

From: LISTS.ASU.EDU LISTSERV Server (16.0) [LISTSERV@asu.edu]
Sent: Saturday, May 28, 2011 6:10 PM
To: Shapard Wolf
Subject: File: "AAPORNET LOG0408"

Date: Mon, 2 Aug 2004 17:45:24 -0400
Reply-To: "Christopher B. Mann" <christopher.mann@YALE.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Christopher B. Mann" <christopher.mann@YALE.EDU>
Subject: Re: defining likely voters
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
In-Reply-To: <0I1C006B78G1HD@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 8bit

With apologies for being a week late to this debate due to vacation, I presented a paper at the AAPOR conference last year addressing how the voter turnout history available on many registration rolls (and from many vendors) can be used to accurately model voter turnout in advance. In cooperation with the Washington Post and the Quinnipiac University Polling Institute, we tested a Registration Based Sampling (RBS) procedure in the 2002 election cycle. RBS was developed by Don Green and Alan Gerber who also presented a paper on it at last year's AAPOR conference.

From the voter validation studies we conducted after the 2002 election the RBS procedure was highly accurate in predicting the election outcome without using any vote likelihood screening questions. It performed as well or better than RDD surveys conducted simultaneously. It was also highly representative of the actual demographics of the turnout on the variables available to us from voter registration (age, gender, party registration, past voting history, and length of registration).

We see RBS as a way to use empirical information (past voting history) to draw a sample that will be representative of each future election of that type (voting history from primaries is used to draw the sample for future primaries, voting history from general elections for future general elections, and so on for any type of election that occurs regularly). RBS vastly reduces the cost of surveys - both in length of interview because screens are unnecessary and eliminating terminations for those who "flunk" a screen.

--

Christopher B. Mann
Ph.D. Candidate
Yale University
Institution for Social and Policy Studies
and Department of Political Science
christopher.mann@yale.edu

>

> Date: Fri, 23 Jul 2004 13:24:09 -0400
> From: Michael Dimock <dimockm@PEOPLE-PRESS.ORG>
> Subject: Re: defining "likely voters"
>
> Nick, I couldn't agree more, and this is one of the reasons I often
> =
> worry
> about LV screens that I see applied. Does anyone have any =
> research/remarks
> about how analysts should make the determination of likely turnout
> rate,
> especially in state and local races?
>
> A side note: It is very dangerous to "let the data set the cutoff".
> =
> For
> example, if you develop a 5-point index based on four likely voter
> =
> items,
> you *could* just take all the people who score "4" or "5" on that
> index =
> and
> count them as likely voters. The problems are (1) you may be
> counting =
> too
> few or too many people as likely voters relative to what actual
> turnout =
> will
> be, and as our paper shows, this can lead to very distorted
> horserace
> estimates, and (2) the proportion you code as likely voters will
> almost
> certainly change over the course of the election cycle. If your
> index
> includes measures of attention, interest, self-reported intention to
> =
> vote,
> and even self-reported past voting behavior, these are all attitudes
> =
> that
> tend to "increase" as election day approaches. In Sept you may have
> =
> only
> 25% coded as "likely", but by election weekend you might have 60%
> coded =
> as
> "likely". This could leave you reporting a LV horserace trend toward
> =
> the
> Democratic candidate that is purely based on a changing measure of
> how =
> many
> are likely to vote.
>

> --Mike
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Nick
> Panagakis
> Sent: Friday, July 23, 2004 11:36 AM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: Re: defining "likely voters"
>
> Re: "As a general rule, choosing the most valid turnout estimate
> will
> increase the accuracy of your horserace prediction." I believe you
> are
> saying that this is more important than the number or which
> screening
> questions are used.
>
> I have no quarrel with your paper but this does lead to another =
> question.
>
> The approximate target of 50% of VAP for national presidential
> elections =
> is
> one thing when turnout from election to election does not vary by
> more =
> than
> a few percentage points.
>
> But state and municipal election turnout including Philadelphia can
> vary
> by as much as 20 points over just a few elections.
>
> Deriving a *valid* turnout estimate seems to be the critical
> question.
>
> Nick
>
> Michael Dimock wrote:
>
>> Apparently mentioning that "4 questions gets you just as much
> accuracy =
> as
> 20
>> questions" begs the question of "which 4 questions?" - which many of
> =
> you
>> have asked me offline.
>>
>> Let me clarify just a bit for those who are interested:
>>
>> Our paper found that the more important criterion in the accuracy of
> LV
>> indices is not which questions are included, but what your overall

> =
> estimate
>>of turnout is... In other words, all an index does is give you a
> =
> scale.
> How
>>many people you count as "likely" to vote is subjective at that
> point,
> based
>>on projected turnout rates. (Many people take 50% for
> presidential
>>elections - in other words, the half who score highest on the LV =
> index).
>>Where you set this cutoff makes a big difference, and is not =
> predetermined
>>by the index items.
>>
>>In terms of what items to include, our consideration is time and =
> content
>>validity - the primary 4-item index we tested had one item measuring
> =
> each
> of
>>the four concepts that correlate with turnout: past voting,
> interest =
> in
>>election, intention to vote, and knowledge of voting process ("know
> =
> where
>>your polling place is" is an example of the latter). This performed
> as
> well
>>as 8-item and 15-item scales (I was exaggerating with the 20-item
> statement,
>>though we found no evidence that adding items helps in accurately
> predicting
>>who will and will not vote.)
>>
>>In our study, no matter how detailed the index, we were never able
> to
>>correctly classify more than about 80% of respondents in terms of
> =
> whether
>>they would or would not vote. More importantly, and paradoxically,
> we
> found
>>that improving the percent correctly classified did not improve
> the
>>horserace estimates. As a general rule, choosing the most valid =
> turnout
>>estimate will increase the accuracy of your horserace prediction,
> even
>>though it may be less efficient at correctly predicting who will and
> =

> will
>>not vote.
>>
>>Dr. Michael A. Dimock
>>Research Director
>>Pew Research Center for the People and the Press
>>1150 18th St, NW, Suite 975
>>Washington, D.C. 20036
>>www.people-press.org
>>
>>
>>-----Original Message-----
>>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Michael
> Dimock
>>Sent: Wednesday, July 21, 2004 5:39 PM
>>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>>Subject: Re: defining "likely voters"

>>
>>We did a validation experiment on the accuracy of likely voter
> scales =
> in
>>predicting who would actually vote, and tested various scaling =
> techniques.
>>Bottom-line: 4 questions gets you just as much accuracy as 20 =
> questions.

>>
>>Presented at 2001 AAPOR. The press-release version of it is at
> our
> website:

>>
>><http://people-press.org/reports/display.php3?ReportID=3D12>
>>

>>I can also send the full AAPOR paper as an attachment to any who
> are
>>interested.

>>
>>Dr. Michael A. Dimock
>>Research Director
>>Pew Research Center for the People and the Press
>>1150 18th St, NW, Suite 975
>>Washington, D.C. 20036
>>www.people-press.org
>>

>>-----Original Message-----
>>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Steve Farkas
>>Sent: Wednesday, July 21, 2004 11:41 AM
>>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>>Subject: defining "likely voters"

>>
>>Sorry the following question might seem amateurish - I don't usually
> =
> get
>>involved in election surveys.

>>In a survey of the general public, what are my options for
> efficiently
>>determining likely voters? If it's 8 questions I won't be able to
> use =
> the
>>series - I don't have the room. Please tell me the questions or
> direct =
> me
>>to the source. If you can, please also tell me what to expect in
> terms =
> of
>>the results, ie what percent of the general public will probably be
> =
> defined
>>as likely voters. Thank you in advance for your help.
>>

>
> Date: Fri, 23 Jul 2004 12:47:18 -0500
> From: Rob Daves <daves@STARTRIBUNE.COM>
> Subject: Re: defining "likely voters"
>

> Mike certainly reflects my concerns about the challenges of using a
> screen (and to a lesser extent), a cutoff index. Both use a priori
> assumptions about turnout. (However, I think Gallup has a method
> of
> estimating turnout that I=27d encourage them to share with the list,
> if
> they can, and Gallup, building on Paul Perry=27s original work, still
> uses
> the cutoff index successfully.) The danger with using a screen often
> is
> not the technique itself, but the fact that often researchers, in a
> bid
> for cost savings or deadline pressures, will not gather information
> about those who get screened out, which makes it impossible to
> calculate
> turnout estimates.

>
> In the past, I=27ve successfully used the weighting method of
> modeling a
> likely electorate. When you weight for likelihood to vote you
> typically
> will get a smaller N than the raw N, because everyone gets a weight
> of
> less than 1. By dividing the weighted N by the raw N, one can get
> the
> turnout ratio. If you=27ve taken the time to validate voting
> behavior of
> respondents in past surveys and develop an accurate system of
> weights
> for different types of elections, then the turnout estimates should
> be
> fairly close. Unless =97 which HAS happened =97 the =22typical=22

> =
> election
> becomes atypical. (The 1998 gubernatorial election in Minnesota
> comes
> to mind, when we used a statewide election model, but because of
> Jesse
> Ventura's presence, turnout levels were higher, that is, closer to
> a
> presidential election model.)
>
> The weighting method appears to work best in higher turnout
> elections,
> and should be combined with a screen in primaries (at least that's
> what
> works best in Minnesota) to isolate only those who will vote in
> particular primary elections.
>
> In the never-ending quest for accuracy ...
>
> Rob Daves, director
> The Minnesota Poll

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Mon, 2 Aug 2004 19:32:16 -0400
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Subject: comparing 2004 with 2000
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

An acquaintance who's rather skeptical about the polling business writes:

>An accurate poll would seek to determine the swing from the 2000
>election, narrowly won by Gore. It would have a sufficiently
>large sample (roughly the number of people polled each week by
>all the polls taken together) and would ask these questions:
>
>1) In 2000 did you
>--Vote for the candidate of the Republican Party? (Bush)
>--Vote for the candidate of the Democratic Party? (Gore)
>--Vote for the candidate of the Green Party (Nader)
>--Vote for some other candidate?
>--Not vote in the presidential election?
>
>2) In 2004 do you expect to
>--Vote for the candidate of the Republican Party? (Bush)
>--Vote for the candidate of the Democratic Party? (Kerry)

>--Vote for the candidate of the Green Party? (Cobb)
>--Vote for the independent candidate? (Nader)
>--Vote for some other candidate?
>--Not vote in the presidential election?
>--Vote for some candidate about whom you have yet to make up your
> mind, if you vote at all?
>
>
>The answers to these questions would give a meaningful and
>very accurate picture of the actual voting intentions of the
>electorate. I would be very, very surprised were such a poll
>to be conducted and published by anyone. Until that unlikely
>event, all the horse-race polls should be written off as
>so many tout sheets.

Does anyone do polls like this? Any thoughts on this?

--

Doug Henwood
Left Business Observer
38 Greene St - 4th fl.
New York NY 10013-2505 USA
voice +1-212-219-0010
fax +1-212-219-0098
cell +1-917-865-2813
email <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>
web <http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Tue, 3 Aug 2004 11:28:03 -0700
Reply-To: "Joe D. Eyerman" <eyerman@RTI.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Joe D. Eyerman" <eyerman@RTI.ORG>
Subject: SAPOR - Registration is Open

The annual meeting of the Southern Association for Public Opinion Research will be held at the University Club on the campus of NC State University in Raleigh on October 7 & 8, 2004. The keynote speaker will be Dr. Christopher F. Gelpi.

Abstracts for papers are due September 7, 2004. Submissions for the student paper competition are due August 16, 2004. See <http://www.irss.unc.edu/irss/sapor/2004/ConferenceInfo.html> for more information and to register for the conference.

To receive a discounted registration rate, please email, fax, or mail your completed registration form to the SAPOR treasurer, Patrick Stanforth, no later than September 15, 2004.

We look forward to seeing you in Raleigh!

About Dr. Gelpi:

Christopher F. Gelpi (Ph.D., University of Michigan, 1994) is an Associate Professor of Political Science at Duke University. His primary research interests are the sources of international militarized conflict and strategies for international conflict resolution. He is currently engaged in research projects on American civil-military relations and the use of force, the influence of democracy and trade on the use of force, and the forecasting of military conflict. He has also published works on the role of norms in crisis bargaining, alliances as instruments of control, diversionary wars, deterrence theory, and the influence of the international system on the outbreak of violence. He is author of *The Power of Legitimacy: The Role of Norms in Crisis Bargaining* (Princeton University Press, 2002) and co-author (with Peter D. Feaver) of *Choosing Your Battles: American Civil-Military Relations and the Use of Force* (Princeton University Press, 2003).

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

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

Date: Wed, 4 Aug 2004 07:37:53 +0200

Reply-To: Matthias Kretschmer <MKretschmer@GMX.NET>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Matthias Kretschmer <MKretschmer@GMX.NET>

Subject: Meta-analysis

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

Dear all,

Does anybody have recommendations for literature on meta-analysis, especially based on multiple regression results. As an example, I have several separate readership surveys that look at the impact of age on media behavior (in that case it would be how many minutes a day they read the newspaper). These results are given to me as multiple regressions with different control variables. I now want to do some kind of meta-analysis that could tell me the impact of age on newspaper readership.

Thanks

Matthias

Matthias Kretschmer

ZMG Zeitungs Marketing Gesellschaft mbH & Co. KG

Schmidtstraße 53

60326 Frankfurt am Main

www.zeitungsmonitor.de

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Thu, 5 Aug 2004 23:18:04 +0200
Reply-To: Edith de Leeuw <edithl@XS4ALL.NL>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Edith de Leeuw <edithl@XS4ALL.NL>
Subject: Special Issue Journal of Official Statistics on Questionnaire
Development and testing
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu, SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU, WAPOR@UNL.EDU,
nosmo@nic.surfnet.nl
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Apologies for cross-posting

The Journal of Official Statistics (JOS) has published a special issue on=20
Questionnaire Development, Evaluation, and Testing). The special issue=20
consists of a sample of revised contributed papers presented at the QDET=20
Conference that took place in Charleston, SC in 2002. The detailed contents=
=20
of the special issue are shown below in the Table of Contents (2004:2).=20
Those who wish to buy copies of the special issue are encouraged to place=20
an order at the following e-mail address: jos@scb.se. The price is 40 USD=20
per copy.

Dr. Edith D. de Leeuw
Associate Editor, Journal of Official Statistics
<http://www.jos.nu>

Plantage Doklaan 40, NL-1018 CN Amsterdam, The Netherlands
tel +31.20.3302596 fax + 31.20.3302597
e-mail edithl@xs4all.nl

+++++
+++++
Contents Special Issue

Preface 141

Iterative, Multiple-Method Questionnaire Evaluation Research: A Case Study=
143
James L. Esposito

Calendar and Question-List Survey Methods: Association Between Interviewer

Behaviors and Data Quality 185
Robert F. Belli, Eun Ha Lee, Frank P. Stafford, and Chia-Hung Chou

A Questionnaire Design for Dependent Interviewing that Addresses the
Problem of Cognitive Satisficing 219
Adriaan W. Hoogendoorn

TADEQ: A Tool for the Documentation and Analysis of Electronic=20
Questionnaires 233
Jelke Bethlehem and Anco Hundepool

Relating Respondent-Generated Intervals Questionnaire Design to Survey
Accuracy and Response Rate 265
S. James Press and Judith M. Tanur

Developing Bilingual Questionnaires: Experiences from New Zealand in the
Development of the 2001 M=E4ori Language Survey 289
Lyn Potaka and Suzanne Cochrane

The Time-line as a Device to Enhance Recall in Standardized Research=20
Interviews:
A Split Ballot Study 301
Wander van der Vaart

Using Vignettes in Cognitive Research on Establishment Surveys 319
Rebecca L. Morrison, Kristin Stettler, and Amy E. Anderson

Pre-printing Effects in Official Statistics: An Experimental Study 341
Anders Holmberg

Exploring Confidentiality Issues Related to Dependent Interviewing:
Preliminary Findings 357
Joanne Pascale and Thomas S. Mayer

How Good is Good? Comparing Numerical Ratings of Response Options for Two
Versions of the Self-Assessed Health Status Question 379
Barbara Foley Wilson, Barbara M. Altman, Karen Whitaker, and Mario Callegaro

Identifying and Reducing Response Burdens in Internet Business Surveys 393
Gustav Haraldsen

Book and Software Reviews 411

Journal of Official Statistics
Vol. 20, No. 2, 2004, =A9 Statistics Sweden
ISSN 0282423X
Journal of Official Statistics Vol. 20, No. 2, 2004

=20=

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Mon, 9 Aug 2004 08:41:39 -0500
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: Standardized Surveys
Comments: To: AAPORNet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I'm posting this for a non-AAPOR member. If you have information, please forward it directly to her at:=20

=20
pfamy@uaa.alaska.edu

=20
=20

Dear Sir,
=20

I'm working on my Ph.D. in psychology from Northcentral University. My dissertation topic is direct-to-consumer prescription drug advertising. I plan to administer a survey to human service students at a local college regarding this topic. Are there any standardized surveys that are available for this research? My advisor thought that there might be, but was unaware of any in particular. Any information you can give me will be greatly appreciated.

=20
Ann Yaros

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 9 Aug 2004 09:53:19 -0400
Reply-To: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmg1p@cms.mail.virginia.edu>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmg1p@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU>
Subject: About Robin Bebel
Comments: To: AAPORnet List server <aapornet@asu.edu>,
asro listserv <asro@virginia.edu>
Comments: cc: "bebel, robin" <rab6r@virginia.edu>,
csr-staff@virginia.edu, "thomas, john" <jpt6n@virginia.edu>,
"campbell, paula" <psc@virginia.edu>,
"bebel, robin" <rab6r@virginia.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
Content-disposition: inline

To the AAPOR list and the ASRO list:

Many of you know Robin Bebel, Assistant Director of the Center for Survey Research at U.Va., who was for many years with the NIU Survey Lab. Some of you have heard the unfortunate news that Robin, still on the young

side of 50, sustained a serious stroke two weeks ago. It happened while she was visiting her parents in Roanoke, VA, and she has been hospitalized since then at Carilion Roanoke Memorial Hospital. This is not the place to share medical details, but Robin currently has significant impairment on her right side and has temporarily lost the ability to swallow. She is mentally alert and in good spirits, and is communicating with her left hand and by writing out messages, as a breathing tube currently prevents her from speaking. We are expecting her to be able to improve greatly with therapy and that she will eventually be able to resume her work at CSR.

Denny Bebel, Robin's husband, will be monitoring her e-mail account for the present and, since she can't take phone calls at this point, you are welcome to send her your greetings and good wishes via e-mail to rab6r@virginia.edu. I know she will be in your thoughts and prayers.

In the meantime, David Hartman of our staff will be serving temporarily as Assistant Director of CSR.

Tom Guterbock

Thomas M. Guterbock Voice: (434)243-5223
Director CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222
Center for Survey Research FAX: (434)243-5233
University of Virginia EXPRESS DELIVERY: 2400 Old Ivy Road
P. O. Box 400767 Suite 223
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767 Charlottesville, VA 22903
e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Mon, 9 Aug 2004 11:50:28 -0400
Reply-To: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>
Subject: trading in political futures
Comments: To: aapor <aapornet@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

It would be useful if a knowledgeable aapor member commented on the use of trading in political futures (NYT, August 8) and other alternatives (e.g., economic indicators) to pre-election polls for assessing the present state of the presidential election and its future course.

Howard

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Mon, 9 Aug 2004 15:59:42 -0400
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>

Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing
Subject: Re: trading in political futures
Comments: To: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <41179D44.6030206@umich.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

They have abysmal track records in real world situations.

You can find a lot of information and links to other sites, including some of the current models, at <http://www.politicalforecasting.com/>

At the American Political Science Association Conference in August 2000, seven models were presented, all showing Gore winning in 2000 by a substantial margin. The March 2001 issue of Political Science had a series of post mortems on that topic, a good deal of which you can read online at <http://www.apsanet.org/PS/march01/election2000.cfm>

Jan Werner

Howard Schuman wrote:

> It would be useful if a knowledgeable aapor member commented on the use
> of trading in political futures (NYT, August 8) and other alternatives
> (e.g., economic indicators) to pre-election polls for assessing the
> present state of the presidential election and its future course.

> Howard

>
> -----

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

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

>

>

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

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

Date: Tue, 10 Aug 2004 10:47:39 -0500
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: Job Opportunity
Comments: To: AAPORNet@asu.edu
Comments: cc: librown@umbc.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Survey Research Center Director

=20

The Maryland Institute for Policy Analysis and Research (MIPAR) of the University of Maryland, Baltimore County (UMBC) seeks a director for its new survey research center (SRC). This is a non-tenure track faculty position at a rank of either Assistant or Associate Research Scientist. The SRC is a start-up, and one of the principal responsibilities of the director will be to establish it and initiate its operation. The ideal candidate will have an appropriate terminal graduate degree (Ph.D. preferred) and substantial experience in all aspects of survey research including survey research management. For further information and complete instructions about applying, go to www.umbc.edu/mipar <<http://www.umbc.edu/mipar>> and click on "Survey Research Center Director Search." =20

=20

UMBC is an AA/EO Employer

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====
Date: Tue, 10 Aug 2004 17:40:27 -0400
Reply-To: Diane Bowers <dbowers@CASRO.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Diane Bowers <dbowers@CASRO.ORG>
Subject: Frugging Press Release
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

TO: AAPOR Colleagues
FROM: Diane Bowers

I wanted to share with you a Press Release concerning a=20 little-noted provision of the amended Telemarketing Sales Rule (Jan 2003)=20 that prohibits misrepresentation in charitable fundraising. The FTC has=20 added a separate provision to the TSR that prohibits specific deceptive=20 practices by telefunders, including misrepresenting the purpose of the=20 call. This government anti-"frugging" (fundraising under the guise of=20 research) support provides a legal enforcement avenue to address "sugging"=
=20 and, now, "frugging" complaints. Please read on for more details. Let me=
=20 know if you have any questions, and if you, too, have received any=20 "frugging" or "sugging" complaints of late. Thanks, Diane

2cd54813.jpg

170 North Country Road, Suite 4 Port Jefferson, New York 11777

Phone: (631)=20

928-6954 Fax: (631)=20

928-6041 Email: casro@casro.org Website:=20

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

FOR IMMEDIATE=20

RELEASE=20

Contact: Diane K. Bowers, President

August 10,=20

2004=20

Jim Robinson, Director, Government & Public Affairs

A Victory Against =93Frugging=94

Survey Research now has a powerful tool to combat =93frugging=
=94=20
(fundraising under the guise of research). The Federal Government via the=
=20
FTC will now be able to take action against fruggers directly. In amending=
=20
the Telemarketing Sales Rule in 2003, the FTC heralded the establishment of=
=20
the National Do Not Call Registry. We are all familiar with (and, for=20
survey research, involved in) the escalating attention and overwhelming=20
public support the National DNC Registry received. However, another=20
provision was added to the amended TSR, which received little attention=20
and, yet, for survey research is equally fortuitous.

The amended TSR included a provision that prohibits=20
misrepresentation in charitable fundraising. No longer can telemarketers=20
who are soliciting charitable contributions (telefunders) misrepresent the=
=20
purpose of their call: they must state promptly (at the beginning of the=20
call) that their purpose is to solicit a charitable=20
contribution. Fundraising under the guise of research, or =93frugging,=94=
is=20
effectively prohibited.

Titled =93Prohibited Deceptive Acts or Practices in the=
Solicitation=20
of Charitable Contributions=94 (=A7310.3(d), Federal Register, Vo. 68, No.=
19,=20
1/29/03), this provision makes it a violation of the Rule to =93misrepresent=
,=20
either directly or by implication=94 any material information such as the=20
=93nature, purpose or mission of any entity on behalf of which a charitable=
=20
contribution is being requested.=94

The TSR=92s non-misrepresentation requirements originally addressed=
=20

telemarketing =93sales=94 only. The 1995 TSR effectively prohibited =93sugging=94=20 (selling under the guise of research) by requiring that telemarketers state =20 promptly (at the beginning of the call) that they are selling something, =20 what the product/service is, and how much it costs.

With this new TSR provision, the prohibitions against =20 telemarketing misrepresentation was expanded to address telemarketing =20 =93charitable fundraising=94 as well. If a charity uses a telemarketing =20 organization to solicit contributions, those telefunders may not use =20 deceptive practices, such as the =93foot in the door=94 approach of =93frugging, =94 =20 to begin their solicitation.

The Federal Trade Commission amended the Telemarketing Sales =20 Rule in January 2003. This amended rule received tremendous response from =20 the public, industry, and media because of its groundbreaking decision to =20 establish a National Do Not Call Registry. All eyes focused on this issue: =20 the ever-increasing number of citizens signing up for the DNC list (now at =20 over 60 million households); the courtroom opposition from the =20 telemarketers, suing on grounds of unconstitutionality (now at the level of =20 the Supreme Court); and the media overload of articles, interviews, =20 editorials, etc. CASRO and the Survey Research Industry were equally =20 absorbed: issuing comments, joining forces to write an amicus brief in =20 support of the constitutionality and the FTC =92s right to establish a DNC =20 Registry, and, now, preparing for more-aggressive state DNC initiatives.

