked. Don Dillman reminded me of them when I interviewed him for a USA Today op-ed piece (Nov. 2). The self-administered

format means that:

1. You can ask a truly unbiased question by presenting a sample ballot.
2. The bias that comes from the social interaction with the interviewer (leading to non-attitudes passed off as genuine attitudes) is absent.
3. The respondent has time to think about his/her answer.
4. Identifying registered voters is no problem because that is the source of the sample.

It's true that the response rate is poor, but at least it can be calculated.

With RDD, you have to guess whether the phones that never answer had eligible respondents behind them or not.

Don will have a piece on this in the forthcoming Gallup Research Journal. Don, if you are guarding this channel, would you like to enlighten us?

```
=====
Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism  Voice: 919 962-4085
CB 3365 Howell Hall                      Fax: 919 962-1549
University of North Carolina             Cell: 919 906-3425
Chapel Hill NC 27599-3365                http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer
=====
```

```
>From Krosnick.1@osu.edu Fri Nov 6 13:53:29 1998
Received: from mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu (root@mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu
[128.146.214.32])
    by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
    id NAA25906 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 6 Nov 1998 13:53:25 -0800
(PST)
Received: from PC342.psy.ohio-state.edu (pc342.psy.ohio-state.edu
[128.146.254.42])
    by mail3.uts.ohio-state.edu (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with SMTP id QAA26888
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 6 Nov 1998 16:53:22 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <4.1.19981106164705.013c3810@pop.service.ohio-state.edu>
X-Sender: krosnick@pop.service.ohio-state.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.1
Date: Fri, 06 Nov 1998 16:53:59 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Jon Krosnick <Krosnick.1@osu.edu>
Subject: Fwd: Re: Comparisons of Poll Accuracy
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
    boundary="=====_27222256==_._ALT"
```

```
-----_27222256==_._ALT
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
```


>X-Incognito-SN: 788
>Date: Fri, 06 Nov 1998 12:36:07 -0500
>From: David Krane <david@lha.gsbc.com>
>Subject: Re: Comparisons of Poll Accuracy
>Sender: owner-aapornet@usc.edu
>To: aapornet@usc.edu
>Reply-to: david@lha.gsbc.com
>X-Incognito-Version: 4.11.23
>
>Can anyone point to a good description of the Columbus Dispatch's
>methodology?

Our paper describes the methodology in detail. Public Opinion Quarterly
1996,
vol. 60, pp. 181-227.

Phil Meyer's summary of Don Dillman's observations includes only some of the
reasons why the Dispatch Poll works better. Our article lists and
empirically
documents the impact of many others.

And our forthcoming chapter in Paul Lavrakas and Mike Traugott's book shows
how
the conventional methodology of telephone polls can be significantly improved
to substantially increase accuracy, making them nearly as good as the
Dispatch
Poll results (I am happy to send people electronic copies of the chapter).

Jon Krosnick
Professor of Psychology and Political Science
Ohio State University
1885 Neil Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210

-----_27222256==_.ALT
Content-Type: text/html; charset="us-ascii"

<html>
>X-Incognito-SN: 788

>Date: Fri, 06 Nov 1998 12:36:07 -0500

>From: David Krane <david@lha.gsbc.com>

>Subject: Re: Comparisons of Poll Accuracy

>Sender: owner-aapornet@usc.edu

>To: aapornet@usc.edu

>Reply-to: david@lha.gsbc.com

>X-Incognito-Version: 4.11.23

>

>Can anyone point to a good description of the Columbus Dispatch's

>methodology?

Our paper describes the methodology in detail. Public Opinion
Quarterly 1996, vol. 60, pp. 181-227.

Phil Meyer's summary of Don Dillman's observations includes only some of
the reasons why the Dispatch Poll works better. Our article lists
and empirically documents the impact of many others.

And our forthcoming chapter in Paul Lavrakas and Mike Traugott's book
shows how the conventional methodology of telephone polls can be
significantly improved to substantially increase accuracy, making them
nearly as good as the Dispatch Poll results (I am happy to send
people electronic copies of the chapter).

Jon Krosnick

Professor of Psychology and Political Science

Ohio State University

1885 Neil Avenue

Columbus, Ohio 43210

</html>

-----_2722256==_.ALT--

>From surveys@wco.com Fri Nov 6 15:22:40 1998
Received: from mailhub2.ncal.verio.com (mailhub2.ncal.verio.com
[204.247.247.54])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id PAA28635 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 6 Nov 1998 15:22:40 -0800
(PST)
Received: from compaq (sextans126.wco.com [209.21.28.126])
by mailhub2.ncal.verio.com (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id PAA28884
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 6 Nov 1998 15:22:36 -0800 (PST)
Message-ID: <008b01be09dc\$60dffe20\$6a7afea9@compaq>
From: "Hank Zucker" <surveys@wco.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Comparisons of Poll Accuracy
Date: Fri, 6 Nov 1998 15:16:43 -0800
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

>In actuality, the best predictor has always been height.
>At least in presidential elections, throughout the history of this country,
>the taller candidate has always won (although I have not yet checked the
>elections in the past 20-25 years, I am confident it would hold up then
>also.).

It does. For example, in '92 Clinton was tallest candidate in either party
& Bush was tallest Republican. Only one candidate in either party was less
than 6'0" (Tsongas - one of the first to drop out).

And not just Presidential races. In Senate races with two non-incumbent men
running, the taller has won the large majority of the time - not always, but
far more often than could be attributed to chance.

This could be an interesting public opinion investigation. Why is the
public so prejudiced in favor of tall men?