The anti- =93sugging =94 and anti- =93frugging =94 provisions of the =20 FTC =92s TSR =20 are more important now than ever. Post-DNC, CASRO has already seen an =20 increase in pseudo-surveys. Some telemarketers are, once again, using =20 =93sugging =94 and =93frugging =94 as deceptive tools to reach the public. =20 CASRO =92s =20 and the survey research industry =92s self-regulatory =93tools =94 in fighting =20 =93sugging =94 and =93frugging =94 are significantly enhanced by the FTC and =20 the =20 TSR. CASRO and all survey researchers may use the enforcement division of =20 the FTC to address complaints against telemarketers and telefunders. And, =20 perhaps in the near future, we can put an end to these abuses of survey =20 research.

For more information about CASRO and the CASRO Government & =20 Public Affairs program visit our website at =20 <<http://www.casro.org/>>www.casro.org.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail
=====

Date: Wed, 11 Aug 2004 10:15:58 -0400
Reply-To: Brian Dautch <bdautch@CMOR.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Brian Dautch <bdautch@CMOR.ORG>
Subject: Re: Frugging Press Release
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <6.0.1.1.2.20040810173038.01e5b450@localhost>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

TO: AAPOR Colleagues
FROM: Brian Dautch, CMOR Director of Government Affairs

To complement the information posted by Diane, I would like to call your attention to our home page, www.cmor.org. There we have posted a recent Advisory Opinion from the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) that is custom-tailored to the needs and concerns of the survey research profession. It clarifies our profession's status in the eyes of the Do Not Call law, and specifically addresses "sugging", among other important issues, over the course of its three pages.

A few months ago, CMOR asked the FTC to write this Opinion because of all the confusion and questions survey researchers had about Do Not Call, the issue of Subscription Account Numbers (SANs), "scrubbed" vs. "unscrubbed" calling lists, etc.

I would have cut and pasted the Advisory Opinion here, but I had trouble because the document is in PDF form. My other option would have been an attachment, but I was worried about the possibility of your spam filters blocking it out. So a quick visit to www.cmor.org will give you the Advisory Opinion under our "Breaking News" section right on our home page. I also wrote a detailed Q&A about the piece, which is posted just below the link to the Opinion itself.

If you have any questions about the document, the Q&A, or the implications of this Advisory Opinion, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Thanks,
Brian

Brian Dautch
Director of Government Affairs

CMOR

Promoting and Advocating Survey Research
6931 Arlington Rd., Suite 308
Bethesda, MD 20814
(301) 654-6601
bdautch@cmor.org <mailto:bdautch@cmor.org>

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Diane Bowers
Sent: Tuesday, August 10, 2004 5:40 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Frugging Press Release

TO: AAPOR Colleagues
FROM: Diane Bowers

I wanted to share with you a Press Release concerning a little-noted provision of the amended Telemarketing Sales Rule (Jan 2003) that prohibits misrepresentation in charitable fundraising. The FTC has added a separate provision to the TSR that prohibits specific deceptive practices by telefunders, including misrepresenting the purpose of the call. This government anti-"frugging" (fundraising under the guise of research) support provides a legal enforcement avenue to address "sugging" and, now, "frugging" complaints. Please read on for more details. Let me know if you have any questions, and if you, too, have received any "frugging" or "sugging" complaints of late. Thanks, Diane

2cd54813.jpg

170 North Country Road, Suite 4 Port Jefferson, New York 11777
Phone: (631)
928-6954 Fax: (631)
928-6041 Email: casro@casro.org Website:
<<http://www.casro.org/>>www.casro.org

FOR IMMEDIATE
RELEASE

Contact: Diane K. Bowers, President
August 10,
2004
Jim Robinson, Director, Government & Public Affairs

A Victory Against "Frugging"

Survey Research now has a powerful tool to combat "frugging" (fundraising under the guise of research). The Federal Government via the FTC will now be able to take action against fruggers directly. In amending the Telemarketing Sales Rule in 2003, the FTC heralded the establishment of the National Do Not Call Registry. We are all familiar with (and, for survey research, involved in) the escalating attention and overwhelming public support the National DNC Registry received. However, another provision was added to the amended TSR, which received little attention

and, yet, for survey research is equally fortuitous.

The amended TSR included a provision that prohibits misrepresentation in charitable fundraising. No longer can telemarketers who are soliciting charitable contributions (telefundors) misrepresent the purpose of their call: they must state promptly (at the beginning of the call) that their purpose is to solicit a charitable contribution. Fundraising under the guise of research, or “frugging,” is effectively prohibited.

Titled “Prohibited Deceptive Acts or Practices in the Solicitation of Charitable Contributions” (§310.3(d), Federal Register, Vo. 68, No. 19, 1/29/03), this provision makes it a violation of the Rule to “misrepresent, either directly or by implication” any material information such as the “nature, purpose or mission of any entity on behalf of which a charitable contribution is being requested.”

The TSR’s non-misrepresentation requirements originally addressed telemarketing “sales” only. The 1995 TSR effectively prohibited “sugging” (selling under the guise of research) by requiring that telemarketers state promptly (at the beginning of the call) that they are selling something, what the product/service is, and how much it costs.

With this new TSR provision, the prohibitions against telemarketing misrepresentation was expanded to address telemarketing “charitable fundraising” as well. If a charity uses a telemarketing organization to solicit contributions, those telefundors may not use deceptive practices, such as the “foot in the door” approach of “frugging,” to begin their solicitation.

The Federal Trade Commission amended the Telemarketing Sales Rule in January 2003. This amended rule received tremendous response from the public, industry, and media because of its groundbreaking decision to establish a National Do Not Call Registry. All eyes focused on this issue: the ever-increasing number of citizens signing up for the DNC list (now at over 60 million households); the courtroom opposition from the telemarketers, suing on grounds of unconstitutionality (now at the level of the Supreme Court); and the media overload of articles, interviews, editorials, etc. CASRO and the Survey Research Industry were equally absorbed: issuing comments, joining forces to write an amicus brief in support of the constitutionality and the FTC’s right to establish a DNC Registry, and, now, preparing for more-aggressive state DNC initiatives.

The anti-“sugging” and anti-“frugging” provisions of the FTC’s TSR are more important now than ever. Post-DNC, CASRO has already seen an increase in pseudo-surveys. Some telemarketers are, once again, using “sugging” and “frugging” as deceptive tools to reach the public. CASRO’s and the survey research industry’s self-regulatory “tools” in fighting “sugging” and “frugging” are significantly enhanced by the FTC and the TSR. CASRO and all survey researchers may use the enforcement division of the FTC to address complaints against telemarketers and telefundors. And, perhaps in the near future, we can put an end to these abuses of survey research.

For more information about CASRO and the CASRO Government & Public Affairs program visit our website at <<http://www.casro.org/>>www.casro.org.

- 30 -

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====

Date: Wed, 11 Aug 2004 14:00:48 -0400
Reply-To: Diane Bowers <dbowers@CASRO.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Diane Bowers <dbowers@CASRO.ORG>
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

To AAPORnetters,

I wanted to let you know that we received official confirmation that the CASRO position is absolutely correct in its consistent referral to "survey research as NOT COVERED by (NOT INCLUDED in) "telemarketing" laws, like the DNC Registry, the TCPA telemarketing regulations, and the TSR regulations. This is the same position that was expressed in AAPOR's and CASRO's Joint Amicus Brief on the DNC and in our joint Comments to the FTC re the Definitions in the CAM SPAM Act.

Our insistence on this position is based on thorough review of the definitions, language and intent of the statutes. Simply put, survey researchers are not "exempt" from telemarketing laws, because we are not telemarketers. Therefore we are not covered by these laws and don't have to comply with any aspect of telemarketing laws, even the provisions for "exempted" telemarketers. Survey researchers do not have to, nor should they, register as EOs and obtain a SAN. The only instance in which a survey researcher conceivably could be legally required to register as an EO and obtain a SAN is IF the survey researcher wanted to obtain a list scrubbed against the DNC registry--an instance that, practically speaking,

seems remote to CASRO members and probably to AAPOR members.

I am truly hopeful that the entire industry will understand the importance of this position, since the "exempt" position makes all of our government work harder, more costly, and, at the extreme, gives substance to those who believe (including some legislators) that survey research is a kind of "commercial activity," like direct (tele) marketing, and should be regulated as such.

Please read the following and let Duane, Jim or me know if you have further questions. Thanks, Diane

clip_image002.jpg

3 Upper Devon Port Jefferson, New York 11777
Phone: (631) 928-6954 Fax: (631) 928-6041 Email: casro@casro.org Website: <http://www.casro.org/>

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Contact: Duane Berlin, General Counsel
August 11, 2004
Diane Bowers, President

Jim Robinson, Director, CASRO GPA

FTC ISSUES CLARIFICATION OF ADVISORY OPINION Regarding Survey Research Organizations Status under Do-Not-Call Registry

Commission Lawyer Confirms that Survey Research should be referred to as Not Covered by DNC rather than Exempt and that Telephone Researchers Are Not Required to Access the National DNC Database

On August 9, 2004, FTC Staff Attorney David Torok, in response to an inquiry from CASRO, issued a clarification of his advisory opinion dated July 22, 2004, in which he discussed the relationship of survey research firms to the TSR and the Do Not Call Regulations.

Attorney Torok, in his clarification, confirmed again that survey research organizations are not telemarketers as that term is defined in the TSR. Additionally, Attorney Torok confirmed that as a result, survey research organizations are not exempt from the DNC, but are in fact not covered by that regulation. Attorney Torok explained that in his July 22, 2004 advisory opinion, he was using the word exempt in its informal,

=20
illustrative form rather than the technical, legal sense contemplated by=20
the TSR and the DNC and was simply trying to carve all entities into two=20
groups =96 those that must access the DNC, and those that are not required=
to=20
access it. He apologized for any confusion his use of =93exempt=94 may have=
=20
caused.

As we have repeatedly stated, CASRO believes that this distinction is=20
critical to our industry, because referring to survey research=20
organizations as =93exempt=94 indicates that they are subject to the Act and=
=20
the regulations as telemarketers, a classification CASRO has fought against=
=20
since these laws first came into existence.

Mr. Torok also stated to CASRO that because telephone survey researchers=20
are not covered by the TSR or the DNC regulation they do not have to access=
=20
the Do Not Call Registry.

Both of these clarifications confirm CASRO=92s position that survey=20
researchers should not be required to register as Exempt Organizations so=20
they can obtain Subscriber Account Numbers, which are used by telemarketers=
=20
to access the Registry.

This issue also demonstrates the importance of relying upon primary source=
=20
materials, in this case, the actual statute and regulations, when=20
conducting analysis of this kind. For example, we recognize that the FTC=92=
s=20
web site contains several instances of the illustrative use of =93exempt=94=
=20
when referring to survey research organizations=92 status with respect to=
the=20
DNC, which is causing confusion to some who have relied upon the site for=20
analysis and guidance. Based upon Attorney Torok=92s clarification of this=
=20
issue, CASRO is requesting that the FTC revise its web site to remove all=20
references to survey research organizations as =93exempt,=94 replacing them=
=20
with references to these entities as =93not covered,=94 which would be=20
consistent with the statute, regulation and Attorney Torok=92s=
clarification.

Mr. Torok=92s clarification and CASRO=92s request for clarification are set=
=20
forth below, in their entirety:

Sent: Monday, August 09, 2004 10:23 AM
Subject: RE: Request for Clarification

Dear Ms. Bowers:

Thank you for your email query, reprinted below. As stated in the staff opinion letter, legitimate survey research firms calling consumers for the sole purpose of conducting a survey are not engaged in "telemarketing" as that term is defined in the Telemarketing Sales Rule, 16 CFR 310.2(cc). As a result, such firms are "not covered" by the do not call provisions of that Rule, and they do not have to access the National Do Not Call Registry prior to engaging in telephonic surveys.

The staff opinion letter referred to survey research firms as "exempt" entities only in an attempt to divide all entities into two categories -those that have to access the National Do Not Call Registry, and those that do not.

I apologize for any confusion the use of that term may have caused members of your organization. Please feel free to contact me if you have any additional questions.

David M. Torok, Staff Attorney
Division of Marketing Practices
Federal Trade Commission
August 4, 2004

Mr. David M. Torok
Staff Attorney
Division of Marketing Practices
Federal Trade Commission

Dear Mr. Torok:

I am the President of the Council of American Survey Research Organizations (CASRO). I read with interest your Advisory Opinion to the Council for Marketing and Opinion Research (CMOR) dated July 22, 2004. I have a specific and, for my members, critical question that I hope you can answer. First, some background.

As the national trade association of survey research companies, CASRO has long agreed with and supported laws that are targeted to telemarketers and commercial activities, writing in support of the TCPA, the TSR, the FTC's Do Not Call Registry, and the CAN-SPAM Act. With the help of the USPS, we have waged successful challenges against fraudulent research operations that harm the integrity of survey research and survey research businesses. As an industry and profession, we

have consistently opposed and tried to help eliminate fundraising and selling under the guise of survey research (Sugging). As an example, the TSR's requirement that telemarketers state promptly (at the beginning of a call) that they are selling something, what the product is, and how much it costs has provided substantial government support to our efforts to stop Sugging.

CASRO has consistently stated that legitimate survey research is not included in, nor covered by, laws and regulations that specifically target telemarketing (either by regulation or by exemption) and other commercial activities, such as advertising, marketing, fundraising, promotion, and the like.

Accordingly, we do not believe that survey research can be properly described as exempt from the Do Not Call regulations. It is our understanding that such exemptions are applicable only to certain unsolicited callers that Congress and the Commission have determined should not have to comply with the regulation even though they engage in telemarketing. We believe that, because legitimate survey research is not telemarketing, it does not need to be exempt but is, rather, simply not covered by the regulation in the first place.

While this distinction may seem merely semantic, we believe that it is substantively important for many reasons, including the need to distinguish our industry from those that utilize unsolicited telephone calls for marketing, fundraising and sales. Indeed, one of the central reasons that we believe the distinction is critical is the issue that you addressed in your correspondence with CMOR, i.e., the attempt by some data vendors to require researchers to register as Exempt Organizations. We believe that describing research as exempt is contradictory and harmful and implies, in essence, that survey research is a kind of telemarketing.

Accordingly, we have been asked by our members and the survey research industry/profession in general (including corporate research departments, government research agencies, and academic research organizations) to clarify whether we are exempt or simply not included (=not covered) by the Do Not Call regulations.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please let me know. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,
Diane K. Bowers
President

cc: Duane Berlin, CASRO General Counsel
Simon Chadwick, CASRO Board Chair
Dave Richardson, CASRO Board Chair-Elect
Jim Robinson, CASRO Director of Government & Public Affairs

- 30 -

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====
Date: Wed, 11 Aug 2004 15:19:45 -0400
Reply-To: Brian Dautch <bdautch@CMOR.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Brian Dautch <bdautch@CMOR.ORG>
Subject: CMOR's Take-- FTC Advisory Opinion
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <6.0.1.1.2.20040811135619.01da7bb0@localhost>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

To the Members of AAPORNet:

I would like to call your attention to a brief segment of Ms. Bowers' latest message:

"The only instance in which a survey researcher conceivably could be legally required to register as an EO and obtain a SAN is IF the survey researcher wanted to obtain a list scrubbed against the DNC registry--an instance that, practically speaking, seems remote to CASRO members and probably to AAPOR members."

This exact point is one of the most crucial elements of the FTC's Advisory Opinion. In many cases, survey researchers, or their clients, make a business decision that they don't want to call people on the Do Not Call list. In other words, such researchers or clients are often saying to themselves, "I get low rates of respondent cooperation when I call people on the Do Not Call Registry. As a result, I'd like to purchase a list of data or sample that has been scrubbed against the DNC Registry."

In such an instance, that survey researcher is, in the eyes of the Do Not Call regulations and the FTC's Advisory Opinion, an "exempt organization" (EO). Ultimately, that is why CMOR chooses to use the phrase "exempt" in this particular circumstance; it's because the phrase "exempt organization" appears in this aspect of the law. And since survey researchers qualify as Exempt Organizations in this case, we use the word "exempt".

Please bear in mind that being "exempt" from Do Not Call in no way implies

that survey research is commercial speech. Acknowledging the Exempt Organization (and SAN) requirement is simply letting survey researchers know how Do Not Call works, and what must be done if they (or their clients) want to purchase a scrubbed list. This is strictly necessary to achieve Do Not Call compliance in the case of purchasing a scrubbed list; we do not imply any element of "commercial speech" by informing our members of what is required in order for legal and regulatory compliance to be achieved.

In CMOR's eyes, it is not our place to determine how frequently or infrequently a survey researcher chooses to purchase a scrubbed list. Rather, it is CMOR's place to fully establish the rights and responsibilities of survey researchers who wish to do so.

Thank you,
Brian

Brian Dautch
Director of Government Affairs

CMOR
Promoting and Advocating Survey Research
6931 Arlington Rd., Suite 308
Bethesda, MD 20814
(301) 654-6601
bdautch@cmor.org <mailto:bdautch@cmor.org>

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Diane Bowers
Sent: Wednesday, August 11, 2004 2:01 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject:

To AAPORnetters,

I wanted to let you know that we received official confirmation that the CASRO position is absolutely correct in its consistent referral to "survey research as NOT COVERED by (NOT INCLUDED in) "telemarketing" laws, like the DNC Registry, the TCPA telemarketing regulations, and the TSR regulations. This is the same position that was expressed in AAPOR's and CASRO's Joint Amicus Brief on the DNC and in our joint Comments to the FTC re the Definitions in the CAM SPAM Act.

Our insistence on this position is based on thorough review of the definitions, language and intent of the statutes. Simply put, survey researchers are not "exempt" from telemarketing laws, because we are not telemarketers. Therefore we are not covered by these laws and don't have to comply with any aspect of telemarketing laws, even the provisions for "exempted" telemarketers. Survey researchers do not have to, nor should they, register as EOs and obtain an SAN. The only instance in which a survey researcher conceivably could be legally required to register as an EO and obtain a SAN is IF the survey researcher wanted to obtain a list scrubbed against the DNC registry--an instance that, practically speaking, seems remote to CASRO members and probably to AAPOR members.

I am truly hopeful that the entire industry will understand the importance of this position, since the "exempt" position makes all of our government work harder, more costly, and, at the extreme, gives substance to those who believe (including some legislators) that survey research is a kind of "commercial activity," like direct (tele) marketing, and should be regulated as such.

Please read the following and let Duane, Jim or me know if you have further questions. Thanks, Diane

clip_image002.jpg

3 Upper Devon Port Jefferson, New York 11777
Phone: (631) 928-6954 Fax: (631)
928-6041 Email: casro@casro.org Website:
<<http://www.casro.org/>>www.casro.org

FOR IMMEDIATE
RELEASE
Contact: Duane Berlin, General Counsel
August 11,
2004
Diane Bowers, President

Jim
Robinson, Director, CASRO GPA

FTC ISSUES CLARIFICATION OF ADVISORY OPINION
Regarding Survey Research Organizations' Status under Do-Not-Call Registry

Commission Lawyer Confirms that Survey Research should be referred to as
"Not Covered" by DNC rather than "Exempt" and that
Telephone Researchers Are Not Required to Access the National DNC Database

On August 9, 2004, FTC Staff Attorney David Torok, in response to an inquiry from CASRO, issued a clarification of his advisory opinion dated July 22, 2004, in which he discussed the relationship of survey research firms to the TSR and the Do Not Call Regulations.

Attorney Torok, in his clarification, confirmed again that survey research organizations are not "telemarketers" as that term is defined in the TSR. Additionally, Attorney Torok confirmed that as a result, survey research organizations are not "exempt" from the DNC, but are in fact "not covered" by that regulation. Attorney Torok explained that in his July 22, 2004 advisory opinion, he was using the word "exempt" in its informal, illustrative form rather than the technical, legal sense contemplated by the TSR and the DNC and was simply trying to carve all entities into two groups – those that must access the DNC, and those that are not required to access it. He apologized for any confusion his use of "exempt" may have caused.

As we have repeatedly stated, CASRO believes that this distinction is

critical to our industry, because referring to survey research organizations as “exempt” indicates that they are subject to the Act and the regulations as telemarketers, a classification CASRO has fought against since these laws first came into existence.

Mr. Torok also stated to CASRO that because telephone survey researchers are not covered by the TSR or the DNC regulation they do not have to access the Do Not Call Registry.

Both of these clarifications confirm CASRO’s position that survey researchers should not be required to register as Exempt Organizations so they can obtain Subscriber Account Numbers, which are used by telemarketers to access the Registry.

This issue also demonstrates the importance of relying upon primary source materials, in this case, the actual statute and regulations, when conducting analysis of this kind. For example, we recognize that the FTC’s web site contains several instances of the illustrative use of “exempt” when referring to survey research organizations’ status with respect to the DNC, which is causing confusion to some who have relied upon the site for analysis and guidance. Based upon Attorney Torok’s clarification of this issue, CASRO is requesting that the FTC revise its web site to remove all references to survey research organizations as “exempt,” replacing them with references to these entities as “not covered,” which would be consistent with the statute, regulation and Attorney Torok’s clarification.

Mr. Torok’s clarification and CASRO’s request for clarification are set forth below, in their entirety:

Sent: Monday, August 09, 2004 10:23 AM
Subject: RE: Request for Clarification

Dear Ms. Bowers:

Thank you for your email query, reprinted below. As stated in the staff opinion letter, legitimate survey research firms calling consumers for the sole purpose of conducting a survey are not engaged in "telemarketing" as that term is defined in the Telemarketing Sales Rule, 16 CFR 310.2(cc). As a result, such firms are "not covered" by the do not call provisions of that Rule, and they do not have to access the National Do Not Call Registry prior to engaging in telephonic surveys.

The staff opinion letter referred to survey research firms as "exempt" entities only in an attempt to divide all entities into two categories -those that have to access the National Do Not Call Registry, and those that do not.

I apologize for any confusion the use of that term may have caused members of your organization. Please feel free to contact me if you have any additional questions.

David M. Torok, Staff Attorney
Division of Marketing Practices
Federal Trade Commission

August 4, 2004

Mr. David M. Torok
Staff Attorney
Division of Marketing Practices
Federal Trade Commission

Dear Mr. Torok:

I am the President of the Council of American Survey Research Organizations (CASRO). I read with interest your Advisory Opinion to the Council for Marketing and Opinion Research (CMOR) dated July 22, 2004. I have a specific and, for my members, critical question that I hope you can answer. First, some background.

As the national trade association of survey research companies, CASRO has long agreed with and supported laws that are targeted to telemarketers and “commercial” activities, writing in support of the TCPA, the TSR, the FTC’s Do Not Call Registry, and the CAN SPAM Act. With the help of the USPS, we have waged successful challenges against fraudulent “research” operations that harm the integrity of survey research and survey research businesses. As an industry and profession, we have consistently opposed and tried to help eliminate fundraising and selling under the guise of survey research (“Sugging”). As an example, the TSR’s requirement that telemarketers state promptly (at the beginning of a call) that they are selling something, what the product is, and how much it costs has provided substantial government support to our efforts to stop Sugging.

CASRO has consistently stated that legitimate survey research is not included in, nor covered by, laws and regulations that specifically target telemarketing (either by regulation or by exemption) and other “commercial” activities, such as advertising, marketing, fundraising, promotion, and the like.

Accordingly, we do not believe that survey research can be properly described as “exempt” from the Do Not Call regulations. It is our understanding that such exemptions are applicable only to certain unsolicited callers that Congress and the Commission have determined should not have to comply with the regulation even though they engage in telemarketing. We believe that, because legitimate survey research is not telemarketing, it does not need to be “exempt,” but is, rather, simply not covered by the regulation in the first place.

While this distinction may seem merely semantic, we believe that it is substantively important for many reasons, including the need to distinguish our industry from those that utilize unsolicited telephone calls for marketing, fundraising and sales. Indeed, one of the central reasons that we believe the distinction is critical is the issue that you addressed in your correspondence with CMOR, i.e., the attempt by some data vendors to require researchers to register as Exempt Organizations. We believe that describing research as “exempt” is contradictory and harmful and implies, in essence, that survey research is a kind of telemarketing.

Accordingly, we have been asked by our members and the survey research industry/profession in general (including corporate research departments, government research agencies, and academic research organizations) to clarify whether we are “exempt” or simply “not included” (“not covered”) by the Do Not Call regulations.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please let me know. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,
Diane K. Bowers
President

cc: Duane Berlin, CASRO General Counsel
Simon Chadwick, CASRO Board Chair
Dave Richardson, CASRO Board Chair-Elect
Jim Robinson, CASRO Director of Government & Public Affairs

- 30 -

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Thu, 12 Aug 2004 08:59:18 -0500
Reply-To: ALLAN L MCCUTCHEON <amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: ALLAN L MCCUTCHEON <amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU>
Subject: 2004 Nebraska Symposium on Survey Science
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

2004 Nebraska Symposium on Survey Science

Exposures and Well-Being:
Emerging Methodologies in Life-Events Research

October 21-23, 2004
Gallup University Riverfront Campus, Omaha, Nebraska, USA

Co-sponsors

The Gallup Research Center of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln
The Gallup Organization
Funding generously provided through the Othmer Foundation

The prospective and retrospective collection of life-events data has become instrumental toward answering fundamental issues on the human condition in the behavioral, social, and health sciences.