Hank Zucker
Creative Research Systems
makers of The Survey System: Survey Software that Makes You Look Good
<http://www.surveysystem.com>
<mailto:surveys@wco.com>

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

From: H. H. Kassarian <hkassarj@ucla.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Friday, November 06, 1998 10:52 AM
Subject: Re: Comparisons of Poll Accuracy

>In Response to Schulman re: Literary Digest accuracy. It seems to me that
>the quota control polls that emerged in 1936 also had a pretty good track
>record until 1948. In actuality, the best predictor has always been
height.
>At least in presidential elections, throughout the history of this country,
>the taller candidate has always won (although I have not yet checked the
>elections in the past 20-25 years, I am confident it would hold up then
>also.). Schulman's point is well taken! Nevertheless, off-beat methods
>can be sorta right some of the time, according to statistics course I once
>taught. And that's the stuff that's fun to compare. And Bill is taller
than
>Newt, ... afterall... I think!
>Hal Kassarian
>*****

>From david@lha.gsbc.com Fri Nov 6 15:49:51 1998
Received: from vserver1.gsbc.com (vserver1.gsbc.com [206.1.46.4])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
id PAA08450 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 6 Nov 1998 15:49:47 -0800
(PST)
Received: by vserver1.gsbc.com with VINES-ISMTMP; Fri, 6 Nov 98 18:48:55 -0500
Date: Fri, 6 Nov 98 18:38:21 -0500
Message-ID: <vines.Utk8+hVsEqA@vserver1.gsbc.com>
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
From: "David Krane" <david@lha.gsbc.com>
Reply-To: <david@lha.gsbc.com>
Subject: Predicting Presidential Elections
X-Incognito-SN: 788
X-Incognito-Version: 4.11.23
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Speaking of predicting elections, we have found nine ways - some serious, some rational, some peculiar:

- 1) Incumbents presidents who coast to renomination, without a challenger from within their own party, win. Incumbents whose renominations are seriously challenged lose.
- 2) Incumbent presidents with positive performance ratings in the polls win. Those with negative ratings lose.
- 3) The candidate who is ahead in the first polls after Labor Day wins
- 4) The party of the incumbent president wins if consumer confidence index (from the Conference Board) is 100 or higher and loses if it is below 100.
- 5) If real disposable income increases by 3.8% in the year before an election, the incumbent party winds; if not, it loses.
- 6) If unemployment is falling the incumbent party winds; if unemployment is rising the challenging party wins.
- 7) The taller of the two candidates win.
- 8) No left-handed president has ever been elected and reelected for a second term.
- 9) If the Yankees win the World Series, the Republican candidate wins; when the Yankees lose the World Series the Democrat wins.

If anyone has any others, we'd love to hear 'em.

David Krane
Louis Harris and Associates
111 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10003
(Tel) 212-539-9648
(Fax)212-539-9669
(Email) david@lha.gsbc.com

>From abider@earthlink.net Fri Nov 6 17:11:41 1998
Received: from scaup.prod.itd.earthlink.net (scaup.prod.itd.earthlink.net
[207.217.120.49])

by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTTP
id RAA04582 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 6 Nov 1998 17:11:39 -0800

(PST)

Received: from alvbysy (sdn-ar-002dcwashP240.dialsprint.net [168.191.22.65])
by scaup.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.8.7/8.8.5) with SMTP id RAA05898
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 6 Nov 1998 17:11:36 -0800 (PST)

Message-ID: <000f01be09eb\$baa9b040\$4116bfa8@alvbysy>

Reply-To: "Albert Biderman" <abider@earthlink.net>

From: "Albert Biderman" <abider@earthlink.net>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Predicting Presidential Elections (New Heights)

Date: Fri, 6 Nov 1998 20:12:41 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="-----=_NextPart_000_000C_01BE09C1.CEE980A0"

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.2106.4

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----=_NextPart_000_000C_01BE09C1.CEE980A0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64
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v
bmUgbWF5IGRldGVjdCwgXkgZmF2b3JpdGUGchJvc3B1Y3RpdmUgY2FuZGlkYXRlIGlzlIFJvYmVy
dCBSZWljaC4NCg0KQnkgdGh1IHdheSwgYm93IHRoYXQgdGhleSBoYXZlIHJlY2VpdmVklEppbSBC
ZW5pZ2VzJ3MgZW5kb3JzZW11bnQsIEkgdW5kZXJzdGFuZCB0aGUGaGlnaCBzY2hvb2wg3R1ZGVu
dHMgYXZlIG5vdCBhYm91dCB0byBnaXZlIHRoZWlyIG1ldGhvZG9sb2dpY2FsIHh1Y3JlIHMGYXdh
eSBmcmVlIGFzIHRoZSBDb2x1bWJpYSBEaXNwYXRjaCBkb2VzIGJ1dCBhcmUgcGxhbm5pbmcmcYSBt

dwX0aS1jaXR5IGRpZGFjdGljIHNlbWluYXlIgdG91ciAoUmVnaXN0cmF0aW9uIEZlZSA0LSQ1MDApLg0KDQpBbCBCaWRlcm1hbiAgDQphYm1kZXJAYW1lcm1jYW4uZWR1DQo=

-----=_NextPart_000_000C_01BE09C1.CEE980A0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64