- * *How can we optimize the quality of retrospective reports?
- * *How can panel surveys best accommodate a mix of prospective and retrospective data collection methods?
- * *What analytic methods best reveal substantive findings in life-events research?

The national and international speakers at this symposium, from diverse fields including sociology, psychology, psychiatry, economics, criminology, social work, nursing, demography, and statistics, will discuss emerging data collection and data quality methods in the measurement and analysis of life histories on partnering, parenting, labor, substance use, family violence, crime, and health-risk behaviors.

Presenters

Duane Alwin, Pennsylvania State University
Jennifer Bailey, University of Washington
Robert F. Belli, University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lee Berney, Imperial College London
Wil Dijkstra, Free University Amsterdam
Kristy Martyn, University of Michigan
Edward P. Mulvey, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine
Maike Reimer, Max Planck Institute for Human Development
Linda Carter Sobell, Nova Southeastern University
Frank P. Stafford, University of Michigan
Wander van der Vaart, Free University Amsterdam
Kazuo Yamaguchi, University of Chicago
Mieko Yoshihama, University of Michigan

Registration

PLEASE REGISTER EARLY -- SPACE IS LIMITED

Via the web at <http://sram.unl.edu/nebsymp04.asp>

<<http://sram.unl.edu/nebsymp04.asp>>

\$125; Student \$50

Registration includes all presentations, materials, refreshment breaks, and lunches. Most hotels include complimentary breakfast and transportation to and from the Gallup University.

You can find more information regarding travel and hotels on the website as well!

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

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

Date: Thu, 12 Aug 2004 11:00:26 -0400
Reply-To: Claudia Deane <deanec@WASHPOST.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Claudia Deane <deanec@WASHPOST.COM>
Subject: New Poll Watchers column
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Heads up: new Poll Watchers column posted on washingtonpost.com

Young Voters Deserting Bush

AAPOR Protests 9/11 Commission Mistake

What's Next for the Bounce?

Bouncelet for Teresa

Poll Vault: [Expletive Deleted] Potty Mouths

LINK:
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A59072-2004Aug12.html>

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Thu, 12 Aug 2004 11:47:52 -0500
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: Job Opportunity
Comments: To: AAPORNet@asu.edu
Comments: cc: skannel@lspa.com
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Research Analyst position open in a progressive public policy research firm in Washington, DC. This position would be with a four-person team conducting national public opinion surveys and studies for foundations and non-profits on issues related to healthcare coverage, poverty, global health, reproductive health, and other social issues. Statistical background a plus as well as knowledge of telephone surveys and focus groups. Strong writing skills a must. A perfect position for both recent grads and those with several years of work experience. Please fax resume to: (202) 776-9074 ATTN: SUSAN KANNEL.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Fri, 13 Aug 2004 14:31:30 -0400
Reply-To: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmglp@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU>
Subject: Literature on response rates for docs?
Comments: To: AAPORnet List server <aapornet@asu.edu>
Comments: cc: "reitsma, angelique" <ar6j@virginia.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
Content-disposition: inline

TO: The AAPORnet list

Need some input here . . .

We completed a mail-out survey of practicing surgeons, about ethical issues, for a group of investigators in our bioethics group here. We achieved a response rate of 50.1% using a Dillman-style mailout that included a cash incentive and telephone reminders at the last stage.

We have just heard that the investigators had a manuscript based on our survey rejected by JAMA in part because the response rate was considered "very low."

I seem to recall discussion of this issue before, about JAMA having some unrealistic expectations regarding response rates. Anyone know where I can find that in the archives?

The real question is: Is there literature somebody can suggest that would bear out our conviction that getting 50% back in a survey of surgeons (not the easiest survey targets) is pretty good? How should this decent response rate properly be set into context for the reviewers at the next journal?

Thanks,
Tom

Thomas M. Guterbock Voice: (434)243-5223
Director CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222
Center for Survey Research FAX: (434)243-5233
University of Virginia EXPRESS DELIVERY: 2400 Old Ivy Road
P. O. Box 400767 Suite 223
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767 Charlottesville, VA 22903
e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail
=====

Date: Fri, 13 Aug 2004 14:01:51 -0500
Reply-To: "Wolf, James G" <jamwolf@IUPUI.EDU>

bear out our conviction that getting 50% back in a survey of surgeons =
(not the easiest survey targets) is pretty good? How should this decent
response rate properly be set into context for the reviewers at the next
journal?

Thanks,
Tom

Thomas M. Guterbock Voice: (434)243-5223
Director CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222
Center for Survey Research FAX: (434)243-5233
University of Virginia EXPRESS DELIVERY: 2400 Old Ivy Road
P. O. Box 400767 Suite 223
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767 Charlottesville, VA 22903
e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====
Date: Fri, 13 Aug 2004 16:44:05 -0400
Reply-To: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Subject: Re: Literature on response rates for docs?
Comments: To: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmglp@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU>,
 AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I recall that exchange and believe some good points were made but can't =
think of what to search on other than AMA or JAMA.

The discussion of response rates by Gary Langer of ABC News is one of =
the best I've seen written for the intelligent but possibly =
non-technical layperson.

Paul Erdos (precursor to Dillman) once said about his firm's 50 percent =
threshold: "I want to be able to face the client and say more people =
answered (the survey) than did not!"

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
(610) 408-8800
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

----- Original Message -----=20
From: Thomas M. Guterbock=20
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu=20
Sent: Friday, August 13, 2004 2:31 PM
Subject: Literature on response rates for docs?

TO: The AAPORnet list

Need some input here . . .

We completed a mail-out survey of practicing surgeons, about ethical issues, for a group of investigators in our bioethics group here. We achieved a response rate of 50.1% using a Dillman-style mailout that included a cash incentive and telephone reminders at the last stage.

We have just heard that the investigators had a manuscript based on = our survey rejected by JAMA in part because the response rate was considered "very low."

I seem to recall discussion of this issue before, about JAMA having = some unrealistic expectations regarding response rates. Anyone know where I = can find that in the archives?

The real question is: Is there literature somebody can suggest that = would bear out our conviction that getting 50% back in a survey of surgeons = (not the easiest survey targets) is pretty good? How should this decent response rate properly be set into context for the reviewers at the next journal?

Thanks,
Tom

Thomas M. Guterbock Voice: (434)243-5223
Director CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222
Center for Survey Research FAX: (434)243-5233
University of Virginia EXPRESS DELIVERY: 2400 Old Ivy Road
P. O. Box 400767 Suite 223
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767 Charlottesville, VA 22903
e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail=

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Fri, 13 Aug 2004 14:04:49 -0700
Reply-To: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@ASU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@ASU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Literature on response rates for docs?
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Comments: cc: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmg1p@cms.mail.virginia.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Tom,

A search of the AAPORNET archives at <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> on the keyword JAMA shows a discussion from May of 2003 about their publication of an article on internet use. It refers to their reluctance to publish surveys with <50% response rate. The poster was Karen Donelan and the Subject was: "A real case: response rates, publication and the news." There were nine follow-up messages.

If you haven't used the AAPORNET archives before, click on the link above to go there. If it is your first visit, you'll need to create a password and let Listserv save it as a cookie (on each pc you use to access the archives). The password is up to you; it is not related to your AAPOR web site userid or password. There is a link on the page to set your password.

Once you've done that, you can click on the "search the archives" link and type in your search terms. There is on-line help to get you going.

All months since the move to ASU in October 2002 return individual messages, along with some of the earlier months of the USC archives that I've converted. The unconverted USC archives just give you the whole month; use your browser's search function to find the particular message.

Please write me if you have any questions about how to use this feature of AAPORNET. There is a wealth of history here: Nov 1994 to today!

Shap Wolf

AAPORNET volunteer administrator
Associate Chair, Publications & Information=20

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

From: Thomas M. Guterbock Sent: Friday, 13 August, 2004 11:32 AM

TO: The AAPORnet list

Need some input here . . .

We completed a mail-out survey of practicing surgeons, about ethical issues, for a group of investigators in our bioethics group here. We

achieved a response rate of 50.1% using a Dillman-style mailout that included a cash incentive and telephone reminders at the last stage.

We have just heard that the investigators had a manuscript based on our survey rejected by JAMA in part because the response rate was considered "very low."

I seem to recall discussion of this issue before, about JAMA having some unrealistic expectations regarding response rates. Anyone know where I can find that in the archives?

The real question is: Is there literature somebody can suggest that would bear out our conviction that getting 50% back in a survey of surgeons (not the easiest survey targets) is pretty good? How should this decent response rate properly be set into context for the reviewers at the next journal?

Thanks,
Tom

Thomas M. Guterbock Voice: (434)243-5223
Director CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222
Center for Survey Research FAX: (434)243-5233
University of Virginia EXPRESS DELIVERY: 2400 Old Ivy Road
P. O. Box 400767 Suite 223
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767 Charlottesville, VA 22903
e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Mon, 16 Aug 2004 11:16:46 -0400
Reply-To: Yasamin Miller <yd17@CORNELL.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Yasamin Miller <yd17@CORNELL.EDU>
Subject: NY City Parents - web access
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

There is a professor at Cornell who is interested in surveying parents of school children throughout New York, focusing more on low-income households. Is there any data available to determine how many households have internet access (nationwide vs New York State) and if these numbers can be broken down by other household demographics (such as income)?
Many thanks for your assistance.

Yasamin

Yasamin Miller, Director
Survey Research Institute - SRI
168 Ives Hall
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853
* yd17@cornell.edu
(607-255-0148
fax: 607-255-7118

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail
=====

Date: Mon, 16 Aug 2004 10:31:47 -0500
Reply-To: "Smith, David W" <SmithD2@UTHSCSA.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Smith, David W" <SmithD2@UTHSCSA.EDU>
Subject: Re: Literature on response rates for docs? (4)
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Try Peter Mariolis at CDC <pxml@cdc.gov>. He was working on the BRFSS, behavioral surveys of the population. This survey is the origin of several articles, mostly in JAMA on weight, diet, and chronic diseases. He told me orally that this was an issue with the major medical journals and that he was going to be working on this for a year. (This was a couple of years ago.) Also try Ali Mokhdad <ahm1@cdc.gov>, who is now in charge of the BRFSS.

I designed two mail surveys of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgeons in the 1990s. The data collection was done by the Association (AAOMS). It is a dental specialty, though about one-third of them get an MD as part of their residency training. As I recall there are about 4000-5000 oral surgeons. For the first survey the response rate was just over 50%. All the staff agreed that rate was not adequate and for the next one the response rate was about 75%. =20

Both surveys used virtually all the techniques suggested by Dillman in Mail and Telephone Surveys. This is a modest sized group who know each other fairly well through professional contacts including meetings, accreditation, shared lobbying, shared insurance concerns, and the maintenance of common professional standards. The professional sanction of the Association and having a PI well known to the members doubtless helped a lot.

For the second survey, we hired a staff member to make personal contacts with the surgeon or someone representing the surgeon, almost always his or her office manager. (Most oral surgeons are in relatively small practices, no more than three.) We asked the office manager to keep the questionnaire "on top" of the pile of mail requiring a response. The staff member also gave some oral instructions regarding the information we expected, such as making judgements rather than looking up records. We may have made some other minor changes but I believe this one made all the difference.

Regards,

David Smith

David W. Smith, Ph.D., M.P.H.
Associate Professor, Biometry
The University of Texas School of Public Health
San Antonio Branch Campus
voice: (210) 562-5512
e-mail: david.w.smith@uth.tmc.edu
or smithd2@uthscsa.edu

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

Date: Fri, 13 Aug 2004 14:31:30 -0400
From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmg1p@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU>
Subject: Literature on response rates for docs?

TO: The AAPORnet list

Need some input here . . .

We completed a mail-out survey of practicing surgeons, about ethical issues, for a group of investigators in our bioethics group here. We achieved a response rate of 50.1% using a Dillman-style mailout that included a cash incentive and telephone reminders at the last stage.

We have just heard that the investigators had a manuscript based on our survey rejected by JAMA in part because the response rate was considered "very low."

I seem to recall discussion of this issue before, about JAMA having some unrealistic expectations regarding response rates. Anyone know where I can find that in the archives?

The real question is: Is there literature somebody can suggest that would bear out our conviction that getting 50% back in a survey of surgeons (not the easiest survey targets) is pretty good? How should this decent response rate properly be set into context for the reviewers at the next journal?

Thanks,
Tom

Thomas M. Guterbock Voice: (434)243-5223
Director CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222
Center for Survey Research FAX: (434)243-5233
University of Virginia EXPRESS DELIVERY: 2400 Old Ivy Road

P. O. Box 400767 Suite 223
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767 Charlottesville, VA 22903
e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text: set
aapornet nomail On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Fri, 13 Aug 2004 14:01:51 -0500
From: "Wolf, James G" <jamwolf@IUPUI.EDU>
Subject: Re: Literature on response rates for docs?

Tom,

I'm not aware of any conclusive literature that might impress JAMA. =3D
Based on the conversation I had with others on this topic at the AAPOR =
=3D
conference last May, the real story may lie in how the "JAMA-approved" =
=3D
response rates are calculated. AAPOR's standard definitions for =3D
calculating response rates are apparently not required by JAMA and other
=3D medical journals and therefore not always used.

For what it's worth: congratulations on your 50% rate with getting =3D
doctors to respond!

=3D3D-=3D3D-=3D3D-=3D3D-=3D3D-=3D3D-=3D3D-=3D3D-=3D3D-=3D3D-=3D3D-=3D3D=
3D-=3D3D-=3D3D-=3D3D-=3D3D-=3D3D-
=3D3D=3D
-=3D3D-=3D3D

Jim =
Wolf=3DA0=3DA0=3DA0=3DA0=3DA0=3DA0=3DA0=3DA0=3DA0=3DA0=3DA0=3DA0 =
=3DA0=3DA0 jamwolf@iupui.edu
Director, Public Opinion Laboratory Indiana University School of Liberal
Arts at IUPUI
(317) 278-9230

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>] On Behalf Of Thomas M. =3D
Guterbock
Sent: Friday, August 13, 2004 1:32 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Literature on response rates for docs?

TO: The AAPORnet list

Need some input here . . .

We completed a mail-out survey of practicing surgeons, about ethical
issues, for a group of investigators in our bioethics group here. We

achieved a response rate of 50.1% using a Dillman-style mailout that included a cash incentive and telephone reminders at the last stage.

We have just heard that the investigators had a manuscript based on our survey rejected by JAMA in part because the response rate was considered "very low."

I seem to recall discussion of this issue before, about JAMA having some unrealistic expectations regarding response rates. Anyone know where I can find that in the archives?

The real question is: Is there literature somebody can suggest that would bear out our conviction that getting 50% back in a survey of surgeons (not the easiest survey targets) is pretty good? How should this decent response rate properly be set into context for the reviewers at the next journal?

Thanks,
Tom

Thomas M. Guterbock Voice: (434)243-5223
Director CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222
Center for Survey Research FAX: (434)243-5233
University of Virginia EXPRESS DELIVERY: 2400 Old Ivy Road
P. O. Box 400767 Suite 223
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767 Charlottesville, VA 22903
e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text: set aapornet nomail On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text: set aapornet nomail On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Fri, 13 Aug 2004 16:44:05 -0400
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Subject: Re: Literature on response rates for docs?

I recall that exchange and believe some good points were made but can't think of what to search on other than AMA or JAMA.

The discussion of response rates by Gary Langer of ABC News is one of the best I've seen written for the intelligent but possibly non-technical layperson.

Paul Erdos (precursor to Dillman) once said about his firm's 50 percent

=3D

threshold: "I want to be able to face the client and say more people =3D answered (the survey) than did not!"

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
(610) 408-8800
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

----- Original Message -----=3D20
From: Thomas M. Guterbock=3D20
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu=3D20
Sent: Friday, August 13, 2004 2:31 PM
Subject: Literature on response rates for docs?

TO: The AAPORnet list

Need some input here . . .

We completed a mail-out survey of practicing surgeons, about ethical issues, for a group of investigators in our bioethics group here. We achieved a response rate of 50.1% using a Dillman-style mailout that included a cash incentive and telephone reminders at the last stage.

We have just heard that the investigators had a manuscript based on =
=3D our survey rejected by JAMA in part because the response rate was considered "very low."

I seem to recall discussion of this issue before, about JAMA having =
=3D some unrealistic expectations regarding response rates. Anyone know where I =3D can find that in the archives?

The real question is: Is there literature somebody can suggest that =
=3D would bear out our conviction that getting 50% back in a survey of surgeons =3D (not the easiest survey targets) is pretty good? How = should this decent response rate properly be set into context for the reviewers at the next journal?

Thanks,
Tom

Thomas M. Guterbock Voice: (434)243-5223
Director CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222
Center for Survey Research FAX: (434)243-5233
University of Virginia EXPRESS DELIVERY: 2400 Old Ivy Road
P. O. Box 400767 Suite 223
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767 Charlottesville, VA 22903
e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text: set
aapornet nomail On your return send: set aapornet mail=3D

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text: set
aapornet nomail On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Fri, 13 Aug 2004 14:04:49 -0700
From: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@ASU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Literature on response rates for docs?

Tom,
A search of the AAPORNET archives at
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> on the keyword JAMA shows a
discussion from May of 2003 about their publication of an article on
internet use. It refers to their reluctance to publish surveys with <50%
response rate. The poster was Karen Donelan and the Subject was: "A real
case: response rates, publication and the news." There were nine
follow-up messages.

If you haven't used the AAPORNET archives before, click on the link
above to go there. If it is your first visit, you'll need to create a
password and let Listserv save it as a cookie (on each pc you use to
access the archives). The password is up to you; it is not related to
your AAPOR web site userid or password. There is a link on the page to
set your password.

Once you've done that, you can click on the "search the archives" link
and type in your search terms. There is on-line help to get you going.

All months since the move to ASU in October 2002 return individual
messages, along with some of the earlier months of the USC archives that
I've converted. The unconverted USC archives just give you the whole
month; use your browser's search function to find the particular
message.

Please write me if you have any questions about how to use this feature
of AAPORNET. There is a wealth of history here: Nov 1994 to today!

Shap Wolf

AAPORNET volunteer administrator
Associate Chair, Publications & Information=3D20

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

From: Thomas M. Guterbock Sent: Friday, 13 August, 2004 11:32 AM

TO: The AAPORnet list

Need some input here . . .

We completed a mail-out survey of practicing surgeons, about ethical
issues, for a group of investigators in our bioethics group here. We
achieved a response rate of 50.1% using a Dillman-style mailout that

included a cash incentive and telephone reminders at the last stage.

We have just heard that the investigators had a manuscript based on our survey rejected by JAMA in part because the response rate was considered "very low."

I seem to recall discussion of this issue before, about JAMA having some unrealistic expectations regarding response rates. Anyone know where I can find that in the archives?

The real question is: Is there literature somebody can suggest that would bear out our conviction that getting 50% back in a survey of surgeons (not the easiest survey targets) is pretty good? How should this decent response rate properly be set into context for the reviewers at the next journal?

Thanks,
Tom

Thomas M. Guterbock Voice: (434)243-5223
Director CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222
Center for Survey Research FAX: (434)243-5233
University of Virginia EXPRESS DELIVERY: 2400 Old Ivy Road
P. O. Box 400767 Suite 223
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767 Charlottesville, VA 22903
e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text: set
aapornet nomail On your return send: set aapornet mail

End of AAPORNET Digest - 12 Aug 2004 to 13 Aug 2004 (#2004-165)

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====
Date: Mon, 16 Aug 2004 13:36:22 -0400
Reply-To: Jane Dockery <jane.dockery@WRIGHT.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jane Dockery <jane.dockery@WRIGHT.EDU>
Organization: Wright State University
Subject: surveys that assess voter issues
Comments: To: "AAPORNET@asu.edu" <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Comments: cc: David Jones <david.jones@wright.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

My colleague, Jack Dustin, is searching for questionnaires that generally address voter issues. He wants to probe voters about which

issues they consider to be most important when they vote. This survey would be implemented via a CATI system. If you have an instrument or could refer him to one, please send a response to David Jones, who is cc'd above. Thank you, Jane

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====
Date: Tue, 17 Aug 2004 14:52:10 -0400
Reply-To: Roman Czujko <rczujko@AIP.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Roman Czujko <rczujko@AIP.ORG>
Subject: job opening in the D.C. area
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable
Content-disposition: inline

SENIOR RESEARCH ASSISTANT=20

The American Institute of Physics is seeking a Senior Research Assistant = who will be responsible for conducting surveys of the scientific workforce.= The position involves statistical programming, database management, = questionnaire development, data analysis, interpretation, and report = production. The successful candidate will oversee the work of coders and = work as part of a research team.=20

Bachelor's degree in social science or statistics preferred or equivalent = combination of education and work experience is desired. Requires = experience with statistical software packages (syntax-based SPSS preferred)= , attention to detail, and excellent oral and written communication = skills. Also requires experience with social science or survey research = and the ability to work independently and as part of a research team.=20

If you feel you have the qualifications and would like to apply for this = position, please send your resume to: The American Institute of Physics/Hum= an Resources Division, One Physics Ellipse, College Park, MD 20740: FAX: = 301-209-0847: EMAIL: aiphr@aip.org The American Institute of Physics is an = Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity Employer.=20

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====
Date: Tue, 17 Aug 2004 13:16:46 -0700
Reply-To: Douglas Rivers <doug@POLIMETRIX.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Douglas Rivers <doug@POLIMETRIX.COM>
Subject: Job Openings at Polimetrix

Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Polimetrix, a venture-funded startup based in Palo Alto, is developing databases, analytics, and infrastructure for political polling and opinion measurement. We are small (currently nine employees, mostly Ph.D.'s) and innovative (testing some novel approaches to survey data collection). If you're energetic, imaginative, technologically sophisticated, and care about politics, we probably have a position for you.

PROJECT MANAGER

We are looking for project managers to implement online opinion surveys. We are innovators in the field of public affairs surveying, based in Palo Alto, California.

Responsibilities include implementation and monitoring of online polls, insuring projects are performed within budget, on-time, and according to quality standards, interfacing with other product managers, panel operations director, statistical-operations staff, developing programs to promote panelist loyalty and satisfaction, and assistance in the design of polls.

The successful candidate will have a background in survey research, statistics, and social science, excellent computer skills (including use of database and statistics software), excellent communication skills, an aptitude for teamwork, and the ability to work on multiple projects in a fast-paced environment.

ANALYST

Analysts assist in the design, implementation, and analysis of surveys. A B.A. in social science or statistics is required, along with coursework and possibly practical experience in statistical analysis of survey data. Strong computing skills, including some database or Web programming, is desirable. The most important characteristic for this job is intelligence, enthusiasm, and a willingness to work hard and learn.

SENIOR STATISTICIAN/STATISTICIAN

We are looking for applicants with strong backgrounds in applied statistics or econometrics to assist in the development of sampling and analytical techniques for political polling. You will work with our survey services and

information technology groups. Requirements include graduate coursework or Ph.D. in applied statistics or econometrics. A strong background in computing also essential.

WEB APPLICATION PROGRAMMER

You will help design, deploy, and maintain web applications. Experience in page design, server-hosted and client-side programming, and database interfacing is sought.

Experience with both Microsoft (Windows Server 2003, IIS, SQL Server 2000, and C# ASP.NET) and LAMP (Linux, Apache, MySQL, PHP/Python) is essential since we operate on both platforms.

Candidates should be prepared to work with a small team of developers using modern software engineering principles including object-oriented design. They

must have good communication skills, be able to support the non-technical staff, provide systems maintenance assistance, and work in a fast-paced environment.

HOW TO APPLY:

Send cover letter and resume by email to jobs@polimetrix.com or snail mail to Polimetrix, Inc., 364 University Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94301. Please mention the position that you are applying for.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Tue, 17 Aug 2004 16:38:22 -0400
Reply-To: Sid Groeneman <sid.grc@VERIZON.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Sid Groeneman <sid.grc@VERIZON.NET>
Subject: Survey Analyst Needed for Short-term Project
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Comments: cc: "Morton, Diane" <diane.morton@aspeninst.org>,

"topolsky, janet" <janet.topolsky@aspeninst.org>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

SHORT-TERM CONTRACT POSITION AVAILABLE FOR

SURVEY RESEARCH ANALYST

The Aspen Institute Community Strategies Group (CSG) is currently conducting a survey of all (approx. 650) community foundations in the United States to learn about trends in the formation of affiliate/community funds, and in community foundation coverage of rural areas. CSG seeks a researcher who is willing to work on a contract basis to do the data analysis of the survey and produce a report on the findings. This is an excellent opportunity for an individual interested in obtaining experience in the growing field of philanthropic research and in working for a high-profile non-profit organization. The work is anticipated to require between 125 - 225 hours and is expected to begin in late August or early September.

Primary duties will include:

- * Preparing a detailed report that presents and analyzes the survey data. Specific components of the report, in addition to the core, topic-by-topic analysis, will be (1) an opening section on the background and objectives of the research; (2) a concluding section synthesizing the results in light of the study's objectives; (3) an executive summary; (4) a description of the survey methods and procedures (including a profile of the final sample); (5) a copy of the survey questions (with branching logic).
- * Preparing tables and/or graphics presenting the marginal frequency distributions overall and for key respondent segments, and to highlight key findings. The tables and graphs will be summarized using text, and noting important relationships, interpretations, and implications.
- * Classifying (coding) open-end question responses into appropriate categories so the data can be statistically analyzed.
- * Preparing any necessary re-drafts of the survey report.

The ideal candidate will possess the following skills and attributes:

- * A Bachelor's degree with concentration in a social or behavioral sciences field of study (Master's degree preferred);
- * Understanding of survey research methods;
- * Training in basic statistical analysis (equivalent of at least two courses in statistics/data analysis);
- * Experience preparing reports summarizing data from survey studies;
- * Ability to summarize survey data results clearly and succinctly;
- * Experience and facility using Microsoft Excel, including use of common statistical functions and graphs;

- * A strong orientation to detail and research quality;
- * Willingness to work under the supervision of senior project staff;
- * Commitment to finishing the report on time (early October);
- * A candidate located in the Washington, DC-metropolitan area is preferred, but not essential.

Compensation:

The Community Strategies Group will pay \$20 - \$25 per hour for the work described above. The exact amount will be determined based on the qualifications and experience of the successful candidate.

The Community Strategies Group is a program of the Aspen Institute established in 1985. CSG strives to have a positive impact on communities by designing and facilitating learning opportunities that enhance the efforts of organizations and practitioners working to achieve more widely shared and lasting prosperity in communities, and that sustain the impact of funders' investment in those communities and relevant fields. Supporting peer learning in the fields of community and economic development, resource stewardship, civic capacity and philanthropy has been our core business for the past decade.

CSG manages the Rural Development Philanthropy Learning Network, and has been organizing and tailoring Peer-Exchange Workshops, Learning Clusters, Learning Institutes, workbooks and publications for community foundations since 1993. For more information about CSG, please visit www.aspenincsg.org/rdp.

The Aspen Institute is an international non-profit organization dedicated to informed dialogue and inquiry on issues of global concern. Founded in 1950, it has pursued its mission of fostering enlightened leadership through seminars, policy studies and fellowship programs. The Institute is headquartered in Washington, DC, and has campuses in Aspen, Colorado, and on the Wye River on Maryland's Eastern Shore. Its international network includes partner Aspen Institute in Berlin, Rome, Lyon and Tokyo, and leadership programs in Africa.

How to apply:

Interested applicants should submit a resume and cover letter (via e-mail or regular mail) by August 25th to:

Diane Morton
Community Strategies Group
The Aspen Institute
One Dupont Circle
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
diane.morton@aspeninst.org <<mailto:jt@aspeninst.org>>

No phone inquiries, please!

The Aspen Institute is an equal opportunity employer. Minority applicants are particularly encouraged to apply.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail
=====

Date: Wed, 18 Aug 2004 10:53:21 -0400
Reply-To: Roger Tourangeau <rtourangeau@SURVEY.UMD.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Roger Tourangeau <rtourangeau@SURVEY.UMD.EDU>
Subject: Upcoming Lecture at JPSM
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
Content-disposition: inline

JPSM is sponsoring at Distinguished Lecture by Chris Skinner on Friday, September 10. The title is "Some Issues in Modeling with Complex Survey Data."

The talk will be at 3:00 pm at 2205 Lefrak Hall on the University of Maryland, College Park Campus.

This lecture will provide a discussion of some issues arising in the analysis of survey data when complex sampling designs have been employed. In addition to a survey of some general approaches to modeling with complex survey data, the lecture will include specific consideration of the impact of complex sampling on standard errors in certain kinds of longitudinal analyses. Some evidence of high design effects for such analyses will be considered using data from the British Household Panel Survey.

Chris Skinner is Professor of Social Statistics at the University of Southampton, where he has worked since he completed his PhD there in 1982. Before then he completed a first degree in Mathematics at the University of Cambridge and a Masters degree in Statistics at the London School of Economics. He has interests in statistical aspects of survey methodology and in statistical methods in the social sciences. He is Director of the UK Centre for Applied Social Surveys which runs courses on survey methodology and provides an online resource of survey questions. He is also Director of a new U.K. National Centre for Research Methods, which will promote developments and training in research methods in the social sciences. He has researched methodological aspects of government statistics, particularly through an ongoing cooperative project with the Office for National Statistics. His publications include co-editing books on Analysis of Complex Surveys (1989) with Tim Holt and Fred Smith and on Analysis of Survey Data (2003) with Ray Chambers.

There will be two discussants--Keith Rust from Westat and Barry Graubard from NCI. A reception will immediately follow the talk.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Thu, 19 Aug 2004 08:47:20 -0700
Reply-To: Wei Yen <weiyen@UCLA.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Wei Yen <weiyen@UCLA.EDU>
Subject: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Thought this group might be interested in this. - Wei Yen, UCLA

U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

Thu Aug 19, 6:08 AM ET

By ANDREW SELSKY, Associated Press Writer

CARACAS, Venezuela - A U.S. firm's exit poll that said President Hugo Chavez would lose a recall referendum has landed in the center of a controversy following his resounding victory.

"Exit Poll Results Show Major Defeat for Chavez," the survey, conducted by Penn, Schoen & Berland Associates, asserted even as Sunday's voting was still on. But in fact, the opposite was true AD Chavez ended up trouncing his enemies and capturing 59 percent of the vote.

Any casual observer of the 2000 U.S. presidential elections knows exit polls can at times be unreliable. But the poll has become an issue here because the opposition, which mounted the drive to force the leftist leader from office, insists it shows the results from the vote itself were fraudulent. The opposition also claims electronic voting machines were rigged, but has provided no evidence.

Election officials banned publication or broadcast of any exit polls during the historic vote on whether to oust Chavez, a populist who has sought to help the poor and is reviled by the wealthy, who accuse him of stoking class divisions.

But results of the Penn, Schoen & Berland survey were sent out by fax and e-mail to media outlets and opposition offices more than four hours before polls closed. It predicted just the opposite of what happened, saying 59 percent had voted in favor of recalling Chavez.

Cesar Gaviria, secretary general of the Organization of American States who=20 monitored the referendum, said the poll must have had a tremendous impact=20 on Chavez's opponents, who felt they were about to complete their two-year=20 drive to oust him.

"They were told they had a lead of 20 points and then when the results=20 came, they lost by 20 points," Gaviria said. "It's very difficult to deal=20 with that."

Both Gaviria and former President Jimmy Carter, another election monitor,=20 endorsed the vote, saying the results coincided with their own independent=20 samplings.

Mark Penn, of Penn, Schoen & Berland Associates, said Wednesday he has=20 limited knowledge of the exit poll. He said his partner, Doug Schoen,=20 "believes there were more problems with the voting than with the exit poll."

Schoen could not immediately be reached, and another employee familiar with=20 the poll declined to comment.

"We have to let the authorities do their investigation of the election,"=20 said Marcela Berland, with the firm. "It would be irresponsible to=20 interfere with that."

Critics of the exit poll have questioned how it was conducted because=20 officials have said Penn, Schoen & Berland worked with a U.S.-funded=20 Venezuela group that the Chavez government considers hostile.

Penn, Schoen & Berland had members of Sumate, a Venezuelan group that=20 helped organize the recall initiative, do the fieldwork for the poll,=20 election observers said.

Roberto Abdul, a Sumate official, acknowledged in a telephone interview=20 that the firm "supervised" an exit poll carried out by Sumate. Abdul added=20 that at least five exit polls were completed for the opposition, with all=20 pointing to a Chavez victory.

Abdul said Sumate =AD which has received a \$53,400 grant from the National=20 Endowment for Democracy, which in turn receives funds from the U.S.=20 Congress =AD did not use any of those funds to pay for the surveys.

The issue is potentially explosive because even before the referendum,=20 Chavez himself cited Washington's funding of Sumate as evidence that the=20 Bush administration was financing efforts to oust him =AD an allegation U.S.=20 officials deny.

Venezuelan Minister of Communications Jesse Chacon said it was a mistake for Sumate to be involved in the exit poll because it might have skewed the results.

"If you use an activist as a pollster, he will eventually begin to act like an activist," Chacon told The Associated Press.

Chris Sabatini, senior program officer for the National Endowment for Democracy, defended Sumate as "independent and impartial."

"Exit polls are notoriously unreliable," Sabatini said by telephone from Washington. "Just because they're off doesn't mean that the group that conducted them is partial to one side."

AP reporters Juan Pablo Toro in Caracas and Will Lester in Washington contributed to this report.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Thu, 19 Aug 2004 09:59:31 -0700
Reply-To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>
Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <6.1.1.1.2.20040819084036.02fbf690@mail.ucla.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

There is a sense from the AP article WEI YEN put up to the list that this poll was done fraudulently with a purpose in mind. Looking at the 2004 directory I don't find any of the three names listed on the firm's head (I believe that AAPOR's Viola Penn of Arbitron is surely not the same Penn). This may be an example of why the public has become more resistant to participating in or accepting polls. AAPOR should investigate the details further and then, if appropriate, issue a statement repudiating that organization for unethical and anti-democratic behavior. For me the kicker comes in the last sentence when one of their reps claims that exit polls are notoriously unreliable. Silly me, I always thought that, done correctly and with a rare exception or two, exit polls are "notoriously" reliable.

Marc Sapir MD, MPH
Executive Director

Retro Poll
www.retopoll.org

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Wei Yen
Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2004 7:47 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

Thought this group might be interested in this. - Wei Yen, UCLA

U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

Thu Aug 19, 6:08 AM ET

By ANDREW SELSKY, Associated Press Writer

CARACAS, Venezuela - A U.S. firm's exit poll that said President Hugo Chavez would lose a recall referendum has landed in the center of a controversy following his resounding victory.

"Exit Poll Results Show Major Defeat for Chavez," the survey, conducted by Penn, Schoen & Berland Associates, asserted even as Sunday's voting was still on. But in fact, the opposite was true - Chavez ended up trouncing

his enemies and capturing 59 percent of the vote.

Any casual observer of the 2000 U.S. presidential elections knows exit polls can at times be unreliable. But the poll has become an issue here because the opposition, which mounted the drive to force the leftist leader from office, insists it shows the results from the vote itself were fraudulent. The opposition also claims electronic voting machines were rigged, but has provided no evidence.

Election officials banned publication or broadcast of any exit polls during the historic vote on whether to oust Chavez, a populist who has sought to help the poor and is reviled by the wealthy, who accuse him of stoking class divisions.

But results of the Penn, Schoen & Berland survey were sent out by fax and e-mail to media outlets and opposition offices more than four hours before polls closed. It predicted just the opposite of what happened, saying 59 percent had voted in favor of recalling Chavez.

Cesar Gaviria, secretary general of the Organization of American States

who monitored the referendum, said the poll must have had a tremendous impact on Chavez's opponents, who felt they were about to complete their two-year drive to oust him.

"They were told they had a lead of 20 points and then when the results came, they lost by 20 points," Gaviria said. "It's very difficult to deal with that."

Both Gaviria and former President Jimmy Carter, another election monitor, endorsed the vote, saying the results coincided with their own independent samplings.

Mark Penn, of Penn, Schoen & Berland Associates, said Wednesday he has limited knowledge of the exit poll. He said his partner, Doug Schoen, "believes there were more problems with the voting than with the exit poll."

Schoen could not immediately be reached, and another employee familiar with the poll declined to comment.

"We have to let the authorities do their investigation of the election," said Marcela Berland, with the firm. "It would be irresponsible to interfere with that."

Critics of the exit poll have questioned how it was conducted because officials have said Penn, Schoen & Berland worked with a U.S.-funded Venezuela group that the Chavez government considers hostile.

Penn, Schoen & Berland had members of Sumate, a Venezuelan group that helped organize the recall initiative, do the fieldwork for the poll, election observers said.

Roberto Abdul, a Sumate official, acknowledged in a telephone interview that the firm "supervised" an exit poll carried out by Sumate. Abdul added that at least five exit polls were completed for the opposition, with all pointing to a Chavez victory.

Abdul said Sumate - which has received a \$53,400 grant from the National Endowment for Democracy, which in turn receives funds from the U.S. Congress - did not use any of those funds to pay for the surveys.

The issue is potentially explosive because even before the referendum, Chavez himself cited Washington's funding of Sumate as evidence that the

Bush administration was financing efforts to oust him - an allegation U.S. officials deny.

Venezuelan Minister of Communications Jesse Chacon said it was a mistake for Sumate to be involved in the exit poll because it might have skewed the results.

"If you use an activist as a pollster, he will eventually begin to act like an activist," Chacon told The Associated Press.

Chris Sabatini, senior program officer for the National Endowment for Democracy, defended Sumate as "independent and impartial."

"Exit polls are notoriously unreliable," Sabatini said by telephone from Washington. "Just because they're off doesn't mean that the group that conducted them is partial to one side."

AP reporters Juan Pablo Toro in Caracas and Will Lester in Washington contributed to this report.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Thu, 19 Aug 2004 13:59:13 -0400
Reply-To: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela
Comments: To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@comcast.net>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Exit polls are ideal for protecting against fraud in election results = reporting. This has been stated by Mitofsky in testimony or publication = somewhere and would be hard to contest. I have suggested that AAPOR =

encourage reputable polling organizations to characterize their =
published findings as resulting from work done in compliance with AAPOR =
standards for scientific surveys. This could result in journalists and =
informed readers learning to watch for this "Good Housekeeping" seal and =
to discount the likely validity of studies without it. A source of =
leverage in the direction of integrity. Now the public sees, "Penn, =
Schoen & Berland" and shrugs its shoulders, saying "Who are they?" "How =
do you know what to believe?"=20

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
(610) 408-8800
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

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

From: Marc Sapir=20
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu=20
Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2004 12:59 PM
Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

There is a sense from the AP article WEI YEN put up to the list that
this poll was done fraudulently with a purpose in mind. Looking at the
2004 directory I don't find any of the three names listed on the firm's
head (I believe that AAPOR's Viola Penn of Arbitron is surely not the
same Penn). This may be an example of why the public has become more
resistant to participating in or accepting polls. AAPOR should
investigate the details further and then, if appropriate, issue a
statement repudiating that organization for unethical and
anti-democratic behavior. For me the kicker comes in the last sentence
when one of their reps claims that exit polls are notoriously
unreliable. Silly me, I always that thought that, done correctly and
with a rare exception or two, exit polls are "notoriously" reliable.

Marc Sapir MD, MPH
Executive Director
Retro Poll
www.retropoll.org

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Wei Yen
Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2004 7:47 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

Thought this group might be interested in this. - Wei Yen, UCLA

U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

Thu Aug 19, 6:08 AM ET

By ANDREW SELSKY, Associated Press Writer

CARACAS, Venezuela - A U.S. firm's exit poll that said President Hugo Chavez would lose a recall referendum has landed in the center of a controversy following his resounding victory.

"Exit Poll Results Show Major Defeat for Chavez," the survey, conducted by Penn, Schoen & Berland Associates, asserted even as Sunday's voting was still on. But in fact, the opposite was true - Chavez ended up trouncing his enemies and capturing 59 percent of the vote.

Any casual observer of the 2000 U.S. presidential elections knows exit polls can at times be unreliable. But the poll has become an issue here because the opposition, which mounted the drive to force the leftist leader from office, insists it shows the results from the vote itself were fraudulent. The opposition also claims electronic voting machines were rigged, but has provided no evidence.

Election officials banned publication or broadcast of any exit polls during the historic vote on whether to oust Chavez, a populist who has sought to help the poor and is reviled by the wealthy, who accuse him of stoking class divisions.

But results of the Penn, Schoen & Berland survey were sent out by fax and e-mail to media outlets and opposition offices more than four hours before polls closed. It predicted just the opposite of what happened, saying 59 percent had voted in favor of recalling Chavez.

Cesar Gaviria, secretary general of the Organization of American States who monitored the referendum, said the poll must have had a tremendous impact on Chavez's opponents, who felt they were about to complete their two-year drive to oust him.

"They were told they had a lead of 20 points and then when the results came, they lost by 20 points," Gaviria said. "It's very difficult to deal with that."

Both Gaviria and former President Jimmy Carter, another election monitor, endorsed the vote, saying the results coincided with their own independent samplings.

Mark Penn, of Penn, Schoen & Berland Associates, said Wednesday he has limited knowledge of the exit poll. He said his partner, Doug Schoen, "believes there were more problems with the voting than with the exit poll."

Schoen could not immediately be reached, and another employee familiar with the poll declined to comment.

"We have to let the authorities do their investigation of the election,"

said Marcela Berland, with the firm. "It would be irresponsible to interfere with that."

Critics of the exit poll have questioned how it was conducted because officials have said Penn, Schoen & Berland worked with a U.S.-funded Venezuela group that the Chavez government considers hostile.

Penn, Schoen & Berland had members of Sumate, a Venezuelan group that helped organize the recall initiative, do the fieldwork for the poll, election observers said.

Roberto Abdul, a Sumate official, acknowledged in a telephone interview that the firm "supervised" an exit poll carried out by Sumate. Abdul added that at least five exit polls were completed for the opposition, with all pointing to a Chavez victory.

Abdul said Sumate - which has received a \$53,400 grant from the National

Endowment for Democracy, which in turn receives funds from the U.S. Congress - did not use any of those funds to pay for the surveys.

The issue is potentially explosive because even before the referendum, Chavez himself cited Washington's funding of Sumate as evidence that the

Bush administration was financing efforts to oust him - an allegation U.S. officials deny.

Venezuelan Minister of Communications Jesse Chacon said it was a mistake

for Sumate to be involved in the exit poll because it might have skewed the results.

"If you use an activist as a pollster, he will eventually begin to act like an activist," Chacon told The Associated Press.

Chris Sabatini, senior program officer for the National Endowment for Democracy, defended Sumate as "independent and impartial."

"Exit polls are notoriously unreliable," Sabatini said by telephone from Washington. "Just because they're off doesn't mean that the group that conducted them is partial to one side."

AP reporters Juan Pablo Toro in Caracas and Will Lester in Washington contributed to this report.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail=

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====
Date: Thu, 19 Aug 2004 18:53:43 +0100
Reply-To: "Moon, Nick" <nmoon@NOPWORLD.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Moon, Nick" <nmoon@NOPWORLD.COM>
Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

I think you're maligning Penn, Schoen & Berland here. I do not see any evidence that the poll "was done fraudulently, with a purpose in mind". My company worked with the Opposition Party in the UK for many years, and no-one seriously argued that it meant we shouldn't conduct exit polls for the BBC.

The "kicker" quote comes from what I assume to be a pressure group, not from Penn et al. AFAIK they are more in the line of political marketing consultants than researchers, which may well explain why Mark Penn (his full name is given in the piece) nor the other principals are AAPOR members.

While it may be just a poor exit poll, and there is certainly plenty of history of them round the world, it does also raise the very serious issue of whether an exit poll may indeed give a more accurate picture of respondent behaviour than the official election result, especially in countries where the government can influence the conduct of the election,

and even the counting process.

Given all the concern about the lack of a paper trail in electronic voting, as cited in that interesting article someone recently posted on this list, what would the reaction be in 2008 if the exit poll showed Hilary Clinton well ahead of Bill Owens in the swing states, but the result from the electronic voting machines, calculated by the private companies that supplied them and the software, showed Owens had won by 5%. Would we all be SURE the exit poll was wrong?

I seem to recall a similar example being posted here before, from a former soviet republic, with the defeated opposition claiming the exit poll was proof the election had been rigged, and this has to be given serious consideration.

As the 2001 AAPOR Conference T-shirt said - "Polling, now more accurate than the election itself"

Nick Moon
NOP Research Group
245 Blackfriars Road, London SE1 9UL
tel 020 7890 9830 fax 020 7890 9589
<http://www.nopworld.com>

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

> From: Marc Sapir [mailto:marcsapir@COMCAST.NET]

> Sent: 19 August 2004 18:00

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

>

>

> There is a sense from the AP article WEI YEN put up to the list that
> this poll was done fraudulently with a purpose in mind.

> Looking at the

> 2004 directory I don't find any of the three names listed on

> the firm's

> head (I believe that AAPOR's Viola Penn of Arbitron is surely not the

> same Penn). This may be an example of why the public has become more

> resistant to participating in or accepting polls. AAPOR should

> investigate the details further and then, if appropriate, issue a

> statement repudiating that organization for unethical and

> anti-democratic behavior. For me the kicker comes in the

> last sentence

> when one of their reps claims that exit polls are notoriously

> unreliable. Silly me, I always that thought that, done correctly and

> with a rare exception or two, exit polls are "notoriously" reliable.

>

> Marc Sapir MD, MPH

> Executive Director

> Retro Poll

> www.retropoll.org

>

>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Wei Yen
> Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2004 7:47 AM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela
>
> Thought this group might be interested in this. - Wei Yen, UCLA
>
>
> U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela
>
> Thu Aug 19, 6:08 AM ET
>
> By ANDREW SELSKY, Associated Press Writer
>
> CARACAS, Venezuela - A U.S. firm's exit poll that said President Hugo
> Chavez would lose a recall referendum has landed in the center of a
> controversy following his resounding victory.
>
> "Exit Poll Results Show Major Defeat for Chavez," the survey,
> conducted
> by
> Penn, Schoen & Berland Associates, asserted even as Sunday's
> voting was
> still on. But in fact, the opposite was true - Chavez ended
> up trouncing
>
> his enemies and capturing 59 percent of the vote.
>
> Any casual observer of the 2000 U.S. presidential elections knows exit
> polls can at times be unreliable. But the poll has become an
> issue here
> because the opposition, which mounted the drive to force the leftist
> leader
> from office, insists it shows the results from the vote itself were
> fraudulent. The opposition also claims electronic voting machines were
> rigged, but has provided no evidence.
>
> Election officials banned publication or broadcast of any exit polls
> during
> the historic vote on whether to oust Chavez, a populist who has sought
> to
> help the poor and is reviled by the wealthy, who accuse him of stoking
> class divisions.
>
> But results of the Penn, Schoen & Berland survey were sent out by fax
> and
> e-mail to media outlets and opposition offices more than four hours
> before
> polls closed. It predicted just the opposite of what
> happened, saying 59
>
> percent had voted in favor of recalling Chavez.

>
> Cesar Gaviria, secretary general of the Organization of
> American States
> who
> monitored the referendum, said the poll must have had a tremendous
> impact
> on Chavez's opponents, who felt they were about to complete their
> two-year
> drive to oust him.
>
> "They were told they had a lead of 20 points and then when the results
> came, they lost by 20 points," Gaviria said. "It's very difficult to
> deal
> with that."
>
> Both Gaviria and former President Jimmy Carter, another election
> monitor,
> endorsed the vote, saying the results coincided with their own
> independent
> samplings.
>
> Mark Penn, of Penn, Schoen & Berland Associates, said Wednesday he has
> limited knowledge of the exit poll. He said his partner, Doug Schoen,
> "believes there were more problems with the voting than with the exit
> poll."
>
> Schoen could not immediately be reached, and another employee familiar
> with
> the poll declined to comment.
>
> "We have to let the authorities do their investigation of the
> election,"
>
> said Marcela Berland, with the firm. "It would be irresponsible to
> interfere with that."
>
> Critics of the exit poll have questioned how it was conducted because
> officials have said Penn, Schoen & Berland worked with a U.S.-funded
> Venezuela group that the Chavez government considers hostile.
>
> Penn, Schoen & Berland had members of Sumate, a Venezuelan group that
> helped organize the recall initiative, do the fieldwork for the poll,
> election observers said.
>
> Roberto Abdul, a Sumate official, acknowledged in a telephone
> interview
> that the firm "supervised" an exit poll carried out by Sumate. Abdul
> added
> that at least five exit polls were completed for the opposition, with
> all
> pointing to a Chavez victory.
>
> Abdul said Sumate - which has received a \$53,400 grant from
> the National

>
> Endowment for Democracy, which in turn receives funds from the U.S.
> Congress - did not use any of those funds to pay for the surveys.
>
> The issue is potentially explosive because even before the referendum,
> Chavez himself cited Washington's funding of Sumate as
> evidence that the
>
> Bush administration was financing efforts to oust him - an allegation
> U.S.
> officials deny.
>
> Venezuelan Minister of Communications Jesse Chacon said it
> was a mistake
>
> for Sumate to be involved in the exit poll because it might
> have skewed
> the
> results.
>
> "If you use an activist as a pollster, he will eventually begin to act
> like
> an activist," Chacon told The Associated Press.
>
> Chris Sabatini, senior program officer for the National Endowment for
> Democracy, defended Sumate as "independent and impartial."
>
> "Exit polls are notoriously unreliable," Sabatini said by
> telephone from
>
> Washington. "Just because they're off doesn't mean that the group that
> conducted them is partial to one side."
>
> _____
> AP reporters Juan Pablo Toro in Caracas and Will Lester in Washington
> contributed to this report.
>
>
> _____
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> set aapornet nomail
> On your return send: set aapornet mail
>
> _____
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> set aapornet nomail
> On your return send: set aapornet mail
>

Any views or opinions are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of NOP World or any of its associated companies.

The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, please do not read, copy, use or disclose this communication and notify the sender immediately. It should be noted that any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited.