PCFET0NUWVBFIEhUTUwgUFVCTE1DICI+Ly9XM0MvL0RURCBXMyBIVE1MLy9FTiI+DQo8SFRNTD4N
CjxIRUFEPg0KDQo8TUVUQSbj250ZW50PXRleHQuaHRtbDtdjaGFyc2V0PWlzbj04ODU5LTFEgaHR0
cC1lcXVpdj1Db250ZW50LVR5cGU+DQo8TUVUQSbj250ZW50PSciTVNIVE1MIDQuNzIuMjEwNi42
IicgbmFtZT1HRU5FUkFUT1I+DQo8L0hfQUU+DQo8QK9EWSBiZ0NvbG9yPSNmZmZmZmY+DQo8RElW
PjxGT05UIGNvbG9yPSMwMDAwMDAgZmFjZT0iRnV0dXJhIE1kIEJUUiBzaXplPTI+SXQncyBnb29k
IHRvIHNlZSB0aGUgDQpwcmVkaWNoaw9uIGRpc2N1c3Npb24gbW92aW5nIGJleW9uZCBYcGZlZmVw
aXJpY2lzbS4mbmJzcDsgVGhlcmUgYXJlIGV4Y2VsbgVudCANCnRoZW9yZXRpY2FsIHJlYXNvbnMg
Zm9yIHB1dHRpbmccgXVpdGUgYSBiaXQgb2Ygd2VpZ2h0IG9uIGhlaWdodC4mbmJzcDsgDQo8L0ZP
TlQ+PC9ESVY+DQo8RElWpJxGT05UIGNvbG9yPSMwMDAwMDAgZmFjZT0iRnV0dXJhIE1kIEJUUiBz
aXplPTI+PC9GT05UPiZuYnNwOzwvRElWpG0KPERJVj48Rk9OVCBjb2xvcj0jMDAwMDAwIGZhY2U9
IkZ1dHVyYSBNZCBCVCIGc2l6ZT0yPk5ld3QsIGl0IHNlZW1zLCZuYnNwOyBtYXkgDQpoYXZlIGNh
dWdodCBvbiB0byB0aGUgaW1wb3J0YW5jZSBvZiBoZWlnaHQsIGFsdGhvdWdoLCBiZW5hdXNlIG9m
Jm5ic3A7IEExpbmNvbG4gDQp2LiBEb3VnbGFzJm5ic3A7IGluIElsbGluZ2l2LCBpdCBYZW1haW5z
IGEgZGVlYXRhYmxlIGZhY3Rvci4gPC9GT05UPjwvRElWpG0KPERJVj48Rk9OVCBjb2xvcj0jMDAw
MDAwIGZhY2U9IkZ1dHVyYSBNZCBCVCIGc2l6ZT0yPjwvRk90VD4mbmJzcDsgL0RJVj4NCjxESVY+
PEZPTlQgY29sb3I9IzAwMDAwMCMwYWNlPSJGdXR1cmEgTWQgQlQiIHNpemU9Mj5BbHNvL0CBiZW5hdXNl
dXNlIHRoZXkgd2VyZSANCmhlcmV0b2ZvciBoawRkZW4gdmFyaWFiGvZLCB3ZSBtYXkgYmUgYmVn
bGVjdGluZyB0aGUgaW1wb3J0YW5jZSBvZiBvdGhlcianCmRpc3Rpbmd1aXNoaw5nIGNoYXJhY3Rl
cm1ldGJlcj04mbmJzcDsgL0ZPTlQ+PC9ESVY+DQo8RElWpJxGT05UIGNvbG9yPSMwMDAwMDAgZmFj
ZT0iRnV0dXJhIE1kIEJUUiBzaXplPTI+PC9GT05UPiZuYnNwOzwvRElWpG0KPERJVj48Rk9OVCBj
b2xvcj0jMDAwMDAwIGZhY2U9IkZ1dHVyYSBNZCBCVCIGc2l6ZT0yPkFzIG9uZSBtYXkgZGV0ZW50
LCBteSANCmZhdn9yaXRlIHByb3NwZW50aXZlIGNhbmRpZGF0ZSBpcyBSb2JlcnQgUmVpY2guPC9G
T05UPjwvRElWpG0KPERJVj48Rk9OVCBjb2xvcj0jMDAwMDAwIGZhY2U9IkZ1dHVyYSBNZCBCVCIGc
2l6ZT0yPjwvRk90VD4mbmJzcDsgL0RJVj4NCjxESVY+PEZPTlQgY29sb3I9IzAwMDAwMCMwYWNl
PSJGdXR1cmEgTWQgQlQiIHNpemU9Mj5CeSB0aGUgD2F5L0CBub3cgdGhhdCB0aGV5IA0KaGF2ZSBy
ZW50aXZlZCBCaW0gQmVuaWdlcidzIGVvZG9yc2VtZW50L0CBjIHVvZGVyc3RhbmdGdGh1IGhpZ2gg
c2Nob29sIHN0dWRlbnRzIA0KYXJlIG5vdCBhYm91dCB0byBnaXZlIHRoZWlyIGl1dGhvdG9sb2dp
Y2FsIHJlY3JlZHMgYXdsb29uZSBmcmVlIGFzIHRoZSBDb2x1bWJpYSA0KPC9GT05UPjwvRElWpG0KPERJVj48
Rk9OVCBjb2xvcj0jMDAwMDAwIGZhY2U9IkZ1dHVyYSBNZCBCVCIGc2l6ZT0yPkFsIEJpZGVyYbWfu
Jm5ic3A7IA0KPC9GT05UPjwvRElWpG0KPERJVj48Rk9OVCBjb2xvcj0jMDAwMDAwIGZhY2U9IkZ1
dHVyYSBNZCBCVCIGc2l6ZT0yPjxBIA0KaHJlZj0ibWVpbnRvOmFiaWRlckBhbWVyaWNhbi5lZHUu
PmFiaWRlckBhbWVyaWNhbi5lZHU8L0E+PC9GT05UPjwvRElWpG0KPERJVj48Rk9EWT48L0hUTUw+DQo=

-----=_NextPart_000_000C_01BE09C1.CEE980A0--

>From dhenwood@panix.com Fri Nov 6 17:31:05 1998
Received: from mail2.panix.com (mail2.panix.com [166.84.0.213])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP

id RAA09608 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 6 Nov 1998 17:31:03 -0800
(PST)
Received: from [166.84.250.86] (dhenwood.dialup.access.net [166.84.250.86])
by mail2.panix.com (8.8.8/8.8.8/PanixM1.3) with ESMTTP id UAA13869
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 6 Nov 1998 20:30:59 -0500 (EST)
X-Sender: dhenwood@popserver.panix.com
Message-Id: <l03130304b2695267a86a@[166.84.250.86]>
In-Reply-To: <000f01be09eb\$baa9b040\$4116bfa8@alvbynsy>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Fri, 6 Nov 1998 20:30:58 -0500
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@panix.com>
Subject: Re: Predicting Presidential Elections (New Heights)

I developed a little regression model of presidential elections that retrospectively predicted 10 of the last 12 elections (through 1992) and prospectively the 1996 election. Inputs are the presidential approval rating (from Gallup) and the year-to-year change in real disposable personal income per capita, both as of the second quarter of the election year; outcome is the percentage point gap between the incumbent and challenging parties. The only 2 it missed were 1960 (which Nixon would have won, if it hadn't been for all those dead Chicago voters) and 1976, which was clouded by Watergate. It was quoted in Barron's in June 1996, and I wrote it up in LBO shortly thereafter, so I'm not making this up!

Doug

--

Doug Henwood
Left Business Observer
250 W 85 St
New York NY 10024-3217 USA
+1-212-874-4020 voice +1-212-874-3137 fax
email: <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>
web: <http://www.panix.com/~dhenwood/LBO_home.html>

>From MILTGOLD@aol.com Fri Nov 6 17:32:28 1998
Received: from imo19.mx.aol.com (imo19.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.9])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTTP
id RAA10455; Fri, 6 Nov 1998 17:32:25 -0800 (PST)
From: MILTGOLD@aol.com
Received: from MILTGOLD@aol.com
by imo19.mx.aol.com (IMOV16.10) id EXWEa04682;
Fri, 6 Nov 1998 20:31:39 +1900 (EST)
Message-ID: <addfcec0.3643a2fb@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 6 Nov 1998 20:31:39 EST
To: surveys@wco.com, owner-aapornet@usc.edu, aapornet@usc.edu

Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: Re: Re: Comparisons of Poll Accuracy
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 3.0 for Mac sub 79

In a message dated 11/6/98 6:24:45 PM, surveys@wco.com wrote:

<<This could be an interesting public opinion investigation. Why is the public so prejudiced in favor of tall men?
>>

A correlate of this finding: the taller the business executive, the more likely the person will achieve more. All this may be related to an ability to stand out in a crowd and exert leadership ability, etc. [I've read this somewhere]

Milton Goldsamt
Research Statistician
U. S. Dept. of Justice
miltgold@aol.com

>From Susan.Pinkus@latimes.com Fri Nov 6 17:46:23 1998
Received: from mail-lax-2.pilot.net (mail-lax-2.pilot.net [205.139.40.16])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id RAA15174 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 6 Nov 1998 17:46:21 -0800
(PST)

Received: from mailgw.latimes.com (unknown-c-23-147.latimes.com
[204.48.23.147]
(may be forged))

by mail-lax-2.pilot.net (Pilot/) with ESMTP id RAA06769;
Fri, 6 Nov 1998 17:46:20 -0800 (PST)

Received: from latimes.com (bierce.latimes.com [192.187.72.9]) by
mailgw.latimes.com (8.9.1/8.8.5) with
SMTP id RAA19300; Fri, 6 Nov 1998 17:46:20 -0800 (PST)

Received: from news.latimes.com (fowler.news.latimes.com [192.187.72.7]) by
latimes.com (8.6.10/8.6.9)

with ESMTP id RAA16536; Fri, 6 Nov 1998 17:46:19 -0800

Received: (from pinkus@localhost) by news.latimes.com (8.6.9/8.6.9) id
RAA97311; Fri, 6 Nov 1998
17:48:42 -0800

Date: Fri, 6 Nov 1998 17:48:42 -0800 (PST)

From: Susan Pinkus <Susan.Pinkus@latimes.com>

To: Hank Zucker <surveys@wco.com>

cc: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Comparisons of Poll Accuracy

In-Reply-To: <008b01be09dc\$60df20\$6a7afea9@compaq>

Message-ID: <Pine.A32.3.91.981106174746.45022A-
100000@fowler.news.latimes.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Does that include women in the mix. If the woman was the tallest in a race, did she win?

Susan Pinkus

On Fri, 6 Nov 1998, Hank Zucker wrote:

> >In actuality, the best predictor has always been height.
> >At least in presidential elections, throughout the history of this country,
> >the taller candidate has always won (although I have not yet checked the
> >elections in the past 20-25 years, I am confident it would hold up then
> >also.).
>
> It does. For example, in '92 Clinton was tallest candidate in either party
> & Bush was tallest Republican. Only one candidate in either party was less
> than 6'0" (Tsongas - one of the first to drop out).
>
> And not just Presidential races. In Senate races with two non-incumbent
men
> running, the taller has won the large majority of the time - not always,
but
> far more often than could be attributed to chance.
>
> This could be an interesting public opinion investigation. Why is the
> public so prejudiced in favor of tall men?
>
> Hank Zucker
> Creative Research Systems
> makers of The Survey System: Survey Software that Makes You Look Good
> <http://www.surveysystem.com>
> <mailto:surveys@wco.com>
>
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: H. H. Kassarjian <hkassarj@ucla.edu>
> To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
> Date: Friday, November 06, 1998 10:52 AM
> Subject: Re: Comparisons of Poll Accuracy
>
>
> >In Response to Schulman re: Literary Digest accuracy. It seems to me that
> >the quota control polls that emerged in 1936 also had a pretty good track

> >record until 1948. In actuality, the best predictor has always been
> height.
> >At least in presidential elections, throughout the history of this
country,
> >the taller candidate has always won (although I have not yet checked the
> >elections in the past 20-25 years, I am confident it would hold up then
> >also.). Schulman's point is well taken! Nevertheless, off-beat methods
> >can be sorta right some of the time, according to statistics course I once
> >taught. And that's the stuff that's fun to compare. And Bill is taller
> than
> >Newt, ... afterall... I think!
> >Hal Kassarjian
> >*****
>
>
>
>

*
**

Susan H. Pinkus
Los Angeles Times Poll
Internet:susan.pinkus@latimes.com
American Online: spinkus@aol.com
FAX: 213-237-2505

*
*

>From Susan.Pinkus@latimes.com Fri Nov 6 17:47:35 1998
Received: from mail-lax-2.pilot.net (mail-lax-2.pilot.net [205.139.40.16])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id RAA15726 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 6 Nov 1998 17:47:34 -0800
(PST)
Received: from mailgw.latimes.com (unknown-c-23-147.latimes.com
[204.48.23.147]
(may be forged))
by mail-lax-2.pilot.net (Pilot/) with ESMTP id RAA06969;
Fri, 6 Nov 1998 17:47:32 -0800 (PST)
Received: from latimes.com (bierce.latimes.com [192.187.72.9]) by
mailgw.latimes.com (8.9.1/8.8.5) with
SMTP id RAA19363; Fri, 6 Nov 1998 17:47:33 -0800 (PST)
Received: from news.latimes.com (fowler.news.latimes.com [192.187.72.7]) by
latimes.com (8.6.10/8.6.9)
with ESMTP id RAA16584; Fri, 6 Nov 1998 17:47:31 -0800
Received: (from pinkus@localhost) by news.latimes.com (8.6.9/8.6.9) id

RAA34449; Fri, 6 Nov 1998
17:49:55 -0800
Date: Fri, 6 Nov 1998 17:49:54 -0800 (PST)
From: Susan Pinkus <Susan.Pinkus@latimes.com>
To: Hank Zucker <surveys@wco.com>
cc: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Comparisons of Poll Accuracy
In-Reply-To: <008b01be09dc\$60dffe20\$6a7afea9@compaq>
Message-ID: <Pine.A32.3.91.981106174927.45022B-
100000@fowler.news.latimes.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Obviously, I didn't mean president, but if a woman ran in a senate, or house race.