Recipients are warned that NOP World cannot guarantee that attachments or enclosures are secure or error-free as information could be intercepted, corrupted, or contain viruses

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====
Date: Thu, 19 Aug 2004 13:20:19 -0500
Reply-To: "Michael B. Conaway" <Michael.Conaway@UA.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Michael B. Conaway" <Michael.Conaway@UA.EDU>
Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
In-Reply-To: <369904DA6CB7D611818D0002B3656320071B2542@lud-exch-nt02.nop.nopworld.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

In regard to the kicker, while I don't know whether Chris Sabatini has any relationship with PSB, he is listed as the Senior Program Officer, Latin America and the Caribbean for the National Endowment for Democracy. Knowledge of survey research would seem not to be a requirement of the job. According to the article NED provided funding to Sumate which was not used for the exit polls, whatever that means.

At 12:53 PM 8/19/2004, you wrote:

>I think you're maligning Penn, Schoen & Berland here. I do not see any
>evidence that the poll "was done fraudulently, with a purpose in mind". My
>company worked with the Opposition Party in the UK for many years, and
>no-one seriously argued that it meant we shouldn't conduct exit polls for
>the BBC.
>

>The "kicker" quote comes from what I assume to be a pressure group, not from
>Penn et al. AFAIK they are more in the line of political marketing
>consultants than researchers, which may well explain why Mark Penn (his full
>name is given in the piece) nor the other principals are AAPOR members.
>
>While it may be just a poor exit poll, and there is certainly plenty of
>history of them round the world, it does also raise the very serious issue
>of whether an exit poll may indeed give a more accurate picture of
>respondent behaviour than the official election result, especially in
>countries where the government can influence the conduct of the election,
>and even the counting process.
>
>Given all the concern about the lack of a paper trail in electronic voting,
>as cited in that interesting article someone recently posted on this list,
>what would the reaction be in 2008 if the exit poll showed Hilary Clinton
>well ahead of Bill Owens in the swing states, but the result from the
>electronic voting machines, calculated by the private companies that
>supplied them and the software, showed Owens had won by 5%. Would we all be
>SURE the exit poll was wrong?
>
>I seem to recall a similar example being posted here before, from a former
>soviet republic, with the defeated opposition claiming the exit poll was
>proof the election had been rigged, and this has to be given serious
>consideration.
>
>As the 2001 AAPOR Conference T-shirt said - "Polling, now more accurate than
>the election itself"

>Nick Moon
>NOP Research Group
>245 Blackfriars Road, London SE1 9UL
>tel 020 7890 9830 fax 020 7890 9589
><http://www.nopworld.com>

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

>> From: Marc Sapir [mailto:marcsapir@COMCAST.NET]
>> Sent: 19 August 2004 18:00
>> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>> Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

>>
>> There is a sense from the AP article WEI YEN put up to the list that
>> this poll was done fraudulently with a purpose in mind.
>> Looking at the
>> 2004 directory I don't find any of the three names listed on
>> the firm's
>> head (I believe that AAPOR's Viola Penn of Arbitron is surely not the
>> same Penn). This may be an example of why the public has become more
>> resistant to participating in or accepting polls. AAPOR should
>> investigate the details further and then, if appropriate, issue a
>> statement repudiating that organization for unethical and
>> anti-democratic behavior. For me the kicker comes in the

>> last sentence
>> when one of their reps claims that exit polls are notoriously
>> unreliable. Silly me, I always that thought that, done correctly and
>> with a rare exception or two, exit polls are "notoriously" reliable.
>>
>> Marc Sapir MD, MPH
>> Executive Director
>> Retro Poll
>> www.retropoll.org
>>
>>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Wei Yen
>> Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2004 7:47 AM
>> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>> Subject: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela
>>
>> Thought this group might be interested in this. - Wei Yen, UCLA
>>
>>
>> U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela
>>
>> Thu Aug 19, 6:08 AM ET
>>
>> By ANDREW SELSKY, Associated Press Writer
>>
>> CARACAS, Venezuela - A U.S. firm's exit poll that said President Hugo
>> Chavez would lose a recall referendum has landed in the center of a
>> controversy following his resounding victory.
>>
>> "Exit Poll Results Show Major Defeat for Chavez," the survey,
>> conducted
>> by
>> Penn, Schoen & Berland Associates, asserted even as Sunday's
>> voting was
>> still on. But in fact, the opposite was true - Chavez ended
>> up trouncing
>>
>> his enemies and capturing 59 percent of the vote.
>>
>> Any casual observer of the 2000 U.S. presidential elections knows exit
>> polls can at times be unreliable. But the poll has become an
>> issue here
>> because the opposition, which mounted the drive to force the leftist
>> leader
>> from office, insists it shows the results from the vote itself were
>> fraudulent. The opposition also claims electronic voting machines were
>> rigged, but has provided no evidence.
>>
>> Election officials banned publication or broadcast of any exit polls
>> during
>> the historic vote on whether to oust Chavez, a populist who has sought
>> to
>> help the poor and is reviled by the wealthy, who accuse him of stoking

>> class divisions.
>>
>> But results of the Penn, Schoen & Berland survey were sent out by fax
>> and
>> e-mail to media outlets and opposition offices more than four hours
>> before
>> polls closed. It predicted just the opposite of what
>> happened, saying 59
>>
>> percent had voted in favor of recalling Chavez.
>>
>> Cesar Gaviria, secretary general of the Organization of
>> American States
>> who
>> monitored the referendum, said the poll must have had a tremendous
>> impact
>> on Chavez's opponents, who felt they were about to complete their
>> two-year
>> drive to oust him.
>>
>> "They were told they had a lead of 20 points and then when the results
>> came, they lost by 20 points," Gaviria said. "It's very difficult to
>> deal
>> with that."
>>
>> Both Gaviria and former President Jimmy Carter, another election
>> monitor,
>> endorsed the vote, saying the results coincided with their own
>> independent
>> samplings.
>>
>> Mark Penn, of Penn, Schoen & Berland Associates, said Wednesday he has
>> limited knowledge of the exit poll. He said his partner, Doug Schoen,
>> "believes there were more problems with the voting than with the exit
>> poll."
>>
>> Schoen could not immediately be reached, and another employee familiar
>> with
>> the poll declined to comment.
>>
>> "We have to let the authorities do their investigation of the
>> election,"
>>
>> said Marcela Berland, with the firm. "It would be irresponsible to
>> interfere with that."
>>
>> Critics of the exit poll have questioned how it was conducted because
>> officials have said Penn, Schoen & Berland worked with a U.S.-funded
>> Venezuela group that the Chavez government considers hostile.
>>
>> Penn, Schoen & Berland had members of Sumate, a Venezuelan group that
>> helped organize the recall initiative, do the fieldwork for the poll,
>> election observers said.
>>

>> Roberto Abdul, a Sumate official, acknowledged in a telephone
>> interview
>> that the firm "supervised" an exit poll carried out by Sumate. Abdul
>> added
>> that at least five exit polls were completed for the opposition, with
>> all
>> pointing to a Chavez victory.
>>
>> Abdul said Sumate - which has received a \$53,400 grant from
>> the National
>>
>> Endowment for Democracy, which in turn receives funds from the U.S.
>> Congress - did not use any of those funds to pay for the surveys.
>>
>> The issue is potentially explosive because even before the referendum,
>> Chavez himself cited Washington's funding of Sumate as
>> evidence that the
>>
>> Bush administration was financing efforts to oust him - an allegation
>> U.S.
>> officials deny.
>>
>> Venezuelan Minister of Communications Jesse Chacon said it
>> was a mistake
>>
>> for Sumate to be involved in the exit poll because it might
>> have skewed
>> the
>> results.
>>
>> "If you use an activist as a pollster, he will eventually begin to act
>> like
>> an activist," Chacon told The Associated Press.
>>
>> Chris Sabatini, senior program officer for the National Endowment for
>> Democracy, defended Sumate as "independent and impartial."
>>
>> "Exit polls are notoriously unreliable," Sabatini said by
>> telephone from
>>
>> Washington. "Just because they're off doesn't mean that the group that
>> conducted them is partial to one side."
>>
>> _____
>>
>> AP reporters Juan Pablo Toro in Caracas and Will Lester in Washington
>> contributed to this report.
>>
>>
>> -----
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>> Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
>> set aapornet nomail
>> On your return send: set aapornet mail

>>
>> -----
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>> Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
>> set aapornet nomail
>> On your return send: set aapornet mail

>>
>
>
>*****

>Any views or opinions are solely those of the
>author and do not necessarily represent those of
> NOP World or any of its associated companies.
>*****

>The information transmitted is intended only for
>the person or entity to which it is addressed
>and may contain confidential and/or privileged
>material. If you are not the intended recipient of
>this message, please do not read, copy, use or
> disclose this communication and notify the
>sender immediately. It should be noted that
>any review, retransmission, dissemination or
> other use of, or taking action in reliance
> upon, this information by persons or entities
> other than the intended recipient is prohibited.
>*****

>Recipients are warned that NOP World cannot guarantee
>that attachments or enclosures are secure or error-free
>as information could be intercepted, corrupted,
>or contain viruses
>*****

>
>-----
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
>set aapornet nomail
>On your return send: set aapornet mail

Michael B. Conaway, J.D.
Institute for Social Science Research
University of Alabama
Box 870216
Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0216
(205) 348-9649 Telephone
(205) 348-2849 Facsimile

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====
Date: Thu, 19 Aug 2004 13:25:39 -0500

Reply-To: "Michael B. Conaway" <Michael.Conaway@UA.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Michael B. Conaway" <Michael.Conaway@UA.EDU>
Subject: Fwd: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

BTW, the PSB website is good for a chuckle: <http://www.psbsurveys.com/>.

Interesting what a google search turns up on these folks.

>Date: Thu, 19 Aug 2004 13:20:19 -0500
>To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
>From: "Michael B. Conaway" <Michael.Conaway@ua.edu>
>Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

>
>In regard to the kicker, while I don't know whether Chris Sabatini has any
>relationship with PSB, he is listed as the Senior Program Officer, Latin
>America and the Caribbean for the National Endowment for
>Democracy. Knowledge of survey research would seem not to be a
>requirement of the job. According to the article NED provided funding to
>Sumate which was not used for the exit polls, whatever that means.

>
>
>At 12:53 PM 8/19/2004, you wrote:

>>I think you're maligning Penn, Schoen & Berland here. I do not see any
>>evidence that the poll "was done fraudulently, with a purpose in mind". My
>>company worked with the Opposition Party in the UK for many years, and
>>no-one seriously argued that it meant we shouldn't conduct exit polls for
>>the BBC.

>>
>>The "kicker" quote comes from what I assume to be a pressure group, not from
>>Penn et al. AFAIK they are more in the line of political marketing
>>consultants than researchers, which may well explain why Mark Penn (his full
>>name is given in the piece) nor the other principals are AAPOR members.

>>
>>While it may be just a poor exit poll, and there is certainly plenty of
>>history of them round the world, it does also raise the very serious issue
>>of whether an exit poll may indeed give a more accurate picture of
>>respondent behaviour than the official election result, especially in
>>countries where the government can influence the conduct of the election,
>>and even the counting process.

>>
>>Given all the concern about the lack of a paper trail in electronic voting,
>>as cited in that interesting article someone recently posted on this list,
>>what would the reaction be in 2008 if the exit poll showed Hilary Clinton
>>well ahead of Bill Owens in the swing states, but the result from the
>>electronic voting machines, calculated by the private companies that
>>supplied them and the software, showed Owens had won by 5%. Would we all be
>>SURE the exit poll was wrong?

>>
>>I seem to recall a similar example being posted here before, from a former
>>soviet republic, with the defeated opposition claiming the exit poll was

>>proof the election had been rigged, and this has to be given serious
>>consideration.

>>
>>As the 2001 AAPOR Conference T-shirt said - "Polling, now more accurate than
>>the election itself"

>>
>>Nick Moon
>>NOP Research Group
>>245 Blackfriars Road, London SE1 9UL
>>tel 020 7890 9830 fax 020 7890 9589
>><http://www.nopworld.com>

>>
>>
>>
>>> -----Original Message-----
>>> From: Marc Sapir [mailto:marcsapir@COMCAST.NET]
>>> Sent: 19 August 2004 18:00
>>> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>>> Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

>>>
>>>
>>> There is a sense from the AP article WEI YEN put up to the list that
>>> this poll was done fraudulently with a purpose in mind.
>>> Looking at the
>>> 2004 directory I don't find any of the three names listed on
>>> the firm's
>>> head (I believe that AAPOR's Viola Penn of Arbitron is surely not the
>>> same Penn). This may be an example of why the public has become more
>>> resistant to participating in or accepting polls. AAPOR should
>>> investigate the details further and then, if appropriate, issue a
>>> statement repudiating that organization for unethical and
>>> anti-democratic behavior. For me the kicker comes in the
>>> last sentence
>>> when one of their reps claims that exit polls are notoriously
>>> unreliable. Silly me, I always that thought that, done correctly and
>>> with a rare exception or two, exit polls are "notoriously" reliable.

>>>
>>> Marc Sapir MD, MPH
>>> Executive Director
>>> Retro Poll
>>> www.retropoll.org

>>>
>>>> -----Original Message-----
>>>> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Wei Yen
>>>> Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2004 7:47 AM
>>>> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>>>> Subject: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

>>>>
>>>> Thought this group might be interested in this. - Wei Yen, UCLA
>>>>
>>>> U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

>>>>

>>> Thu Aug 19, 6:08 AM ET

>>>

>>> By ANDREW SELSKY, Associated Press Writer

>>>

>>> CARACAS, Venezuela - A U.S. firm's exit poll that said President Hugo
>>> Chavez would lose a recall referendum has landed in the center of a
>>> controversy following his resounding victory.

>>>

>>> "Exit Poll Results Show Major Defeat for Chavez," the survey,
>>> conducted

>>> by

>>> Penn, Schoen & Berland Associates, asserted even as Sunday's
>>> voting was

>>> still on. But in fact, the opposite was true - Chavez ended
>>> up trouncing

>>>

>>> his enemies and capturing 59 percent of the vote.

>>>

>>> Any casual observer of the 2000 U.S. presidential elections knows exit
>>> polls can at times be unreliable. But the poll has become an

>>> issue here

>>> because the opposition, which mounted the drive to force the leftist
>>> leader

>>> from office, insists it shows the results from the vote itself were

>>> fraudulent. The opposition also claims electronic voting machines were
>>> rigged, but has provided no evidence.

>>>

>>> Election officials banned publication or broadcast of any exit polls
>>> during

>>> the historic vote on whether to oust Chavez, a populist who has sought
>>> to

>>> help the poor and is reviled by the wealthy, who accuse him of stoking
>>> class divisions.

>>>

>>> But results of the Penn, Schoen & Berland survey were sent out by fax
>>> and

>>> e-mail to media outlets and opposition offices more than four hours
>>> before

>>> polls closed. It predicted just the opposite of what
>>> happened, saying 59

>>>

>>> percent had voted in favor of recalling Chavez.

>>>

>>> Cesar Gaviria, secretary general of the Organization of
>>> American States

>>> who

>>> monitored the referendum, said the poll must have had a tremendous
>>> impact

>>> on Chavez's opponents, who felt they were about to complete their
>>> two-year

>>> drive to oust him.

>>>

>>> "They were told they had a lead of 20 points and then when the results
>>> came, they lost by 20 points," Gaviria said. "It's very difficult to

>>> deal
>>> with that."
>>>
>>> Both Gaviria and former President Jimmy Carter, another election
>>> monitor,
>>> endorsed the vote, saying the results coincided with their own
>>> independent
>>> samplings.
>>>
>>> Mark Penn, of Penn, Schoen & Berland Associates, said Wednesday he has
>>> limited knowledge of the exit poll. He said his partner, Doug Schoen,
>>> "believes there were more problems with the voting than with the exit
>>> poll."
>>>
>>> Schoen could not immediately be reached, and another employee familiar
>>> with
>>> the poll declined to comment.
>>>
>>> "We have to let the authorities do their investigation of the
>>> election,"
>>>
>>> said Marcela Berland, with the firm. "It would be irresponsible to
>>> interfere with that."
>>>
>>> Critics of the exit poll have questioned how it was conducted because
>>> officials have said Penn, Schoen & Berland worked with a U.S.-funded
>>> Venezuela group that the Chavez government considers hostile.
>>>
>>> Penn, Schoen & Berland had members of Sumate, a Venezuelan group that
>>> helped organize the recall initiative, do the fieldwork for the poll,
>>> election observers said.
>>>
>>> Roberto Abdul, a Sumate official, acknowledged in a telephone
>>> interview
>>> that the firm "supervised" an exit poll carried out by Sumate. Abdul
>>> added
>>> that at least five exit polls were completed for the opposition, with
>>> all
>>> pointing to a Chavez victory.
>>>
>>> Abdul said Sumate - which has received a \$53,400 grant from
>>> the National
>>>
>>> Endowment for Democracy, which in turn receives funds from the U.S.
>>> Congress - did not use any of those funds to pay for the surveys.
>>>
>>> The issue is potentially explosive because even before the referendum,
>>> Chavez himself cited Washington's funding of Sumate as
>>> evidence that the
>>>
>>> Bush administration was financing efforts to oust him - an allegation
>>> U.S.
>>> officials deny.
>>>

>>> Venezuelan Minister of Communications Jesse Chacon said it
>>> was a mistake
>>>
>>> for Sumate to be involved in the exit poll because it might
>>> have skewed
>>> the
>>> results.
>>>
>>> "If you use an activist as a pollster, he will eventually begin to act
>>> like
>>> an activist," Chacon told The Associated Press.
>>>
>>> Chris Sabatini, senior program officer for the National Endowment for
>>> Democracy, defended Sumate as "independent and impartial."
>>>
>>> "Exit polls are notoriously unreliable," Sabatini said by
>>> telephone from
>>>
>>> Washington. "Just because they're off doesn't mean that the group that
>>> conducted them is partial to one side."
>>>
>>> _____
>>>
>>> AP reporters Juan Pablo Toro in Caracas and Will Lester in Washington
>>> contributed to this report.
>>>
>>>

>>> -----
>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>>> Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
>>> set aapornet nomail
>>> On your return send: set aapornet mail
>>>

>>> -----
>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>>> Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
>>> set aapornet nomail
>>> On your return send: set aapornet mail
>>>

>>> *****
>>> Any views or opinions are solely those of the
>>> author and do not necessarily represent those of
>>> NOP World or any of its associated companies.
>>> *****

>>> The information transmitted is intended only for
>>> the person or entity to which it is addressed
>>> and may contain confidential and/or privileged
>>> material. If you are not the intended recipient of
>>> this message, please do not read, copy, use or
>>> disclose this communication and notify the
>>> sender immediately. It should be noted that
>>> any review, retransmission, dissemination or

>> other use of, or taking action in reliance
>> upon, this information by persons or entities
>> other than the intended recipient is prohibited.
>>*****
>>Recipients are warned that NOP World cannot guarantee
>>that attachments or enclosures are secure or error-free
>>as information could be intercepted, corrupted,
>>or contain viruses
>>*****

>>
>>-----
>>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>>Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
>>set aapornet nomail
>>On your return send: set aapornet mail

>>
>>-----
>Michael B. Conaway, J.D.
>Institute for Social Science Research
>University of Alabama
>Box 870216
>Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0216
>(205) 348-9649 Telephone
>(205) 348-2849 Facsimile

Michael B. Conaway, J.D.
Institute for Social Science Research
University of Alabama
Box 870216
Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0216
(205) 348-9649 Telephone
(205) 348-2849 Facsimile

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Thu, 19 Aug 2004 14:29:13 -0400
Reply-To: "Edelman, Murray" <EdelmanM@CBSNEWS.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Edelman, Murray" <EdelmanM@CBSNEWS.COM>
Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela
Comments: To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

What an error in an exit poll? The exit poll in Venezuela showed Chavez losing in a recall by 59% when he actually won by 59%. This difference is way beyond anything I have ever seen in my long history with exit polls.

Which is wrong the exit poll or the vote?

This question was raised in 2000 in Florida. However, the exit poll showed Gore only slightly ahead of Bush, not even close to a significant difference. In fact, no one called that race based on the exit poll. The calls were made later when real vote had reported. Unfortunately, the exit poll is still being blamed for that one and the article we were sent continues that misinformation.

In this case, the difference is way beyond significance. The exit poll is not measuring the same thing as the counted vote.

Penn, Schoen and Berland is a well-known political polling firm, even though not involved in AAPOR, so I wouldn't dismiss the results that quickly.

A key issue in the validity of the exit poll rests on the interviewing. Was it really done, as the article suggests, by political activists involved in the opposition to Chavez?

This doesn't necessarily make it fraudulent, but even assuming the best intentions of everyone involved in the polling, there are so many ways that bias can enter in an exit poll.

In our exit polls, the interviewers sample voters as they leave the polling place and ask them to fill out a questionnaire. Many of the voters don't respond.

If the firm chose political activists to do their polling and having them poll on an issue that had such a major division across class lines, I have to wonder:

Were the interviewers specifically told not to wear any political identifications? Were they told to dress neutrally, in ways that didn't show their social class? The voter makes a quick decision on whether to respond or not to a questionnaire. They could be easily put off by any sign of preference by the interviewer, the way he or she is dressed, the way the interviewer speaks or something they see. People often wear their class differences.

Were they given specific instructions on how to sample voters and what to do when clumps of voters left at one time?

If left to their own judgment, interviewers could easily gravitate to people that they felt most comfortable with and ask them to fill out the questionnaire.

And I have to wonder what criteria they used for selecting their interviewers in the first place. If they were to compare the exit poll with the official result polling place by polling place, any mischievous interviewers would stand out.

This difference between the exit poll and the election result raises interesting questions. I hope we can get some answers about the fieldwork

and I hope the firm prepares an evaluation of their exit poll.

Murray Edelman
Director of Statistics
CBS News
Election and Survey Unit

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

From: Marc Sapir [mailto:marcsapir@COMCAST.NET]
Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2004 1:00 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

There is a sense from the AP article WEI YEN put up to the list that this poll was done fraudulently with a purpose in mind. Looking at the 2004 directory I don't find any of the three names listed on the firm's head (I believe that AAPOR's Viola Penn of Arbitron is surely not the same Penn). This may be an example of why the public has become more resistant to participating in or accepting polls. AAPOR should investigate the details further and then, if appropriate, issue a statement repudiating that organization for unethical and anti-democratic behavior. For me the kicker comes in the last sentence when one of their reps claims that exit polls are notoriously unreliable. Silly me, I always that thought that, done correctly and with a rare exception or two, exit polls are "notoriously" reliable.

Marc Sapir MD, MPH
Executive Director
Retro Poll
www.retropoll.org

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Wei Yen
Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2004 7:47 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

Thought this group might be interested in this. - Wei Yen, UCLA

U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

Thu Aug 19, 6:08 AM ET

By ANDREW SELSKY, Associated Press Writer

CARACAS, Venezuela - A U.S. firm's exit poll that said President Hugo Chavez would lose a recall referendum has landed in the center of a controversy following his resounding victory.

"Exit Poll Results Show Major Defeat for Chavez," the survey, conducted by Penn, Schoen & Berland Associates, asserted even as Sunday's voting was still on. But in fact, the opposite was true - Chavez ended up trouncing

his enemies and capturing 59 percent of the vote.

Any casual observer of the 2000 U.S. presidential elections knows exit polls can at times be unreliable. But the poll has become an issue here because the opposition, which mounted the drive to force the leftist leader from office, insists it shows the results from the vote itself were fraudulent. The opposition also claims electronic voting machines were rigged, but has provided no evidence.

Election officials banned publication or broadcast of any exit polls during the historic vote on whether to oust Chavez, a populist who has sought to help the poor and is reviled by the wealthy, who accuse him of stoking class divisions.

But results of the Penn, Schoen & Berland survey were sent out by fax and e-mail to media outlets and opposition offices more than four hours before polls closed. It predicted just the opposite of what happened, saying 59

percent had voted in favor of recalling Chavez.

Cesar Gaviria, secretary general of the Organization of American States who monitored the referendum, said the poll must have had a tremendous impact on Chavez's opponents, who felt they were about to complete their two-year drive to oust him.

"They were told they had a lead of 20 points and then when the results came, they lost by 20 points," Gaviria said. "It's very difficult to deal with that."

Both Gaviria and former President Jimmy Carter, another election monitor, endorsed the vote, saying the results coincided with their own independent samplings.

Mark Penn, of Penn, Schoen & Berland Associates, said Wednesday he has limited knowledge of the exit poll. He said his partner, Doug Schoen, "believes there were more problems with the voting than with the exit poll."

Schoen could not immediately be reached, and another employee familiar with the poll declined to comment.

"We have to let the authorities do their investigation of the election,"

said Marcela Berland, with the firm. "It would be irresponsible to interfere with that."

Critics of the exit poll have questioned how it was conducted because officials have said Penn, Schoen & Berland worked with a U.S.-funded Venezuela group that the Chavez government considers hostile.

Penn, Schoen & Berland had members of Sumate, a Venezuelan group that helped

organize the recall initiative, do the fieldwork for the poll, election observers said.

Roberto Abdul, a Sumate official, acknowledged in a telephone interview that the firm "supervised" an exit poll carried out by Sumate. Abdul added that at least five exit polls were completed for the opposition, with all pointing to a Chavez victory.

Abdul said Sumate - which has received a \$53,400 grant from the National Endowment for Democracy, which in turn receives funds from the U.S. Congress - did not use any of those funds to pay for the surveys.

The issue is potentially explosive because even before the referendum, Chavez himself cited Washington's funding of Sumate as evidence that the Bush administration was financing efforts to oust him - an allegation U.S. officials deny.

Venezuelan Minister of Communications Jesse Chacon said it was a mistake for Sumate to be involved in the exit poll because it might have skewed the results.

"If you use an activist as a pollster, he will eventually begin to act like an activist," Chacon told The Associated Press.

Chris Sabatini, senior program officer for the National Endowment for Democracy, defended Sumate as "independent and impartial."

"Exit polls are notoriously unreliable," Sabatini said by telephone from Washington. "Just because they're off doesn't mean that the group that conducted them is partial to one side."

AP reporters Juan Pablo Toro in Caracas and Will Lester in Washington contributed to this report.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text: set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text: set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Thu, 19 Aug 2004 13:39:33 -0500
Reply-To: Smith-Tom <Smith-Tom@NORC.UCHICAGO.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Smith-Tom <Smith-Tom@NORC.UCHICAGO.EDU>
Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela
Comments: To: "Moon, Nick" <nmoon@NOPWORLD.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Without judging the situation in Venezuela, an example of when an exit =
poll was taken as more valid than reported vote counts was the =
Yugoslavian presidential election on September 24, 2000 in which =
Kostunica defeated Milosevic. Milosevic held up the official release of =
the vote and claimed a run-off was needed. The exit poll was widely =
cited as key evidence that Milosevic had lost the election outright. As =
a reporter for the Mirror wrote on September 25th, "Milosevic made =
blatant attempts to rig the vote, but exit polls put lawyer Kostunica at =
least 20 per cent ahead of him."

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

From: Moon, Nick [mailto:nmoon@NOPWORLD.COM]=20
Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2004 12:54 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

I think you're maligning Penn, Schoen & Berland here. I do not see any =
evidence that the poll "was done fraudulently, with a purpose in mind". =
My company worked with the Opposition Party in the UK for many years, =
and no-one seriously argued that it meant we shouldn't conduct exit =
polls for the BBC.

The "kicker" quote comes from what I assume to be a pressure group, not =
from Penn et al. AFAIK they are more in the line of political marketing =
consultants than researchers, which may well explain why Mark Penn (his =
full name is given in the piece) nor the other principals are AAPOR =
members.

While it may be just a poor exit poll, and there is certainly plenty of =
history of them round the world, it does also raise the very serious =
issue of whether an exit poll may indeed give a more accurate picture of =
respondent behaviour than the official election result, especially in =
countries where the government can influence the conduct of the =
election, and even the counting process.

Given all the concern about the lack of a paper trail in electronic =
voting, as cited in that interesting article someone recently posted on =
this list, what would the reaction be in 2008 if the exit poll showed =
Hilary Clinton well ahead of Bill Owens in the swing states, but the =
result from the electronic voting machines, calculated by the private =

companies that supplied them and the software, showed Owens had won by = 5%. Would we all be SURE the exit poll was wrong?

I seem to recall a similar example being posted here before, from a = former soviet republic, with the defeated opposition claiming the exit = poll was proof the election had been rigged, and this has to be given = serious consideration.

As the 2001 AAPOR Conference T-shirt said - "Polling, now more accurate = than the election itself"

Nick Moon
NOP Research Group
245 Blackfriars Road, London SE1 9UL
tel 020 7890 9830 fax 020 7890 9589
<http://www.nopworld.com>

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

> From: Marc Sapir [mailto:marcsapir@COMCAST.NET]

> Sent: 19 August 2004 18:00

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

>

>

> There is a sense from the AP article WEI YEN put up to the list that=20

> this poll was done fraudulently with a purpose in mind. Looking at the

> 2004 directory I don't find any of the three names listed on

> the firm's

> head (I believe that AAPOR's Viola Penn of Arbitron is surely not the

> same Penn). This may be an example of why the public has become more

> resistant to participating in or accepting polls. AAPOR should

> investigate the details further and then, if appropriate, issue a

> statement repudiating that organization for unethical and

> anti-democratic behavior. For me the kicker comes in the

> last sentence

> when one of their reps claims that exit polls are notoriously

> unreliable. Silly me, I always that thought that, done correctly and

> with a rare exception or two, exit polls are "notoriously" reliable.

>

> Marc Sapir MD, MPH

> Executive Director

> Retro Poll

> www.retropoll.org

>

>

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Wei Yen

> Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2004 7:47 AM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

>

> Thought this group might be interested in this. - Wei Yen, UCLA

>
>
> U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela
>
> Thu Aug 19, 6:08 AM ET
>
> By ANDREW SELSKY, Associated Press Writer
>
> CARACAS, Venezuela - A U.S. firm's exit poll that said President Hugo=20
> Chavez would lose a recall referendum has landed in the center of a=20
> controversy following his resounding victory.
>
> "Exit Poll Results Show Major Defeat for Chavez," the survey,=20
> conducted by
> Penn, Schoen & Berland Associates, asserted even as Sunday's
> voting was
> still on. But in fact, the opposite was true - Chavez ended
> up trouncing
>
> his enemies and capturing 59 percent of the vote.
>
> Any casual observer of the 2000 U.S. presidential elections knows exit =

> polls can at times be unreliable. But the poll has become an issue=20
> here because the opposition, which mounted the drive to force the=20
> leftist leader
> from office, insists it shows the results from the vote itself were
> fraudulent. The opposition also claims electronic voting machines were
> rigged, but has provided no evidence.
>
> Election officials banned publication or broadcast of any exit polls=20
> during the historic vote on whether to oust Chavez, a populist who has =

> sought to
> help the poor and is reviled by the wealthy, who accuse him of stoking
> class divisions.
>
> But results of the Penn, Schoen & Berland survey were sent out by fax=20
> and e-mail to media outlets and opposition offices more than four=20
> hours before
> polls closed. It predicted just the opposite of what
> happened, saying 59
>
> percent had voted in favor of recalling Chavez.
>
> Cesar Gaviria, secretary general of the Organization of American=20
> States who
> monitored the referendum, said the poll must have had a tremendous
> impact
> on Chavez's opponents, who felt they were about to complete their
> two-year
> drive to oust him.
>
> "They were told they had a lead of 20 points and then when the results =

> came, they lost by 20 points," Gaviria said. "It's very difficult to=20
> deal with that."
>
> Both Gaviria and former President Jimmy Carter, another election=20
> monitor, endorsed the vote, saying the results coincided with their=20
> own independent
> samplings.
>
> Mark Penn, of Penn, Schoen & Berland Associates, said Wednesday he has =

> limited knowledge of the exit poll. He said his partner, Doug Schoen,=20
> "believes there were more problems with the voting than with the exit=20
> poll."
>
> Schoen could not immediately be reached, and another employee familiar =

> with the poll declined to comment.
>
> "We have to let the authorities do their investigation of the=20
> election,"
>
> said Marcela Berland, with the firm. "It would be irresponsible to=20
> interfere with that."
>
> Critics of the exit poll have questioned how it was conducted because=20
> officials have said Penn, Schoen & Berland worked with a U.S.-funded=20
> Venezuela group that the Chavez government considers hostile.
>
> Penn, Schoen & Berland had members of Sumate, a Venezuelan group that=20
> helped organize the recall initiative, do the fieldwork for the poll,=20
> election observers said.
>
> Roberto Abdul, a Sumate official, acknowledged in a telephone=20
> interview that the firm "supervised" an exit poll carried out by=20
> Sumate. Abdul added
> that at least five exit polls were completed for the opposition, with
> all
> pointing to a Chavez victory.
>
> Abdul said Sumate - which has received a \$53,400 grant from the=20
> National
>
> Endowment for Democracy, which in turn receives funds from the U.S.=20
> Congress - did not use any of those funds to pay for the surveys.
>
> The issue is potentially explosive because even before the referendum, =

> Chavez himself cited Washington's funding of Sumate as evidence that=20
> the
>
> Bush administration was financing efforts to oust him - an allegation=20
> U.S. officials deny.
>

> Venezuelan Minister of Communications Jesse Chacon said it was a=20
> mistake
>
> for Sumate to be involved in the exit poll because it might have=20
> skewed the
> results.
>
> "If you use an activist as a pollster, he will eventually begin to act =

> like an activist," Chacon told The Associated Press.
>
> Chris Sabatini, senior program officer for the National Endowment for=20
> Democracy, defended Sumate as "independent and impartial."
>
> "Exit polls are notoriously unreliable," Sabatini said by telephone=20
> from
>
> Washington. "Just because they're off doesn't mean that the group that =

> conducted them is partial to one side."
>
> _____
>
> AP reporters Juan Pablo Toro in Caracas and Will Lester in Washington=20
> contributed to this report.
>
>
> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text: set=20
> aapornet nomail On your return send: set aapornet mail
>
> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text: set=20
> aapornet nomail On your return send: set aapornet mail
>

Any views or opinions are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of NOP World or any of its associated companies.

The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, please do not read, copy, use or disclose this communication and notify the sender immediately. It should be noted that any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities

other than the intended recipient is prohibited.

Recipients are warned that NOP World cannot guarantee that attachments or enclosures are secure or error-free as information could be intercepted, corrupted, or contain viruses

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====
Date: Thu, 19 Aug 2004 11:51:12 -0700
Reply-To: "Pinkus, Susan" <Susan.Pinkus@LATIMES.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Pinkus, Susan" <Susan.Pinkus@LATIMES.COM>
Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela
Comments: To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>, "AAPORNET@asu.edu" <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

This company - Penn and Schoen is a Democratic polling firm. Penn did polling for Clinton. They are reputable.

I think polling in Central or South America is difficult. If you remember the 1990 election in Nicaragua -- the American polling firms did not get the preelection polls right, but the Venezuelan/C.A. firms did get it right. Howard Schumann did an experiment in that country using different colored pens -- "Pens and Polls in Nicaragua: An Analysis of the 1990 Preelection Surveys" by Katherine Bischooping and Howard Schuman, University of Michigan, American Journal of Political Science, Vol 36, No. 2 May 1992, Pp 331-50. It shows the nature and limitations of polling in other countries and voters' perceptions of who is asking the questions.

Susan

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Marc Sapir
Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2004 10:00 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

There is a sense from the AP article WEI YEN put up to the list that this poll was done fraudulently with a purpose in mind. Looking at the

2004 directory I don't find any of the three names listed on the firm's head (I believe that AAPOR's Viola Penn of Arbitron is surely not the same Penn). This may be an example of why the public has become more resistant to participating in or accepting polls. AAPOR should investigate the details further and then, if appropriate, issue a statement repudiating that organization for unethical and anti-democratic behavior. For me the kicker comes in the last sentence when one of their reps claims that exit polls are notoriously unreliable. Silly me, I always had that thought that, done correctly and with a rare exception or two, exit polls are "notoriously" reliable.

Marc Sapir MD, MPH
Executive Director
Retro Poll
www.retropoll.org

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Wei Yen
Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2004 7:47 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

Thought this group might be interested in this. - Wei Yen, UCLA

U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

Thu Aug 19, 6:08 AM ET

By ANDREW SELSKY, Associated Press Writer

CARACAS, Venezuela - A U.S. firm's exit poll that said President Hugo Chavez would lose a recall referendum has landed in the center of a controversy following his resounding victory.

"Exit Poll Results Show Major Defeat for Chavez," the survey, conducted by Penn, Schoen & Berland Associates, asserted even as Sunday's voting was still on. But in fact, the opposite was true - Chavez ended up trouncing

his enemies and capturing 59 percent of the vote.

Any casual observer of the 2000 U.S. presidential elections knows exit polls can at times be unreliable. But the poll has become an issue here because the opposition, which mounted the drive to force the leftist leader from office, insists it shows the results from the vote itself were fraudulent. The opposition also claims electronic voting machines were rigged, but has provided no evidence.

Election officials banned publication or broadcast of any exit polls during the historic vote on whether to oust Chavez, a populist who has sought

to help the poor and is reviled by the wealthy, who accuse him of stoking class divisions.

But results of the Penn, Schoen & Berland survey were sent out by fax and e-mail to media outlets and opposition offices more than four hours before polls closed. It predicted just the opposite of what happened, saying 59 percent had voted in favor of recalling Chavez.

Cesar Gaviria, secretary general of the Organization of American States who monitored the referendum, said the poll must have had a tremendous impact on Chavez's opponents, who felt they were about to complete their two-year drive to oust him.

"They were told they had a lead of 20 points and then when the results came, they lost by 20 points," Gaviria said. "It's very difficult to deal with that."

Both Gaviria and former President Jimmy Carter, another election monitor, endorsed the vote, saying the results coincided with their own independent samplings.

Mark Penn, of Penn, Schoen & Berland Associates, said Wednesday he has limited knowledge of the exit poll. He said his partner, Doug Schoen, "believes there were more problems with the voting than with the exit poll."

Schoen could not immediately be reached, and another employee familiar with the poll declined to comment.

"We have to let the authorities do their investigation of the election," said Marcela Berland, with the firm. "It would be irresponsible to interfere with that."

Critics of the exit poll have questioned how it was conducted because officials have said Penn, Schoen & Berland worked with a U.S.-funded Venezuela group that the Chavez government considers hostile.

Penn, Schoen & Berland had members of Sumate, a Venezuelan group that helped organize the recall initiative, do the fieldwork for the poll, election observers said.

Roberto Abdul, a Sumate official, acknowledged in a telephone interview

that the firm "supervised" an exit poll carried out by Sumate. Abdul added that at least five exit polls were completed for the opposition, with all pointing to a Chavez victory.

Abdul said Sumate - which has received a \$53,400 grant from the National Endowment for Democracy, which in turn receives funds from the U.S. Congress - did not use any of those funds to pay for the surveys.

The issue is potentially explosive because even before the referendum, Chavez himself cited Washington's funding of Sumate as evidence that the

Bush administration was financing efforts to oust him - an allegation U.S. officials deny.

Venezuelan Minister of Communications Jesse Chacon said it was a mistake for Sumate to be involved in the exit poll because it might have skewed the results.

"If you use an activist as a pollster, he will eventually begin to act like an activist," Chacon told The Associated Press.

Chris Sabatini, senior program officer for the National Endowment for Democracy, defended Sumate as "independent and impartial."

"Exit polls are notoriously unreliable," Sabatini said by telephone from Washington. "Just because they're off doesn't mean that the group that conducted them is partial to one side."

AP reporters Juan Pablo Toro in Caracas and Will Lester in Washington contributed to this report.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Thu, 19 Aug 2004 15:24:42 -0400
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <DBAE93A0ADFAF74AB3E23DD92A580D5C012A9A0F@NYCCNDX5>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Edelman, Murray wrote:

>Were the interviewers specifically told not to wear any political
>identifications? Were they told to dress neutrally, in ways that didn't
>show their social class? he voter makes a quick decision on whether to
>respond or not to a questionnaire. They could be easily put off by any sign
>of preference by the interviewer, the way he or she is dressed, the way the
>interviewer speaks or something they see. People often wear their class
>differences.

And in Venezuela, they wear them on their skin - black and brown vs.
white. Skin shade would mark interviewer and interviewee, thereby
introducing bias at both ends of the relationship.

--

Doug Henwood
Left Business Observer
38 Greene St - 4th fl.
New York NY 10013-2505 USA
voice +1-212-219-0010
fax +1-212-219-0098
cell +1-917-865-2813
email <<mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>>
web <<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>>

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Thu, 19 Aug 2004 15:59:53 -0400
Reply-To: "Butterworth, Michael" <MXB@CBSNEWS.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Butterworth, Michael" <MXB@CBSNEWS.COM>
Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela
Comments: To: Wei Yen <weiyen@UCLA.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain

It isn't clear from the AP story whether any exit polling was done after the faxes and emails referred to, and if so, whether later voters resembled earlier voters; and I don't know what proportion of the vote was cast in the last 4+ hours. I wouldn't expect as large a shift as observed to result from time-of-day differences, but it is one factor that should be considered in trying to find out what happened.

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

From: Wei Yen [mailto:weiyen@UCLA.EDU]
Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2004 11:47 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

Thought this group might be interested in this. - Wei Yen, UCLA

U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

Thu Aug 19, 6:08 AM ET

By ANDREW SELSKY, Associated Press Writer

CARACAS, Venezuela - A U.S. firm's exit poll that said President Hugo Chavez would lose a recall referendum has landed in the center of a controversy following his resounding victory.

----- snip -----

But results of the Penn, Schoen & Berland survey were sent out by fax and e-mail to media outlets and opposition offices more than four hours before polls closed. It predicted just the opposite of what happened, saying 59 percent had voted in favor of recalling Chavez.

----- snip -----

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Thu, 19 Aug 2004 16:18:58 -0700
Reply-To: Kristin Juffer <kjuffer@WESTED.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Kristin Juffer <kjuffer@WESTED.ORG>
Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela
Comments: To: Smith-Tom <Smith-Tom@NORC.UCHICAGO.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The whole concept of running a valid exit poll in Venezuela is suspect in and of itself. Useful and valid exit polling is based on having such a thorough database and knowledge of every precinct (or equivalent political unit) as to know with a high degree of certainty which are the swing precincts, and exactly how the other non-swing precincts are likely to vote, based on a long record of polling data. Do you really think there is such a thing established in Venezuela?!! Don't think so! I've done polling and survey work in Latin America through the 1990's. No such thing.
Kris

This seems bogus to me.

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

From: "Smith-Tom" <Smith-Tom@NORC.UCHICAGO.EDU>
To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2004 11:39 AM
Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

Without judging the situation in Venezuela, an example of when an exit poll was taken as more valid than reported vote counts was the Yugoslavian presidential election on September 24, 2000 in which Kostunica defeated Milosevic. Milosevic held up the official release of the vote and claimed a run-off was needed. The exit poll was widely cited as key evidence that Milosevic had lost the election outright. As a reporter for the Mirror wrote on September 25th, "Milosevic made blatant attempts to rig the vote, but exit polls put lawyer Kostunica at least 20 per cent ahead of him."

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

From: Moon, Nick [mailto:nmoon@NOPWORLD.COM]
Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2004 12:54 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

I think you're maligning Penn, Schoen & Berland here. I do not see any evidence that the poll "was done fraudulently, with a purpose in mind". My company worked with the Opposition Party in the UK for many years, and no-one seriously argued that it meant we shouldn't conduct exit polls for the BBC.

The "kicker" quote comes from what I assume to be a pressure group, not from Penn et al. AFAIK they are more in the line of political marketing consultants than researchers, which may well explain why Mark Penn (his full name is given in the piece) nor the other principals are AAPOR members.

While it may be just a poor exit poll, and there is certainly plenty of history of them round the world, it does also raise the very serious issue of whether an exit poll may indeed give a more accurate picture of respondent behaviour than the official election result, especially in countries where the government can influence the conduct of the election, and even the counting process.

Given all the concern about the lack of a paper trail in electronic voting, as cited in that interesting article someone recently posted on this list, what would the reaction be in 2008 if the exit poll showed Hilary Clinton well ahead of Bill Owens in the swing states, but the result from the electronic voting machines, calculated by the private companies that supplied them and the software, showed Owens had won by 5%. Would we all be SURE the exit poll was wrong?

I seem to recall a similar example being posted here before, from a former soviet republic, with the defeated opposition claiming the exit poll was proof the election had been rigged, and this has to be given serious consideration.

As the 2001 AAPOR Conference T-shirt said - "Polling, now more accurate than the election itself"

Nick Moon
NOP Research Group
245 Blackfriars Road, London SE1 9UL
tel 020 7890 9830 fax 020 7890 9589
<http://www.nopworld.com>

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

> From: Marc Sapir [mailto:marcsapir@COMCAST.NET]

> Sent: 19 August 2004 18:00

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

>

>

> There is a sense from the AP article WEI YEN put up to the list that
> this poll was done fraudulently with a purpose in mind. Looking at the
> 2004 directory I don't find any of the three names listed on
> the firm's

> head (I believe that AAPOR's Viola Penn of Arbitron is surely not the
> same Penn). This may be an example of why the public has become more
> resistant to participating in or accepting polls. AAPOR should
> investigate the details further and then, if appropriate, issue a
> statement repudiating that organization for unethical and
> anti-democratic behavior. For me the kicker comes in the
> last sentence

> when one of their reps claims that exit polls are notoriously
> unreliable. Silly me, I always had that thought that, done correctly and
> with a rare exception or two, exit polls are "notoriously" reliable.

>

> Marc Sapir MD, MPH

> Executive Director

> Retro Poll

> www.retropoll.org

>

>

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Wei Yen
> Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2004 7:47 AM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela
>
> Thought this group might be interested in this. - Wei Yen, UCLA
>
>
> U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela
>
> Thu Aug 19, 6:08 AM ET
>
> By ANDREW SELSKY, Associated Press Writer
>
> CARACAS, Venezuela - A U.S. firm's exit poll that said President Hugo
> Chavez would lose a recall referendum has landed in the center of a
> controversy following his resounding victory.
>
> "Exit Poll Results Show Major Defeat for Chavez," the survey,
> conducted by
> Penn, Schoen & Berland Associates, asserted even as Sunday's
> voting was
> still on. But in fact, the opposite was true - Chavez ended
> up trouncing
>
> his enemies and capturing 59 percent of the vote.
>
> Any casual observer of the 2000 U.S. presidential elections knows exit
> polls can at times be unreliable. But the poll has become an issue
> here because the opposition, which mounted the drive to force the
> leftist leader
> from office, insists it shows the results from the vote itself were
> fraudulent. The opposition also claims electronic voting machines were
> rigged, but has provided no evidence.
>
> Election officials banned publication or broadcast of any exit polls
> during the historic vote on whether to oust Chavez, a populist who has
> sought to
> help the poor and is reviled by the wealthy, who accuse him of stoking
> class divisions.
>
> But results of the Penn, Schoen & Berland survey were sent out by fax
> and e-mail to media outlets and opposition offices more than four
> hours before
> polls closed. It predicted just the opposite of what
> happened, saying 59
>
> percent had voted in favor of recalling Chavez.
>
> Cesar Gaviria, secretary general of the Organization of American
> States who
> monitored the referendum, said the poll must have had a tremendous
> impact
> on Chavez's opponents, who felt they were about to complete their

> two-year
> drive to oust him.
>
> "They were told they had a lead of 20 points and then when the results
> came, they lost by 20 points," Gaviria said. "It's very difficult to
> deal with that."
>
> Both Gaviria and former President Jimmy Carter, another election
> monitor, endorsed the vote, saying the results coincided with their
> own independent
> samplings.
>
> Mark Penn, of Penn, Schoen & Berland Associates, said Wednesday he has
> limited knowledge of the exit poll. He said his partner, Doug Schoen,
> "believes there were more problems with the voting than with the exit
> poll."
>
> Schoen could not immediately be reached, and another employee familiar
> with the poll declined to comment.
>
> "We have to let the authorities do their investigation of the
> election,"
>
> said Marcela Berland, with the firm. "It would be irresponsible to
> interfere with that."
>
> Critics of the exit poll have questioned how it was conducted because
> officials have said Penn, Schoen & Berland worked with a U.S.-funded
> Venezuela group that the Chavez government considers hostile.
>
> Penn, Schoen & Berland had members of Sumate, a Venezuelan group that
> helped organize the recall initiative, do the fieldwork for the poll,
> election observers said.
>
> Roberto Abdul, a Sumate official, acknowledged in a telephone
> interview that the firm "supervised" an exit poll carried out by
> Sumate. Abdul added
> that at least five exit polls were completed for the opposition, with
> all
> pointing to a Chavez victory.
>
> Abdul said Sumate - which has received a \$53,400 grant from the
> National
>
> Endowment for Democracy, which in turn receives funds from the U.S.
> Congress - did not use any of those funds to pay for the surveys.
>
> The issue is potentially explosive because even before the referendum,
> Chavez himself cited Washington's funding of Sumate as evidence that
> the
>
> Bush administration was financing efforts to oust him - an allegation
> U.S. officials deny.
>

> Venezuelan Minister of Communications Jesse Chacon said it was a
> mistake
>
> for Sumate to be involved in the exit poll because it might have
> skewed the
> results.
>
> "If you use an activist as a pollster, he will eventually begin to act
> like an activist," Chacon told The Associated Press.
>
> Chris Sabatini, senior program officer for the National Endowment for
> Democracy, defended Sumate as "independent and impartial."
>
> "Exit polls are notoriously unreliable," Sabatini said by telephone
> from
>
> Washington. "Just because they're off doesn't mean that the group that
> conducted them is partial to one side."
>
> _____
>
> AP reporters Juan Pablo Toro in Caracas and Will Lester in Washington
> contributed to this report.

> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text: set
> aapornet nomail On your return send: set aapornet mail

> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text: set
> aapornet nomail On your return send: set aapornet mail

Any views or opinions are solely those of the
author and do not necessarily represent those of
NOP World or any of its associated companies.