On Fri, 6 Nov 1998, Hank Zucker wrote:

> >In actuality, the best predictor has always been height.
> >At least in presidential elections, throughout the history of this
> country,
> >the taller candidate has always won (although I have not yet checked the
> >elections in the past 20-25 years, I am confident it would hold up then
> >also.).
>
> It does. For example, in '92 Clinton was tallest candidate in either party
> & Bush was tallest Republican. Only one candidate in either party was less
> than 6'0" (Tsongas - one of the first to drop out).
>
> And not just Presidential races. In Senate races with two non-incumbent
> men
> running, the taller has won the large majority of the time - not always,
> but
> far more often than could be attributed to chance.
>
> This could be an interesting public opinion investigation. Why is the
> public so prejudiced in favor of tall men?
>
> Hank Zucker
> Creative Research Systems
> makers of The Survey System: Survey Software that Makes You Look Good
> <http://www.surveysystem.com>
> <mailto:surveys@wco.com>
>
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: H. H. Kassarian <hkassarj@ucla.edu>

> To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
> Date: Friday, November 06, 1998 10:52 AM
> Subject: Re: Comparisons of Poll Accuracy
>
>
> >In Response to Schulman re: Literary Digest accuracy. It seems to me that
> >the quota control polls that emerged in 1936 also had a pretty good track
> >record until 1948. In actuality, the best predictor has always been
> height.
> >At least in presidential elections, throughout the history of this
country,
> >the taller candidate has always won (although I have not yet checked the
> >elections in the past 20-25 years, I am confident it would hold up then
> >also.). Schulman's point is well taken! Nevertheless, off-beat methods
> >can be sorta right some of the time, according to statistics course I once
> >taught. And that's the stuff that's fun to compare. And Bill is taller
> than
> >Newt, ... afterall... I think!
> >Hal Kassarjian
> >*****
>
>
>
>

*
**

Susan H. Pinkus
Los Angeles Times Poll
Internet:susan.pinkus@latimes.com
American Online: spinkus@aol.com
FAX: 213-237-2505

*
*

>From David_Moore@gallup.com Sat Nov 7 09:26:33 1998
Received: from fw (fw.gallup.com [206.158.235.10])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
id JAA14621 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 7 Nov 1998 09:26:32 -0800
(PST)
From: David_Moore@gallup.com
Received: from exchng1.gallup.com by fw (SMI-8.6/SMI-SVR4)
id LAA13277; Sat, 7 Nov 1998 11:25:58 -0600
Received: by gallup.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2232.9)
id <W2DJ7LKA>; Sat, 7 Nov 1998 11:26:00 -0600

Message-ID: <D18E70780D62D1119580006008162F9033F3B7@exchn3.gallup.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: Comparisons of Poll Accuracy
Date: Sat, 7 Nov 1998 11:25:51 -0600
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2232.9)
Content-Type: text/plain

As one whose height does not qualify him to be in the NBA (if in fact the NBA itself were functioning), I should point out that George Romney was taller than Nixon, Dukakis was hardly the tallest Democrat in 1988 when he won the Democratic nomination, that JFK was shorter than LBJ when the former won the nomination in 1960, that Carter was shorter than Ford (1976, in case we forget), that Mondale was shorter than Hart, and that Bill is shorter than George. However, these exceptions do not deny the fundamental truth, depressing as it may be to some of us, that people with longer legs (both men and women) tend to have higher success rates in many professions (where appearance can have an effect) than those with shorter legs. From what I have read, being good looking is even more important than being tall.
Strike two!
David Moore

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Hank Zucker [SMTP:surveys@wco.com]
> Sent: Friday, November 06, 1998 5:17 PM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Re: Comparisons of Poll Accuracy
>
> >In actuality, the best predictor has always been height.
> >At least in presidential elections, throughout the history of this
> country,
> >the taller candidate has always won (although I have not yet checked the
> >elections in the past 20-25 years, I am confident it would hold up then
> >also.).
>
> It does. For example, in '92 Clinton was tallest candidate in either
> party
> & Bush was tallest Republican. Only one candidate in either party was
> less
> than 6'0" (Tsongas - one of the first to drop out).
>
> And not just Presidential races. In Senate races with two non-incumbent
> men
> running, the taller has won the large majority of the time - not always,
> but
> far more often than could be attributed to chance.
>
> This could be an interesting public opinion investigation. Why is the
> public so prejudiced in favor of tall men?
>

> Hank Zucker
> Creative Research Systems
> makers of The Survey System: Survey Software that Makes You Look Good
> <http://www.surveysystem.com>
> <mailto:surveys@wco.com>
>
>
>
>From s.kraus@mail.asic.csuohio.edu Sat Nov 7 10:34:45 1998
Received: from mail.asic.csuohio.edu (bones.asic.csuohio.edu [137.148.16.17])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id KAA25416 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 7 Nov 1998 10:34:43 -0800
(PST)
Received: from myhost.csuohio.edu (137.148.59.36) by mail.asic.csuohio.edu
with SMTP (MailShare 1.0fc6); Sat, 7 Nov 1998 13:34:19 -0500
X-Sender: s.kraus@bones.asic.csuohio.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "Dr. Sidney Kraus" <s.kraus@mail.asic.csuohio.edu>
Subject: Re: Comparisons of Poll Accuracy
Date: Sat, 7 Nov 1998 13:34:19 -0500
Message-ID: <1301676837-56494973@mail.asic.csuohio.edu>

If you ask those who help prepare presidential candidates for television debates height has always been a variable associated with "winning" a debate. Here are just two examples.

In 1976, Barry Jagoda, Carter's television advisor, suggested that Ford stand in a depressed area of the stage so that both he and Carter would appear the same height above the podium in head-on face shots on TV. Jagoda's mother called her son and admonished him, "Barry, why do you want to put the President in a hole?" (Kraus, The Great Debates: Carter vs. Ford, 1976)

In 1984, tall man, Vice President Bush, debated short woman, democratic vp candidate, Geraldine Ferraro. Once again, height discussions ensued. After the debate, Bush said, "We tried to kick a little ass last night." (G. Ferraro, Ferraro, My Story)

At 05:48 PM 11/6/98 -0800, you wrote:

>Does that include women in the mix. If the woman was the tallest in a
>race, did she win?

>
>Susan Pinkus

>
>
>

>
>On Fri, 6 Nov 1998, Hank Zucker wrote:
>
>> >In actuality, the best predictor has always been height.
>> >At least in presidential elections, throughout the history of this
country,
>> >the taller candidate has always won (although I have not yet checked the
>> >elections in the past 20-25 years, I am confident it would hold up then
>> >also.).
>>
>> It does. For example, in '92 Clinton was tallest candidate in either
party
>> & Bush was tallest Republican. Only one candidate in either party was
less
>> than 6'0" (Tsongas - one of the first to drop out).
>>
>> And not just Presidential races. In Senate races with two non-incumbent
men
>> running, the taller has won the large majority of the time - not always,
but
>> far more often than could be attributed to chance.
>>
>> This could be an interesting public opinion investigation. Why is the
>> public so prejudiced in favor of tall men?
>>
>> Hank Zucker
>> Creative Research Systems
>> makers of The Survey System: Survey Software that Makes You Look Good
>> <http://www.surveysystem.com>
>> <mailto:surveys@wco.com>
>>
>>
>>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: H. H. Kassarian <hkassarj@ucla.edu>
>> To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
>> Date: Friday, November 06, 1998 10:52 AM
>> Subject: Re: Comparisons of Poll Accuracy
>>
>>
>> >In Response to Schulman re: Literary Digest accuracy. It seems to me
that
>> >the quota control polls that emerged in 1936 also had a pretty good track
>> >record until 1948. In actuality, the best predictor has always been
>> height.
>> >At least in presidential elections, throughout the history of this
country,
>> >the taller candidate has always won (although I have not yet checked the
>> >elections in the past 20-25 years, I am confident it would hold up then
>> >also.). Schulman's point is well taken! Nevertheless, off-beat methods

>> >can be sorta right some of the time, according to statistics course I
once
>> >taught. And that's the stuff that's fun to compare. And Bill is taller
>> than
>> >Newt, ... afterall... I think!
>> >Hal Kassarjian
>> >*****
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>

>*****
>*****

>Susan H. Pinkus
>Los Angeles Times Poll
>Internet:susan.pinkus@latimes.com
>American Online: spinkus@aol.com
>FAX: 213-237-2505

>*****
*
**
>
>
>

>From RFunk787@aol.com Sat Nov 7 10:52:52 1998
Received: from imo14.mx.aol.com (imo14.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.4])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id KAA29278 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 7 Nov 1998 10:52:51 -0800
(PST)
From: RFunk787@aol.com
Received: from RFunk787@aol.com
by imo14.mx.aol.com (IMOV16.10) id FTNCa18749
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 7 Nov 1998 13:51:56 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <daeb3622.364496cc@aol.com>
Date: Sat, 7 Nov 1998 13:51:56 EST
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Mime-Version: 1.0
Subject: Predicting elections
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: PCAO 1.6

11/7/98

This discussion of the accuracy of forecasts of recent elections reminds me
of
an observation Nate Maccooby once made (possibly quoting Sam Stouffer or some
such, I don't recall): "The problem with election polling is that you are

using a survey with a good sample to try to predict the outcome of a survey with a bad one."

Perhaps especially apropos to off-year congressional elections? Maybe the pollsters shouldn't be too hard on themselves.

Ray Funkhouser

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Sat Nov 7 11:09:57 1998
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (almaak.usc.edu [128.125.19.166])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id LAA01163 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 7 Nov 1998 11:09:56 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
id LAA12566 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 7 Nov 1998 11:09:56 -0800
(PST)
Date: Sat, 7 Nov 1998 11:09:55 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: CUPR post-doc (fwd)
Message-ID: <Pine.GS0.4.02.9811071108190.5920-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

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

Date: Fri, 06 Nov 1998 12:25:19 +0000
From: Bob Lake <rlake@rci.rutgers.edu>
Subject: CUPR post-doc

POST-DOCTORAL FELLOW IN URBAN POLICY
CENTER FOR URBAN POLICY RESEARCH

The Center for Urban Policy Research (CUPR) at Rutgers University is seeking a Post-Doctoral Fellow for a one-year non-tenure track appointment beginning July 1, 1999. The post-doc will participate in ongoing research at CUPR and pursue independent research. An individual with strong analytical abilities and specialization in community development, urban poverty, and/or environmental policy is strongly preferred. Salary is \$40,000 for 12 months plus health benefits. A Ph.D. in urban planning, public policy, geography, economics, sociology or a closely related field must be completed prior to July 1, 1999.

Rutgers is an equal opportunity/affirmative action employer.

Applicants should send a letter of interest, a resume, and three letters of recommendation by December 15, 1998 to:

Norman Glickman, Director
Center for Urban Policy Research
Rutgers University
33 Livingston Avenue, Suite 400
New Brunswick, NJ 08901
Glickman@rci.rutgers.edu

>From tiche001@maroon.tc.umn.edu Sat Nov 7 13:00:36 1998
Received: from mhub3.tc.umn.edu (mhub3.tc.umn.edu [128.101.131.43])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
id NAA15617 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 7 Nov 1998 13:00:34 -0800
(PST)

Received: from maroon.tc.umn.edu by mhub3.tc.umn.edu; Sat, 7 Nov 1998
15:00:32

-

0600

Received: from localhost by maroon.tc.umn.edu; Sat, 7 Nov 98 15:00:32 -0600
Date: Sat, 7 Nov 1998 15:00:31 -0600 (CST)
From: Phil Tichenor <tiche001@maroon.tc.umn.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Predicting elections
In-Reply-To: <daeb3622.364496cc@aol.com>
Message-Id: <Pine.SOL.3.96.981107143442.16988A-100000@maroon.tc.umn.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

In contrast to Ray's reference to Nate Maccoby's observation, I offer a different question: Are the pollsters now hard ENOUGH on themselves? At least to the point of asking some hard questions?

Some observations:

1. Nationally, NOBODY (to judge from media reports) expected a Democratic gain in seats in Congress.
2. In Minnesota, NOBODY expected Jesse Ventura to win.
3. Also, in Minnesota, NOBODY expected Hubert H. "Skip" Humphrey III to finish a poor THIRD--acknowledging that the MINN poll did see some change toward Ventura in the final poll a few days before the election.
4. In response to Arianna Huffington, whatever her motivations, NOBODY has provided any profession-wide data on (a) what current-day refusal rates are; (b) what the consequences of 50+ % refusals might be for representativeness, or (c) the question I don't think she asked, what the COMPLETION rates are, as a % of eligible numbers that are tried but not reached.

The typical response we have all made in recent years, including your truly, is that the refusing respondents and the unreached but eligible respondents are represented well by those reached. Maybe, but what empirical checks do we have on that assumption?

There may be good answers to these questions, and I hope there are, but we aren't getting them so far on aapornet. We've had a debate on whether a 20% mail-in sample in Ohio is worthy of investigation.

If we're reaching the point where we seriously consider that way of pre-election polling--with all due respect to the Dillman procedure--we need some awfully serious discussion of what is going on with telephone polling.

And in final response to Ray and our mutually-admired teacher, no American election is a "good sample" of the voting age population. If turnout is that tough to predict, it should be acknowledged, up front.