The information transmitted is intended only for
the person or entity to which it is addressed
and may contain confidential and/or privileged
material. If you are not the intended recipient of
this message, please do not read, copy, use or
disclose this communication and notify the
sender immediately. It should be noted that
any review, retransmission, dissemination or
other use of, or taking action in reliance
upon, this information by persons or entities
other than the intended recipient is prohibited.

Recipients are warned that NOP World cannot guarantee that attachments or enclosures are secure or error-free as information could be intercepted, corrupted, or contain viruses

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Thu, 19 Aug 2004 16:43:02 -0400
Reply-To: Ward Kay <wkay@ADIRONDACK-INC.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Ward Kay <wkay@ADIRONDACK-INC.COM>
Organization: Adirondack Communications
Subject: Post-election panel
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

At this year's MAPOR conference (Nov. 19-20 in Chicago), we are having a post-election panel to share what we found in the polls in statewide elections. I'd like to fill out the panel with one or two more people. If you are doing polls for an interesting race and you are available to be in Chicago on Friday, Nov. 19 - please let me know (wkay@adirondack-inc.com).

And let me make an early plug for MAPOR. Frank Newport from Gallup is the keynote speaker. There are always good papers and panels. And the location is right off Michigan Avenue for great Christmas shopping.

Ward Kay
Vice President, Research
Adirondack Communications

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Thu, 19 Aug 2004 17:21:57 -0400
Reply-To: Nancy Belden <nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nancy Belden <nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM>
Subject: new immigrants
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Comments: cc: Douglas Gould <DGould@douglasgould.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Friends:

A colleague of mine is looking for survey research among immigrants who have come to the US in the last few years. We are aware of the NORC work in this area. My friend is particularly interested in work on attitudes - going beyond demography and background. Studies of all immigrants as well as any such work among one or more particular types would be of interest. Please reply to me if you are aware of something. Many thanks -- Nancy

Nancy Belden
Partner, Belden Russonello & Stewart
President, American Association for Public Opinion Research

1320 19th Street NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
202.822.6090

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Thu, 19 Aug 2004 15:07:43 -0700
Reply-To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>
Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela
Comments: To: "Pinkus, Susan" <Susan.Pinkus@LATIMES.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
Comments: cc: Dennis Bernstein <dbernstein@igc.org>,
Amy Goodman <Mail@democracynow.org>,
George & Dale Friemoth <geodale1@earthlink.net>
In-Reply-To: <2422557534751F4EB6354FE8DD1101EE05810FEC@swift.latimes.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

To Susan Pinkus:

Well, I'm glad to hear you believe that they are a reputable firm but I

wouldn't be quite so sanguine yet. There is evidence to be weighed. Their methods need to be fully investigated.

And, truth be told, the Democratic Party has given money just like the Republicans to oust Hugo Chavez, in the past and present. John Kerry has stated that Chavez must go. This is blatant interventionism, especially because Chavez has not done anything, besides talk against the U.S. while he has assured that he will maintain the U.S. oil supply. So if Penn, Schoen and Berland's money for this poll came from the NED then they may well have been biased by NED's aggressive stance in their methods. As you and others point out there are plenty of variables that can skew the results (class and color of interviewers, a dearth of old data in precincts etc). Let's see if they considered any of these things before they went out and did the work. And finally let's be very clear about one thing: they illegally released before the polls closed, which was against Venezuelan law. They operated in Venezuela and broke the law there, which is what the NED has been doing too.

Marc Sapir MD, MPH
Executive Director
Retro Poll
www.retropoll.org

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Pinkus, Susan
Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2004 10:51 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

This company - Penn and Schoen is a Democratic polling firm. Penn did polling for Clinton. They are reputable.

I think polling in Central or South America is difficult. If you remember the 1990 election in Nicaragua -- the American polling firms did not get the preelection polls right, but the Venezuelan/C.A. firms did get it right. Howard Schumann did an experiment in that country using different colored pens -- "Pens and Polls in Nicaragua: An Analysis of the 1990 Preelection Surveys" by Katherine Bischooping and Howard Schuman, University of Michigan, American Journal of Political Science, Vol 36, No. 2 May 1992, Pp 331-50. It shows the nature and limitations of polling in other countries and voters' perceptions of who is asking the questions.

Susan

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Marc Sapir
Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2004 10:00 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

There is a sense from the AP article WEI YEN put up to the list that

this poll was done fraudulently with a purpose in mind. Looking at the 2004 directory I don't find any of the three names listed on the firm's head (I believe that AAPOR's Viola Penn of Arbitron is surely not the same Penn). This may be an example of why the public has become more resistant to participating in or accepting polls. AAPOR should investigate the details further and then, if appropriate, issue a statement repudiating that organization for unethical and anti-democratic behavior. For me the kicker comes in the last sentence when one of their reps claims that exit polls are notoriously unreliable. Silly me, I always thought that, done correctly and with a rare exception or two, exit polls are "notoriously" reliable.

Marc Sapir MD, MPH
Executive Director
Retro Poll
www.retropoll.org

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Wei Yen
Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2004 7:47 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

Thought this group might be interested in this. - Wei Yen, UCLA

U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

Thu Aug 19, 6:08 AM ET

By ANDREW SELSKY, Associated Press Writer

CARACAS, Venezuela - A U.S. firm's exit poll that said President Hugo Chavez would lose a recall referendum has landed in the center of a controversy following his resounding victory.

"Exit Poll Results Show Major Defeat for Chavez," the survey, conducted by Penn, Schoen & Berland Associates, asserted even as Sunday's voting was still on. But in fact, the opposite was true - Chavez ended up trouncing

his enemies and capturing 59 percent of the vote.

Any casual observer of the 2000 U.S. presidential elections knows exit polls can at times be unreliable. But the poll has become an issue here because the opposition, which mounted the drive to force the leftist leader from office, insists it shows the results from the vote itself were fraudulent. The opposition also claims electronic voting machines were rigged, but has provided no evidence.

Election officials banned publication or broadcast of any exit polls during

the historic vote on whether to oust Chavez, a populist who has sought to help the poor and is reviled by the wealthy, who accuse him of stoking class divisions.

But results of the Penn, Schoen & Berland survey were sent out by fax and e-mail to media outlets and opposition offices more than four hours before polls closed. It predicted just the opposite of what happened, saying 59 percent had voted in favor of recalling Chavez.

Cesar Gaviria, secretary general of the Organization of American States who monitored the referendum, said the poll must have had a tremendous impact on Chavez's opponents, who felt they were about to complete their two-year drive to oust him.

"They were told they had a lead of 20 points and then when the results came, they lost by 20 points," Gaviria said. "It's very difficult to deal with that."

Both Gaviria and former President Jimmy Carter, another election monitor, endorsed the vote, saying the results coincided with their own independent samplings.

Mark Penn, of Penn, Schoen & Berland Associates, said Wednesday he has limited knowledge of the exit poll. He said his partner, Doug Schoen, "believes there were more problems with the voting than with the exit poll."

Schoen could not immediately be reached, and another employee familiar with the poll declined to comment.

"We have to let the authorities do their investigation of the election," said Marcela Berland, with the firm. "It would be irresponsible to interfere with that."

Critics of the exit poll have questioned how it was conducted because officials have said Penn, Schoen & Berland worked with a U.S.-funded Venezuela group that the Chavez government considers hostile.

Penn, Schoen & Berland had members of Sumate, a Venezuelan group that helped organize the recall initiative, do the fieldwork for the poll, election observers said.

Roberto Abdul, a Sumate official, acknowledged in a telephone interview that the firm "supervised" an exit poll carried out by Sumate. Abdul added that at least five exit polls were completed for the opposition, with all pointing to a Chavez victory.

Abdul said Sumate - which has received a \$53,400 grant from the National Endowment for Democracy, which in turn receives funds from the U.S. Congress - did not use any of those funds to pay for the surveys.

The issue is potentially explosive because even before the referendum, Chavez himself cited Washington's funding of Sumate as evidence that the

Bush administration was financing efforts to oust him - an allegation U.S. officials deny.

Venezuelan Minister of Communications Jesse Chacon said it was a mistake for Sumate to be involved in the exit poll because it might have skewed the results.

"If you use an activist as a pollster, he will eventually begin to act like an activist," Chacon told The Associated Press.

Chris Sabatini, senior program officer for the National Endowment for Democracy, defended Sumate as "independent and impartial."

"Exit polls are notoriously unreliable," Sabatini said by telephone from Washington. "Just because they're off doesn't mean that the group that conducted them is partial to one side."

AP reporters Juan Pablo Toro in Caracas and Will Lester in Washington contributed to this report.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====
Date: Thu, 19 Aug 2004 18:18:50 -0400
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

In case you did not see this it tells something about the people who did=20
the interviewing for the Venezuela exit poll.

www.venezuelanalysis.com/articles.php?artno=3D1248

Venezuela=92s Opposition Resorts to Phony Exit Polls
Sunday, Aug 15, 2004

By: Jonah Gindin - Venezuelanalysis.com

In the wealthy Caracas neighborhood of Altamira would-be voters are=20
experiencing extended delays, and some have spent as much as 12 hours=20
waiting in line. Across town in the working-class neighborhood of Petare,=
=20
people have been in line since 4 am. In the upper class neighborhood of=20
Altamira, where voters are almost unanimously against President Ch=E1vez,=20
they are blaming the delays on Chavista sabotage; and in Petare, a bastion=
=20
of Ch=E1vez support, the chaos is the now familiar result of opposition=
dirty=20
tricks.

Outside one of the Altamira voting centers, S=FAmate volunteers conduct exit=
=20
polls and provide support for those still in line. S=FAmate, a=20
self-described civil association, is an arm of the opposition umbrella=20
group the Democratic Coordinator. According to S=FAmate, there are=20
forty-five thousand of these volunteers all over the country=ADat least one=
=20
at every single voting station, and at those voting stations deemed more=20
important, there are as many as twenty.

Altamira, apparently, is one such location. Twenty conscripts stand around outside the voting center, clipboard in hand waiting for unsuspecting citizens to emerge, fresh from having voted. "Good afternoon," they purr, "would you mind telling us if you voted Yes or No?" and "Yes, yes," is the most common response.

"How many No votes have you received?" I asked, playing the naive reporter.

"Let's see," she offered, tapping her tennis shoes, "there are no Nos on this page, and one on this page. I have one No."

"Just one?" I persisted.

"Well, I don't know about the others, but I have just one," she answered, then, spotting some emerging voters in the distance, she scampered off to collect more Yeses.

According to co-director Maria Corina Machado, SFAmate is an objective non-partisan civil association. When asked why SFAmate has worked exclusively with the Venezuelan opposition since its inception in 2002, Machado said that their overtures to the government were regularly rebuffed. Machado neglected to mention that one of the reasons the government may have been hesitant to work with her group is because she was a participant in the 2002 coup that briefly overthrew Chavez she signed the infamous decree of dictator-for-a-day Pedro Carmona. She is currently being investigated for treason, for having received funds from a foreign government (the U.S.) earmarked for ousting the Chavez government.

Due to SFAmate's infamy as an arm of Venezuela's opposition umbrella group the Democratic Coordinador, Machado noted that volunteers stationed in Chavista neighborhoods would not reveal their identities. Since campaigning ended on Thursday, and political groups are not permitted to solicit votes at voting centers on Sunday, SFAmate has instructed its volunteers to pose as good samaritans.

The role of the volunteers, according Machado, is to help citizens resolve any problems they may encounter during the voting process. For example, "if someone comes to a voting center to vote and their name is not on the list that will happen."

According to one of SFAmate's Altamira volunteers, "we are here to provide food for the people in line, to provide them with water, to help them in

any way we can to facilitate the voting process. And to do exit polls, to=20 see if they voted =91Yes=92 or =91No=92.=94

=93And you have volunteers providing food in all the lines all over the= country?=94

=93Yes, absolutely. Everywhere,=94 responded another white-clad S=Famate= pollster.

=93But I was just in Petare, a very Chavista neighbourhood, and I didn=92t= =20 notice anyone from S=Famate handing out food or water,=94 I said coyly.

=93That=92s because the people in those neighbourhoods don=92t like the=20 Coordinadora, not because the Coordinadora doesn=92t want to help them,=94= she=20 exclaimed, visibly perturbed.

=93So if you can=92t get into Chavista neighborhoods, you can=92t do exit= polls=20 there, right?=94 I asked.

=93No=85=94 she hesitated, =93I=92m sure they are doing exit polls= everywhere.=94 End=20 of interview.

In light of Democratic Coordinator leader Enrique Mendoza=92s pronouncement= =20 last week that he would be releasing his exit poll results this afternoon,= =20 S=Famate=92s less than representative polling may be cause for concern.

At this point, the opposition seems to be more or less aware of the=20 likelihood that they will lose today=92s vote. And with the optimistic=20 attitudes of both the Carter Center and the Organization of American States= =20 regarding the transparency of the voting process, it would appear that a=20 Ch=E1vez victory will have to be grudgingly accepted by at least those=20 sectors of the opposition nominally committed to the democratic process.

In that case, perhaps the best that they can hope for is to cast some doubt= =20 on the process; to exaggerate some irregularities, to create others. That= =20 way, they can refer in passing to problems with the referendum results for= =20 the rest of Ch=E1vez=92 tenure as President, never going into any detail,= but=20 perpetuating the international stereotype that Ch=E1vez has authoritarian=20 tendencies.

And releasing exit polls that directly contradict the official results may= =20 be the best way of accomplishing this.

MITOFSKY INTERNATIONAL
1776 Broadway, Suite 1708
New York, NY 10019

212 980-3031
212 980-3107 Fax

www.mitofskyinternational.com
mitofsky@mindspring.com =20

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail
=====

Date: Thu, 19 Aug 2004 16:39:30 -0700
Reply-To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>
Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela
Comments: To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <6.1.2.0.2.20040819181314.0414baf0@mail.mindspring.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

The article forwarded by Warren Mitofsky certainly provides evidence that the exit poll outcome was not just an accidental error. I still think this should be corroborated with an investigation. If the polling was not ethically performed AAPOR should take the appropriate stand publicly. =20

Marc Sapir MD, MPH
Executive Director
Retro Poll
www.retropoll.org

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Warren Mitofsky
Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2004 2:19 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

In case you did not see this it tells something about the people who did the interviewing for the Venezuela exit poll.

www.venezuelanalysis.com/articles.php?artno=1248

Venezuela=92s Opposition Resorts to Phony Exit Polls
Sunday, Aug 15, 2004

By: Jonah Gindin - Venezuelanalysis.com

In the wealthy Caracas neighborhood of Altamira would-be voters are experiencing extended delays, and some have spent as much as 12 hours waiting in line. Across town in the working-class neighborhood of Petare, people have been in line since 4 am. In the upper class neighborhood of

Altamira, where voters are almost unanimously against President Chávez, they are blaming the delays on Chavista sabotage; and in Petare, a bastion of Chávez support, the chaos is the now familiar result of opposition dirty tricks.

Outside one of the Altamira voting centers, SFAmate volunteers conduct exit polls and provide support for those still in line. SFAmate, a self-described civil association, is an arm of the opposition umbrella group the Democratic Coordinator. According to SFAmate, there are forty-five thousand of these volunteers all over the country at least at every single voting station, and at those voting stations deemed more important, there are as many as twenty.

Altamira, apparently, is one such location. Twenty conscripts stand around outside the voting center, clipboard in hand waiting for unsuspecting citizens to emerge, fresh from having voted. Good afternoon, they purr, would you mind telling us if you voted Yes or No? and Yes, yes, is the most common response.

How many No votes have you received? I asked, playing the naive reporter.

Let's see, she offered, tapping her tennis shoes, there are no Nos on this page, and one on this page. I have one No.

Just one? I persisted.

Well, I don't know about the others, but I have just one, she answered, then, spotting some emerging voters in the distance, she scampered off to collect more Yeses.

According to co-director Maria Corina Machado, S=FAMate is an objective=20 non-partisan civil association. When asked why S=FAMate has worked=20 exclusively with the Venezuelan opposition since its inception in 2002,=20 Machado said that their overtures to the government were regularly=20 rebuffed. Machado neglected to mention that one of the reasons the=20 government may have been hesitant to work with her group is because she was=20 a participant in the 2002 coup that briefly overthrew Ch=Elvez=ADshe = signed the=20 infamous decree of dictator-for-a-day Pedro Carmona. She is currently=20 being investigated for treason, for having received funds from a foreign government (the U.S.) earmarked for ousting the Chavez government.

Due to S=FAMate=92s infamy as an arm of Venezuela=92s opposition = umbrella group=20 the Democratic Coordinador, Machado noted that volunteers stationed in=20 Chavista neighborhoods would not reveal their identities. Since=20 campaigning ended on Thursday, and political groups are not permitted to solicit votes at voting centers on Sunday, S=FAMate has instructed its=20 volunteers to pose as =91good samaritans=92.

The role of the volunteers, according Machado, is to help citizens to=20 resolve any problems they may encounter during the voting process. For=20 example, =93if someone comes to a voting center to vote and their = name=92s not=20 on the list=85that will happen.=94

According to one of S=FAMate=92s Altamira volunteers, =93we are here to provide=20 food for the people in line, to provide them with water, to help them in any way we can to facilitate the voting process. And to do exit polls, to=20 see if they voted =91Yes=92 or =91No=92.=94

=93And you have volunteers providing food in all the lines all over the country?=94

=93Yes, absolutely. Everywhere,=94 responded another white-clad S=FAMate pollster.

=93But I was just in Petare, a very Chavista neighbourhood, and I = didn=92t=20 notice anyone from S=FAMate handing out food or water,=94 I said coyly.

=93That=92s because the people in those neighbourhoods don=92t like the=20 Coordinadora, not because the Coordinadora doesn=92t want to help = them,=94 she=20

exclaimed, visibly perturbed.

"So if you can't get into Chavista neighborhoods, you can't do exit polls there, right?" I asked.

"No," she hesitated, "I'm sure they are doing exit polls everywhere."
End of interview.

In light of Democratic Coordinator leader Enrique Mendoza's pronouncement last week that he would be releasing his exit poll results this afternoon, SFAmate's less than representative polling may be cause for concern.

At this point, the opposition seems to be more or less aware of the likelihood that they will lose today's vote. And with the optimistic attitudes of both the Carter Center and the Organization of American States regarding the transparency of the voting process, it would appear that a

Chavez victory will have to be grudgingly accepted by at least those sectors of the opposition nominally committed to the democratic process.

In that case, perhaps the best that they can hope for is to cast some doubt on the process; to exaggerate some irregularities, to create others. That way, they can refer in passing to problems with the referendum results for the rest of Chavez's tenure as President, never going into any detail, but perpetuating the international stereotype that Chavez has authoritarian tendencies.

And releasing exit polls that directly contradict the official results may be the best way of accomplishing this.

MITOFSKY INTERNATIONAL
1776 Broadway, Suite 1708
New York, NY 10019

212 980-3031
212 980-3107 Fax

www.mitofskyinternational.com
mitofsky@mindspring.com

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====

Date: Thu, 19 Aug 2004 17:00:01 -0700
Reply-To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>
Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela
Comments: To: Kristin Juffer <kjuffer@WESTED.ORG>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <007801c486425e870da105d596010a@WESTEDUPBACS35>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I can't take Nick Moon's comments seriously. I never suggested that association with a political movement implies fraud. However, the U.S. government has been financing the opposition to try and overthrow Chavez, which is a different kettle of fish. The group that did this poll, the article reports, has received funds from the National Endowment for Democracy whose purpose is, if one looks beneath the phony name, to interfere in the internal affairs of Latin American nations, Venezuela being a good example. Moreover, though I do agree with Kristin that exit polling without a clear history of results from given precincts before seriously damages the validity of the exit polls, what would anyone guess is the likelihood that a non-fraudulent exit poll can be off by 40%. The real reason that I don't take Nick Moon seriously is that he, like the Venezuelan opposition leaders has simply ignored the fact that the Carter Center and other international observers did their own investigation of polling results and had access to whatever elements they asked to have access to. Their results were exactly the same as reported by the election commission. I can't sit here and prove this is fraud. I simply recommended that AAPOR investigate what has gone on and decide on a scientific basis how the results came out the way they did. If it looks as bad as it sounds right now the organization has a responsibility to its members, as well as the public to make a statement about the ethics of this.

Marc Sapir

Marc Sapir MD, MPH
Executive Director
Retro Poll
www.retropoll.org

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Kristin Juffer
Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2004 3:19 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

The whole concept of running a valid exit poll in Venezuela is suspect in and of itself. Useful and valid exit polling is based on having such a thorough database and knowledge of every precinct (or equivalent political unit) as to know with a high degree of certainty which are the swing precincts, and exactly how the other non-swing precincts are likely to vote, based on a long record of polling data. Do you really think there is such a thing established in Venezuela?!! Don't think so! I've done polling and survey work in Latin America through the 1990's. No such thing.
Kris

This seems bogus to me.

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

From: "Smith-Tom" <Smith-Tom@NORC.UCHICAGO.EDU>
To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2004 11:39 AM
Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

Without judging the situation in Venezuela, an example of when an exit poll was taken as more valid than reported vote counts was the Yugoslavian presidential election on September 24, 2000 in which Kostunica defeated Milosevic. Milosevic held up the official release of the vote and claimed a run-off was needed. The exit poll was widely cited as key evidence that Milosevic had lost the election outright. As a reporter for the Mirror wrote on September 25th, "Milosevic made blatant attempts to rig the vote, but exit polls put lawyer Kostunica at least 20 per cent ahead of him."

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

From: Moon, Nick [mailto:nmoon@NOPWORLD.COM]
Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2004 12:54 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

I think you're maligning Penn, Schoen & Berland here. I do not see any evidence that the poll "was done fraudulently, with a purpose in mind".
My

company worked with the Opposition Party in the UK for many years, and no-one seriously argued that it meant we shouldn't conduct exit polls for the BBC.

The "kicker" quote comes from what I assume to be a pressure group, not from Penn et al. AFAIK they are more in the line of political marketing consultants than researchers, which may well explain why Mark Penn (his full name is given in the piece) nor the other principals are AAPOR members.

While it may be just a poor exit poll, and there is certainly plenty of history of them round the world, it does also raise the very serious issue of whether an exit poll may indeed give a more accurate picture of respondent behaviour than the official election result, especially in countries where the government can influence the conduct of the election, and even the counting process.

Given all the concern about the lack of a paper trail in electronic voting, as cited in that interesting article someone recently posted on this list, what would the reaction be in 2008 if the exit poll showed Hilary Clinton well ahead of Bill Owens in the swing states, but the result from the electronic voting machines, calculated by the private companies that supplied them and the software, showed Owens had won by 5%. Would we all be SURE the exit poll was wrong?

I seem to recall a similar example being posted here before, from a former soviet republic, with the defeated opposition claiming the exit poll was proof the election had been rigged, and this has to be given serious consideration.