> Perhaps especially apropos to off-year congressional elections? Maybe the
> pollsters shouldn't be too hard on themselves.

>

> Ray Funkhouser

>

>From oneil@speedchoice.com Sat Nov 7 17:42:04 1998
Received: from mail.phoenix.speedchoice.com ([207.240.197.31])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id RAA15910 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 7 Nov 1998 17:42:02 -0800

(PST)

Received: from phx35035 (hybrid-217-120.phoenix.speedchoice.com
[207.240.217.120]) by
mail.phoenix.speedchoice.com (8.8.8/) with SMTP id SAA08821 for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 7 Nov 1998
18:42:53 -0700 (MST)

Message-ID: <001a01be0ab8\$1bb59da0\$78d9f0cf@phx35035>

From: "Michael O'Neil" <oneil@speedchoice.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Comparisons of Poll Accuracy

Date: Sat, 7 Nov 1998 18:35:45 -0700

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.2120.0

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2120.0

1976 Carter taller than Ford? Oh, Ford must have been pardoned from the

rule.

=====
Michael O'Neil, Ph.D.
O'Neil Associates, Inc.
412 East Southern Avenue
Tempe, Arizona 85282

602.967.4441 Voice
602.967.6171 Personal Fax
602.967.6122 O'Neil Associates Fax

oneil@speedchoice.com personal email
surveys@primenet.com O'Neil Associates email
-----Original Message-----

>On Fri, 6 Nov 1998, Hank Zucker wrote:

>
>> >In actuality, the best predictor has always been height.
>> >At least in presidential elections, throughout the history of this
country,
>> >the taller candidate has always won (although I have not yet checked the
>> >elections in the past 20-25 years, I am confident it would hold up then
>> >also.).

>>
>> It does. For example, in '92 Clinton was tallest candidate in either
party
>> & Bush was tallest Republican. Only one candidate in either party was
less
>> than 6'0" (Tsongas - one of the first to drop out).

>>
>> And not just Presidential races. In Senate races with two non-incumbent
men
>> running, the taller has won the large majority of the time - not always,
but
>> far more often than could be attributed to chance.

>>
>> This could be an interesting public opinion investigation. Why is the
>> public so prejudiced in favor of tall men?

>>
>> Hank Zucker
>> Creative Research Systems
>> makers of The Survey System: Survey Software that Makes You Look Good
>> <http://www.surveysystem.com>
>> <mailto:surveys@wco.com>

>>
>>
>>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: H. H. Kassarian <hkassarj@ucla.edu>
>> To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>

>> Date: Friday, November 06, 1998 10:52 AM
>> Subject: Re: Comparisons of Poll Accuracy
>>
>>
>> >In Response to Schulman re: Literary Digest accuracy. It seems to me that
>> >the quota control polls that emerged in 1936 also had a pretty good track
>> >record until 1948. In actuality, the best predictor has always been
>> >height.
>> >At least in presidential elections, throughout the history of this country,
>> >the taller candidate has always won (although I have not yet checked the
>> >elections in the past 20-25 years, I am confident it would hold up then
>> >also.). Schulman's point is well taken! Nevertheless, off-beat methods
>> >can be sorta right some of the time, according to statistics course I once
>> >taught. And that's the stuff that's fun to compare. And Bill is taller
>> >than
>> >Newt, ... afterall... I think!
>> >Hal Kassarjian
>> >*****

>>
>>
>>
>>
>
>*****
>*****

>Susan H. Pinkus
>Los Angeles Times Poll
>Internet:susan.pinkus@latimes.com
>American Online: spinkus@aol.com
>FAX: 213-237-2505
>*****
>****

>
>
>

>From abider@earthlink.net Sat Nov 7 19:10:26 1998
Received: from hawk.prod.itd.earthlink.net (hawk.prod.itd.earthlink.net [207.217.120.22])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with ESMTP
id TAA11306 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 7 Nov 1998 19:10:25 -0800 (PST)
Received: from alvbynsy (sdn-ar-002dcwashP283.dialsprint.net [168.191.22.84])
by hawk.prod.itd.earthlink.net (8.8.7/8.8.5) with SMTP id TAA04996
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 7 Nov 1998 19:10:22 -0800 (PST)

Message-ID: <000c01be0ac5\$7f4de900\$5416bfa8@alvbynsy>
Reply-To: "Albert Biderman" <abider@earthlink.net>
From: "Albert Biderman" <abider@earthlink.net>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Montgomery Blair Students Predict
Date: Sat, 7 Nov 1998 22:11:32 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.2106.4
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4

A story in today's (11/7) Washington Post Metro section gives details about the Montgomery Blair 10th graders' prediction that won them the Post's "ninth Crystal Ball competition." Contrary to any implication I may have left here previously, the description in the Post article suggests that their procedures made great sense and doubtless were highly educational as well.

A deservedly serious look at how they analysed the House election poses for me some issues that decision sciences folk have been fussin' over for some time. The first is the finding that for many problems, the record for novices matches or even beats that for experts. (A JAMA paper said that the common bane of sound decision, over-confidence, usually affects experts more often than it does novices.) The field has given a lot of attention to the kinds of complexity and structure of problems on which novices are no worse than experts. Secondly, the students' method apparently was to make judgments by studying every relevant type of information they could get, both national and specific to each district. Their choices of information sources and analyses appear to me to have been judicious. Issues here are when, if ever, to let informed judgment override the result of previously successful formal modelling. Many of the political experts who were in the Post's contest confess (claim?) that's why they went wrong. Another issue the story raises is how to curb the over-confidence that comes from the successful predictions we make of elections that come out the way we like. Pro-Democrat bias may have contributed to the sophomores' success.

Linda DiVall is honest enough to have admitted to the Wash. Post reporter that she didn't go with "her instincts" that told her the Republicans would gain only one seat. "I can't do that, I'm a Republican pollster," she said. It was "instincts," however, not a quant. model's bottom line that she says she censored. With regard to Jim's point about unpublished estimates touted later as being right, it's probably also the case that we don't learn about the fudge on

published fudged predictions that just happen to turn out close to the mark. If DiVal had won the contest with her entry of +7 for the Republicans, would she have said, or even believed, that 6 of the 7 seats were fudge?

To pick up a related AAPORNET thread:

The Post story did not tell us whether the Blair HS'ers were right because they divined what Wednesday morning quarterback's now are telling us: the Dems did well because more less-likely-to-vote voters voted than were expected to and fewer more likely ones did.

>From dillmand@mail.wsu.edu Sun Nov 8 05:26:10 1998
Received: from cypher.turbonet.com (cypher.turbonet.com [204.188.48.1])
by usc.edu (8.8.8/8.8.8/usc) with SMTP
id FAA17934 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 8 Nov 1998 05:26:04 -0800
(PST)
Received: from [204.188.49.222] by cypher.turbonet.com (NTMail
3.03.0017/1.aamz) with ESMTP id ua204172
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 8 Nov 1998 05:26:12 -0800
X-Sender: dillman@turbonet.com (Unverified)
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.1
Date: Sun, 08 Nov 1998 05:18:42 -0800
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Don Dillman <dillmand@mail.wsu.edu>
Subject: Re: Comparisons of Poll Accuracy
In-Reply-To: <Pine.A41.3.95L.981106162213.5322B-100000@login6.isis.unc.edu>
References: <Pine.GS0.4.02.9811061022030.25238-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Message-Id: <13261215507836@turbonet.com>

As a followup to Phil Meyer's comments about the Columbus Dispatch Poll and reference to a paper I had done:

The comments I made in that paper were roughly these: Survey inaccuracy can stem from any or all of four sources of errors: sampling, coverage, measurement, and non response (See Groves, 89 or his POQ article in the 50th anniversary issue for details). Minimizing each is critical for achieving survey accuracy. The Columbus Dispatch Poll does quite well on three of the four.

Coverage is not a problem in this Poll because a statewide list of registered voters is used as the sample frame; therefore, all voters have an equal or known chance of being randomly selected for to vote? How likely are you to vote?) of selected members of households for which there is evidence that socially desirable answers are sometimes offered..

Consequently, some respondents who cannot vote or are unlikely to vote get included in most election surveys.

Measurement may be less biased in this mail survey than the telephone polls because a reasonably close facsimile of the ballot is sent to respondents. Instead of asking questions in a hypothetical manner like, "If the election were held today would you vote for..." the sampled person is presented with the exact ballot wording and visual layout, e.g. "For Governor. J Jones, Democrat;; T Smith, Republican; etc." This format strikes me as desirable because that's exactly what one will see on the actual ballot. Also, the mail questionnaire is visual as is the election ballot. This may be especially advantageous when trying to predict outcomes for initiatives, and lower level statewide races (e.g. auditor, treasurer) where people may not have clear cut preferences. To the extent people are influenced by order, and exactly wording, we don't have to worry about getting equivalency in the wording of questions for an aural format.

Sampling error. The Columbus Dispatch has typically obtained a completed sampled size that is larger than most of the comparison telephone polls with which it was compared (at least prior to this year=96I've not yet seen any of the results from the current election other than Jon Krosnick's summary). All other things equal a larger completed sample should provide more precise estimates. =20

This leaves nonresponse error to consider. The issue here is whether respondents hold different preferences than the nonrespondents who vote. Nonresponse error is not the same as response rate. Apparently, the respondents don't hold different preferences, and the important question is why? It seems like those who choose to send back ballots are much more likely than those who do not send them back to be actual voters, and that should not be surprising. =20

A mail election survey of registered voters is also a little unusual (compared to other surveys of defined populations) because if one obtains a very high response rate, say 75%, a large number of those respondents will be from people who do not vote! This would be true since voting rates are usually much lower than that (I think I heard 39% nationally, in this year's election=96I don't know what the Ohio rate was). What one is interested in is to get response from people who will actually vote and not all registered voters or members of the general public who for whatever reasons say they are registered and likely to vote. =20

In sum, my point in the paper was that on 3 of the 4 major sources of survey error there are reasons to expect the mail survey to produce better results than the telephone. And, on the fourth there are some unusual conditions that make a low response rate from ALL registered voters not necessarily detrimental.

A side comment on the context for these comments. The paper Phil refers to is "Mail and Other Self-Administered Surveys in the 21st Century: The

MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=X-UNKNOWN
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8BIT

Here's yesterday's Washington Post story on the Montgomery County Blair High School students' midterm election poll...

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/WPlate/1998-11/07/1161-110798-idx.html>

© Copyright 1998 The Washington Post Company

A Coup With the Crystal Ball
Students Out-Predict Pundits on Election Results

By Ellen Nakashima
Washington Post Staff Writer
Saturday, November 7, 1998; Page B01

It was the pros vs. the amateurs. A cadre of high-paid political experts vs. a bunch of 10th-graders at a Montgomery County high school.

And the kids waxed the entire crew.

A class of Montgomery Blair High students bested 13 pollsters, prognosticators and pundits in predicting the outcome of Tuesday's midterm elections.

In The Washington Post's ninth Crystal Ball competition, the Blair sophomores were the only ones to predict no House gain for the GOP. They forecast that the Republicans would hold 228 congressional seats and the Democrats 206, a status quo pick that put them closest to the result that shocked the pros: The Democrats actually picked up five seats.

"I'm mortified," said Emory University political scientist Merle Black, who predicted a Republican pickup of nine seats. "We'll all have to go hang our heads in shame."

Mused GOP pollster Linda DiVall: "I think my problem was I was too loyal to my party instead of relying on my instincts."

Her instincts told her the GOP would gain one House seat. "Then I said, 'I can't do that -- I'm a Republican pollster.' So I did House plus seven," she said.

Winners of the contest run by the Sunday Outlook section receive a

crystal ball, a plaque and bragging rights.

Free Congress Foundation President Paul Weyrich, a conservative commentator, laughed when he heard that "a bunch of high school students" had won.

"If I'm gonna be embarrassed and insulted, I would much rather have it be by them than by [CNBC high-volume talk show host] Chris Matthews or someone," he said, chuckling. "That says everything you need to say about this election: that high school kids have a better handle on this than those of us who have been involved in the political process for 40 years!"

Weyrich, who won the contest two years ago, said that next time he will do what he did in 1996: "Go with what I think, and never mind what anyone else thinks."

This time, he said sheepishly, "I talked to a lot of people -- pollsters and consultants, and obviously, I was not getting accurate information."

The 71 students, members of a communication arts program at the school just outside the Capital Beltway in Silver Spring, had no magic formula for picking winners. They did their homework.

After teacher Stacy Dimmick identified the 71 most competitive House, Senate and gubernatorial contests, each student selected one race to research and predict.

They dug up demographic data on each district, including age, gender, religion, educational level and income. They studied campaign ads. They scoured the Web sites of the Census Bureau, Congressional Quarterly and Project Vote