As the 2001 AAPOR Conference T-shirt said - "Polling, now more accurate than the election itself"

Nick Moon
NOP Research Group
245 Blackfriars Road, London SE1 9UL
tel 020 7890 9830 fax 020 7890 9589
<http://www.nopworld.com>

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Marc Sapir [mailto:marcsapir@COMCAST.NET]
> Sent: 19 August 2004 18:00

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela
>
>
> There is a sense from the AP article WEI YEN put up to the list that
> this poll was done fraudulently with a purpose in mind. Looking at the
> 2004 directory I don't find any of the three names listed on
> the firm's
> head (I believe that AAPOR's Viola Penn of Arbitron is surely not the
> same Penn). This may be an example of why the public has become more
> resistant to participating in or accepting polls. AAPOR should
> investigate the details further and then, if appropriate, issue a
> statement repudiating that organization for unethical and
> anti-democratic behavior. For me the kicker comes in the
> last sentence
> when one of their reps claims that exit polls are notoriously
> unreliable. Silly me, I always that thought that, done correctly and
> with a rare exception or two, exit polls are "notoriously" reliable.
>
> Marc Sapir MD, MPH
> Executive Director
> Retro Poll
> www.retropoll.org
>
>

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Wei Yen
> Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2004 7:47 AM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela
>

> Thought this group might be interested in this. - Wei Yen, UCLA
>
>

> U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela
>

> Thu Aug 19, 6:08 AM ET
>

> By ANDREW SELSKY, Associated Press Writer
>

> CARACAS, Venezuela - A U.S. firm's exit poll that said President Hugo
> Chavez would lose a recall referendum has landed in the center of a
> controversy following his resounding victory.
>

> "Exit Poll Results Show Major Defeat for Chavez," the survey,
> conducted by
> Penn, Schoen & Berland Associates, asserted even as Sunday's
> voting was
> still on. But in fact, the opposite was true - Chavez ended
> up trouncing
>

> his enemies and capturing 59 percent of the vote.
>

> Any casual observer of the 2000 U.S. presidential elections knows exit

> polls can at times be unreliable. But the poll has become an issue
> here because the opposition, which mounted the drive to force the
> leftist leader
> from office, insists it shows the results from the vote itself were
> fraudulent. The opposition also claims electronic voting machines were
> rigged, but has provided no evidence.
>
> Election officials banned publication or broadcast of any exit polls
> during the historic vote on whether to oust Chavez, a populist who has
> sought to
> help the poor and is reviled by the wealthy, who accuse him of stoking
> class divisions.
>
> But results of the Penn, Schoen & Berland survey were sent out by fax
> and e-mail to media outlets and opposition offices more than four
> hours before
> polls closed. It predicted just the opposite of what
> happened, saying 59
>
> percent had voted in favor of recalling Chavez.
>
> Cesar Gaviria, secretary general of the Organization of American
> States who
> monitored the referendum, said the poll must have had a tremendous
> impact
> on Chavez's opponents, who felt they were about to complete their
> two-year
> drive to oust him.
>
> "They were told they had a lead of 20 points and then when the results
> came, they lost by 20 points," Gaviria said. "It's very difficult to
> deal with that."
>
> Both Gaviria and former President Jimmy Carter, another election
> monitor, endorsed the vote, saying the results coincided with their
> own independent
> samplings.
>
> Mark Penn, of Penn, Schoen & Berland Associates, said Wednesday he has
> limited knowledge of the exit poll. He said his partner, Doug Schoen,
> "believes there were more problems with the voting than with the exit
> poll."
>
> Schoen could not immediately be reached, and another employee familiar
> with the poll declined to comment.
>
> "We have to let the authorities do their investigation of the
> election,"
>
> said Marcela Berland, with the firm. "It would be irresponsible to
> interfere with that."
>
> Critics of the exit poll have questioned how it was conducted because
> officials have said Penn, Schoen & Berland worked with a U.S.-funded

> Venezuela group that the Chavez government considers hostile.
>
> Penn, Schoen & Berland had members of Sumate, a Venezuelan group that
> helped organize the recall initiative, do the fieldwork for the poll,
> election observers said.
>
> Roberto Abdul, a Sumate official, acknowledged in a telephone
> interview that the firm "supervised" an exit poll carried out by
> Sumate. Abdul added
> that at least five exit polls were completed for the opposition, with
> all
> pointing to a Chavez victory.
>
> Abdul said Sumate - which has received a \$53,400 grant from the
> National
>
> Endowment for Democracy, which in turn receives funds from the U.S.
> Congress - did not use any of those funds to pay for the surveys.
>
> The issue is potentially explosive because even before the referendum,
> Chavez himself cited Washington's funding of Sumate as evidence that
> the
>
> Bush administration was financing efforts to oust him - an allegation
> U.S. officials deny.
>
> Venezuelan Minister of Communications Jesse Chacon said it was a
> mistake
>
> for Sumate to be involved in the exit poll because it might have
> skewed the
> results.
>
> "If you use an activist as a pollster, he will eventually begin to act
> like an activist," Chacon told The Associated Press.
>
> Chris Sabatini, senior program officer for the National Endowment for
> Democracy, defended Sumate as "independent and impartial."
>
> "Exit polls are notoriously unreliable," Sabatini said by telephone
> from
>
> Washington. "Just because they're off doesn't mean that the group that
> conducted them is partial to one side."
>
> _____
>
> AP reporters Juan Pablo Toro in Caracas and Will Lester in Washington
> contributed to this report.
>
>
> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text: set

> aapornet nomail On your return send: set aapornet mail
>
> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text: set
> aapornet nomail On your return send: set aapornet mail
>

Any views or opinions are solely those of the
author and do not necessarily represent those of
NOP World or any of its associated companies.

The information transmitted is intended only for
the person or entity to which it is addressed
and may contain confidential and/or privileged
material. If you are not the intended recipient of
this message, please do not read, copy, use or
disclose this communication and notify the
sender immediately. It should be noted that
any review, retransmission, dissemination or
other use of, or taking action in reliance
upon, this information by persons or entities
other than the intended recipient is prohibited.

Recipients are warned that NOP World cannot guarantee
that attachments or enclosures are secure or error-free
as information could be intercepted, corrupted,
or contain viruses

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail

dHkuCgkKCUFsdGFtaXJhLCBhcHBhemVudGx5LCBpcyBvbmUgc3VjaCBsb2NhdGlvbi4gIFR3ZW50
eSBjb25zY3JpcHRzIHNoYw5kCglhcm91bmQKcW91dHNpZGUgdGhlIHZvdGluZyBjZW50ZXIsIGNs
aXBib2FyZCBpbiBoYW5kIHdhaXRpbmcgZm9yIHVuc3VzcGVjdGluZwoJY2l0aXplbnMgdG8gZW11
cmdlLCBmcmVzaCBmcm9tIGhhdmluZyB2b3RlZC4gI0KAnEdvb2QgYWZ0ZXJub29uL0KAnSB0aGV5
CglwdXJyLAoJ4oCcd291bGQgeW91IG1pbmQgdGVsbGluZyB1cyBpZiB5b3Ugdm90ZWQg4oCYWWVz
4oCZIG9yI0KAmE5v4oCZP+KAnSBhbmQg4oCcWWVzLCB5ZXMscGl5ZXMsc4oCdIGlZiHRoZSBtb3N0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g
UGVkc8gQ2FybW9uYS4gIFNoZSBpcyBjdXJyZW50bHkKCWJlaW5nIGludmVzdGlnYXRlZCBmb3Jg
dHJlYXNvbiwgc29yIGhhdmluZyByZWVlaXZlZCBmdW5kcyBmcm9tIGegZm9yZWlnbgoJCglnb3Zl
cm5tZW50ICh0aGUgVS5TLikgZWfyaWFya2VklGZveciBvdXN0aW5nIHRoZSBDMaGF2ZXogZ292ZXJ
bWVudC4KCQoJRHVlIHRvIFPDum1hdGXigJlZIGluZmFteSBhcyBhbiBhem0gb2YgVmVuZXp1ZWxh
4oCZcyBvcHBvc2l0aW9uIHVtYnJlbGxhCglncm91cAoJdGhllIERlbW9jemF0aWMgQ29vcnRpbmFk
b3IsIE1hY2hhZG8gbm90ZWQgdGhhdCB2b2x1bnRlZXJzIHNoYXRpb25lZCBpbgoJQ2hhdmldzGEg
bmVpZ2hib3Job29kcyB3b3VsZCBub3QgemV2ZWfSiHRoZWlyIGlkZW50aXRpZXMuICBTaW5jZQoJ
Y2FtcGFpZ25pbmcgZW5kZWQgb24gVGh1cnNkYXksIGFuZCBwb2xpdGlyYWwgZ3JvdXBzIGFyZSBu
b3QgcGVybW10dGVkIHRvCgkKcXNvbGJjaXQgdm90ZXMgYXQgdm90aW5nIGNlbnRlcnMgb24gU3Vu
ZGF5LCBTw7ptYXRlIGhhecyBpbnN0cnVjdGVklIGl0cwoJdm9sdW50ZWVycyB0byBwb3NIIGFzI0KA
mGdvb2Qgc2FtYXJpdGFuc+KAmS4KCQoJVGHlIHJvbGUgb2YgdGhllHZvbHVudGVlcnMsIGFyY29y
ZGluZyBNYWNoYWRvLCBpcyB0byBoZWxwIGNpdG16ZW5zIHRvCglyZXNvbHZlIGFueSBwcm9ibGVt
cyB0aGV5IG1heSB1bmNvdW50ZXlZHVyaW5nIHRoZSB2b3RpbmcgcHJvY2Vzcy4gIEZvcgoJZXhh
bXBsZSwg4oCcaWYgc29tZW9uZSBjb21lcyB0byBhIHZvdGluZyBjZW50ZXlGdG8gdm90ZSBhbmQg
dGhlaXIgbmFtZekAmXMkCW5vdAoJb24gdGhllGxpc3TigKZ0aGF0IHdpbGwgaGFwcGVuLuKAnQoJ
CglBY2NvcnRpbmcgdG8gb25lIG9mIFPDum1hdGXigJlZIEFsdGFtaXJhIHZvbHVudGVlcnMsI0KA
nHdlIGFyZSB0ZXJlIHRvCglwcm92aWRlCglmb29kIGZveciB0aGUgcGVvcGxlIGluIGxpbmUsIHRv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o
ZWxwIHRoZW0s4oCdCglzaGUkCWV4Y2xhaW1lZCwgdm1zaWJseSBwZXJ0dXJlZWQuCgkKCeKAnFNv
IGlmIHlvdSBjYw7igJl0IGdlldCBpbnRvIENoYXZpc3RhIG5laWdoYm9yaG9vZHMslHlvdSBjYw7i

Date: Thu, 19 Aug 2004 18:08:15 -0700
Reply-To: Steven Hertzberg <steven@VOTEWATCH.US>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Steven Hertzberg <steven@VOTEWATCH.US>
Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <6.1.2.0.2.20040819181314.0414baf0@mail.mindspring.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Dear all,

I'm concerned that this episode will continue to reduce public confidence in survey research, and more specifically, exit polling. While our organization is certainly a newcomer to the survey research field, I have personally been asked about the credibility of the survey research industry, and exit polling organizations, during numerous talks and presentations regarding our election system. This latest item is certainly not helpful.

Other than this list, I'd like to know if anyone is working to issue a press release or to meet with reporters in an effort to introduce some objectivity and balance in the public domain?

Steven Hertzberg
Votewatch Corporation
2269 Chestnut Street, 611
San Francisco, California 94123

<http://www.votewatch.us>
Your Eye on Elections =20

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Warren Mitofsky
Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2004 3:19 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

In case you did not see this it tells something about the people who did the interviewing for the Venezuela exit poll.

www.venezuelanalysis.com/articles.php?artno=3D1248

Venezuela=92s Opposition Resorts to Phony Exit Polls Sunday, Aug 15, =

2004

By: Jonah Gindin - Venezuelanalysis.com

In the wealthy Caracas neighborhood of Altamira would-be voters are experiencing extended delays, and some have spent as much as 12 hours waiting in line. Across town in the working-class neighborhood of Petare, people have been in line since 4 am. In the upper class neighborhood of Altamira, where voters are almost unanimously against President Chávez, they are blaming the delays on Chavista sabotage; and in Petare, a bastion of Chávez support, the chaos is the now familiar result of opposition dirty tricks.

Outside one of the Altamira voting centers, SFAmate volunteers conduct exit polls and provide support for those still in line. SFAmate, a self-described civil association, is an arm of the opposition umbrella group the Democratic Coordinator. According to SFAmate, there are forty-five thousand of these volunteers all over the country—At least one at every single voting station, and at those voting stations deemed more important, there are as many as twenty.

Altamira, apparently, is one such location. Twenty conscripts stand around outside the voting center, clipboard in hand waiting for unsuspecting citizens to emerge, fresh from having voted. "Good afternoon," they purr, "would you mind telling us if you voted Yes or No?" and "Yes, yes, yes" is the most common response.

"How many No votes have you received?" I asked, playing the naive reporter.

"Let's see," she offered, tapping her tennis shoes, "there are no Nos on this page, and one on this page. I have one No."

"Just one?" I persisted.

"Well, I don't know about the others, but I have just one," she answered, then, spotting some emerging voters in the distance, she scampered off to collect more Yeses.

According to co-director Maria Corina Machado, SFAmate is an objective

non-partisan civil association. When asked why S=Famate has worked exclusively with the Venezuelan opposition since its inception in 2002, Machado said that their overtures to the government were regularly rebuffed. Machado neglected to mention that one of the reasons the government may have been hesitant to work with her group is because she was a participant in the 2002 coup that briefly overthrew Chavez. She signed the infamous decree of dictator-for-a-day Pedro Carmona. She is currently being investigated for treason, for having received funds from a foreign government (the U.S.) earmarked for ousting the Chavez government.

Due to S=Famate's infamy as an arm of Venezuela's opposition umbrella group the Democratic Coordinador, Machado noted that volunteers stationed in Chavista neighborhoods would not reveal their identities. Since campaigning ended on Thursday, and political groups are not permitted to solicit votes at voting centers on Sunday, S=Famate has instructed its volunteers to pose as good samaritans.

The role of the volunteers, according Machado, is to help citizens to resolve any problems they may encounter during the voting process. For example, if someone comes to a voting center to vote and their name is not on the list that will happen.

According to one of S=Famate's Altamira volunteers, we are here to provide food for the people in line, to provide them with water, to help them in any way we can to facilitate the voting process. And to do exit polls, to see if they voted Yes or No.

And you have volunteers providing food in all the lines all over the country?

Yes, absolutely. Everywhere, responded another white-clad S=Famate pollster.

But I was just in Petare, a very Chavista neighbourhood, and I didn't notice anyone from S=Famate handing out food or water, I said coyly.

That's because the people in those neighbourhoods don't like the Coordinadora, not because the Coordinadora doesn't want to help them, she exclaimed, visibly perturbed.

=93So if you can=92t get into Chavista neighborhoods, you can=92t do =
exit polls
there, right?=94 I asked.

=93No=85=94 she hesitated, =93I=92m sure they are doing exit polls =
everywhere.=94 End of
interview.

In light of Democratic Coordinator leader Enrique Mendoza=92s =
pronouncement
last week that he would be releasing his exit poll results this =
afternoon,
S=FAmate=92s less than representative polling may be cause for concern.

At this point, the opposition seems to be more or less aware of the
likelihood that they will lose today=92s vote. And with the optimistic
attitudes of both the Carter Center and the Organization of American =
States
regarding the transparency of the voting process, it would appear that a
Ch=E1vez victory will have to be grudgingly accepted by at least those =
sectors
of the opposition nominally committed to the democratic process.

In that case, perhaps the best that they can hope for is to cast some =
doubt
on the process; to exaggerate some irregularities, to create others. =
That
way, they can refer in passing to problems with the referendum results =
for
the rest of Ch=E1vez=92 tenure as President, never going into any =
detail, but
perpetuating the international stereotype that Ch=E1vez has =
authoritarian
tendencies.
And releasing exit polls that directly contradict the official results =
may
be the best way of accomplishing this.

MITOFSKY INTERNATIONAL
1776 Broadway, Suite 1708
New York, NY 10019

212 980-3031
212 980-3107 Fax

www.mitofskyinternational.com
mitofsky@mindspring.com =20

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

Incoming mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).
Version: 6.0.740 / Virus Database: 494 - Release Date: 8/16/2004
=20

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).
Version: 6.0.740 / Virus Database: 494 - Release Date: 8/16/2004
=20

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====
Date: Thu, 19 Aug 2004 21:09:49 -0400
Reply-To: "Edelman, Murray" <EdelmanM@CBSNEWS.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Edelman, Murray" <EdelmanM@CBSNEWS.COM>
Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela
Comments: To: Kristin Juffer <kjuffer@WESTED.ORG>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

There are many good ways to criticize this poll but the lack of a thorough database is not one.

The media conduct exit polls in primaries every four years. There was no record of past vote identifying swing precincts between Kerry and the others.

There rarely is any reliable past primary data since the candidate configurations are not stable at all like a race between parties.(In fact, in all my thousands of exit polls, I've never looked for swing precincts.)

It is true that we do have reasonably stable measures of size, e.g. the past primary vote for selecting the precincts.However, this is not necessary condition.

It all comes down to basic principles of sampling.

The precincts need to be selected based with known probability, usually something related to size such as registration or past vote. And then the precincts need to be weighted by the inverse of this probability.

One could design a perfectly valid sample by just listing all the precincts and taking every nth precinct. It might have a large variance, but it would still be a valid sample.

I look forward to learning about the methodology of the poll. It should be quite interesting.

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

From: Kristin Juffer [mailto:kjuffer@WESTED.ORG]
Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2004 7:19 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

The whole concept of running a valid exit poll in Venezuela is suspect in and of itself. Useful and valid exit polling is based on having such a thorough database and knowledge of every precinct (or equivalent political unit) as to know with a high degree of certainty which are the swing precincts, and exactly how the other non-swing precincts are likely to vote, based on a long record of polling data. Do you really think there is such a thing established in Venezuela?!! Don't think so! I've done polling and survey work in Latin America through the 1990's. No such thing.
Kris

This seems bogus to me.

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

From: "Smith-Tom" <Smith-Tom@NORC.UCHICAGO.EDU>
To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2004 11:39 AM
Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

Without judging the situation in Venezuela, an example of when an exit poll was taken as more valid than reported vote counts was the Yugoslavian presidential election on September 24, 2000 in which Kostunica defeated Milosevic. Milosevic held up the official release of the vote and claimed a run-off was needed. The exit poll was widely cited as key evidence that Milosevic had lost the election outright. As a reporter for the Mirror wrote on September 25th, "Milosevic made blatant attempts to rig the vote, but exit polls put lawyer Kostunica at least 20 per cent ahead of him."

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

From: Moon, Nick [mailto:nmoon@NOPWORLD.COM]
Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2004 12:54 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

I think you're maligning Penn, Schoen & Berland here. I do not see any

evidence that the poll "was done fraudulently, with a purpose in mind". My company worked with the Opposition Party in the UK for many years, and no-one seriously argued that it meant we shouldn't conduct exit polls for the BBC.

The "kicker" quote comes from what I assume to be a pressure group, not from Penn et al. AFAIK they are more in the line of political marketing consultants than researchers, which may well explain why Mark Penn (his full name is given in the piece) nor the other principals are AAPOR members.

While it may be just a poor exit poll, and there is certainly plenty of history of them round the world, it does also raise the very serious issue of whether an exit poll may indeed give a more accurate picture of respondent behaviour than the official election result, especially in countries where the government can influence the conduct of the election, and even the counting process.

Given all the concern about the lack of a paper trail in electronic voting, as cited in that interesting article someone recently posted on this list, what would the reaction be in 2008 if the exit poll showed Hilary Clinton well ahead of Bill Owens in the swing states, but the result from the electronic voting machines, calculated by the private companies that supplied them and the software, showed Owens had won by 5%. Would we all be SURE the exit poll was wrong?

I seem to recall a similar example being posted here before, from a former soviet republic, with the defeated opposition claiming the exit poll was proof the election had been rigged, and this has to be given serious consideration.

As the 2001 AAPOR Conference T-shirt said - "Polling, now more accurate than the election itself"

Nick Moon
NOP Research Group
245 Blackfriars Road, London SE1 9UL
tel 020 7890 9830 fax 020 7890 9589
<http://www.nopworld.com>

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

> From: Marc Sapir [mailto:marcsapir@COMCAST.NET]

> Sent: 19 August 2004 18:00

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

>

>

> There is a sense from the AP article WEI YEN put up to the list that
> this poll was done fraudulently with a purpose in mind. Looking at the
> 2004 directory I don't find any of the three names listed on
> the firm's
> head (I believe that AAPOR's Viola Penn of Arbitron is surely not the
> same Penn). This may be an example of why the public has become more

> resistant to participating in or accepting polls. AAPOR should
> investigate the details further and then, if appropriate, issue a
> statement repudiating that organization for unethical and
> anti-democratic behavior. For me the kicker comes in the
> last sentence
> when one of their reps claims that exit polls are notoriously
> unreliable. Silly me, I always that thought that, done correctly and
> with a rare exception or two, exit polls are "notoriously" reliable.
>
> Marc Sapir MD, MPH
> Executive Director
> Retro Poll
> www.retopoll.org
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Wei Yen
> Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2004 7:47 AM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela
>
> Thought this group might be interested in this. - Wei Yen, UCLA
>
>
> U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela
>
> Thu Aug 19, 6:08 AM ET
>
> By ANDREW SELSKY, Associated Press Writer
>
> CARACAS, Venezuela - A U.S. firm's exit poll that said President Hugo
> Chavez would lose a recall referendum has landed in the center of a
> controversy following his resounding victory.
>
> "Exit Poll Results Show Major Defeat for Chavez," the survey,
> conducted by
> Penn, Schoen & Berland Associates, asserted even as Sunday's
> voting was
> still on. But in fact, the opposite was true - Chavez ended
> up trouncing
>
> his enemies and capturing 59 percent of the vote.
>
> Any casual observer of the 2000 U.S. presidential elections knows exit
> polls can at times be unreliable. But the poll has become an issue
> here because the opposition, which mounted the drive to force the
> leftist leader
> from office, insists it shows the results from the vote itself were
> fraudulent. The opposition also claims electronic voting machines were
> rigged, but has provided no evidence.
>
> Election officials banned publication or broadcast of any exit polls
> during the historic vote on whether to oust Chavez, a populist who has
> sought to

> help the poor and is reviled by the wealthy, who accuse him of stoking
> class divisions.
>
> But results of the Penn, Schoen & Berland survey were sent out by fax
> and e-mail to media outlets and opposition offices more than four
> hours before
> polls closed. It predicted just the opposite of what
> happened, saying 59
>
> percent had voted in favor of recalling Chavez.
>
> Cesar Gaviria, secretary general of the Organization of American
> States who
> monitored the referendum, said the poll must have had a tremendous
> impact
> on Chavez's opponents, who felt they were about to complete their
> two-year
> drive to oust him.
>
> "They were told they had a lead of 20 points and then when the results
> came, they lost by 20 points," Gaviria said. "It's very difficult to
> deal with that."
>
> Both Gaviria and former President Jimmy Carter, another election
> monitor, endorsed the vote, saying the results coincided with their
> own independent
> samplings.
>
> Mark Penn, of Penn, Schoen & Berland Associates, said Wednesday he has
> limited knowledge of the exit poll. He said his partner, Doug Schoen,
> "believes there were more problems with the voting than with the exit
> poll."
>
> Schoen could not immediately be reached, and another employee familiar
> with the poll declined to comment.
>
> "We have to let the authorities do their investigation of the
> election,"
>
> said Marcela Berland, with the firm. "It would be irresponsible to
> interfere with that."
>
> Critics of the exit poll have questioned how it was conducted because
> officials have said Penn, Schoen & Berland worked with a U.S.-funded
> Venezuela group that the Chavez government considers hostile.
>
> Penn, Schoen & Berland had members of Sumate, a Venezuelan group that
> helped organize the recall initiative, do the fieldwork for the poll,
> election observers said.
>
> Roberto Abdul, a Sumate official, acknowledged in a telephone
> interview that the firm "supervised" an exit poll carried out by
> Sumate. Abdul added
> that at least five exit polls were completed for the opposition, with

> all
> pointing to a Chavez victory.
>
> Abdul said Sumate - which has received a \$53,400 grant from the
> National
>
> Endowment for Democracy, which in turn receives funds from the U.S.
> Congress - did not use any of those funds to pay for the surveys.
>
> The issue is potentially explosive because even before the referendum,
> Chavez himself cited Washington's funding of Sumate as evidence that
> the
>
> Bush administration was financing efforts to oust him - an allegation
> U.S. officials deny.
>
> Venezuelan Minister of Communications Jesse Chacon said it was a
> mistake
>
> for Sumate to be involved in the exit poll because it might have
> skewed the
> results.
>
> "If you use an activist as a pollster, he will eventually begin to act
> like an activist," Chacon told The Associated Press.
>
> Chris Sabatini, senior program officer for the National Endowment for
> Democracy, defended Sumate as "independent and impartial."
>
> "Exit polls are notoriously unreliable," Sabatini said by telephone
> from
>
> Washington. "Just because they're off doesn't mean that the group that
> conducted them is partial to one side."
>
> _____
>
> AP reporters Juan Pablo Toro in Caracas and Will Lester in Washington
> contributed to this report.
>
>
> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text: set
> aapornet nomail On your return send: set aapornet mail
>
> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text: set
> aapornet nomail On your return send: set aapornet mail
>

Any views or opinions are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of NOP World or any of its associated companies.

The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, please do not read, copy, use or disclose this communication and notify the sender immediately. It should be noted that any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited.

Recipients are warned that NOP World cannot guarantee that attachments or enclosures are secure or error-free as information could be intercepted, corrupted, or contain viruses

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Thu, 19 Aug 2004 21:19:51 -0400
Reply-To: Mark David Richards <mark@MARKDAVIDRICHARDS.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark David Richards <mark@MARKDAVIDRICHARDS.COM>
Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <FB166154BCF1004D9510D6FD9E53273B9CD36C@EXCHANGE.mori.com>
MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Thank you Warren, for prompting this discussion.

Other AAPOR Friends and colleagues--

I have a lot of empathy for the embarrassment our colleagues face just now, and I would like to understand what happened. I start by assuming they used what they thought were sound methods. All researchers I know want their research to be accurate--especially when you're making such high-profile announcements. So, in general, I assume we don't run out and do things that are likely to lead to inaccurate results. Even if we have opinions.

There are many allegations being thrown around in this heated environment. I expect most allegations should be taken with a grain of salt until evidence is provided: because they are allegations. The issues and questions need to be sorted carefully. Call that process what you will. WAPOR and AAPOR's role in solving this question should be what we have come to expect from our involvement in these organizations: fairness and methodologically soundness. =20

Quickly, I have three questions arising from the fact that the predictions by our colleagues were way off:

--What can we learn methodologically from this problem? =20

--How accurate have exit polls been in each country? And what are the caveats of conducting exit polls (or polling in general) in each country?

The research world is increasingly interdependent. (The methodology certainly is impacted by the social construction, culture, and technological location in the world of the population under study. Slightly different methods in different cultural and technological milieu could yield equally reliable results--and vice versa, I expect.)

--What was the impact of releasing early predictions on the outcome of voter intent/the final vote count?

All the best, =20

mark

Mark David Richards

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Bob Worcester
Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2004 7:32 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

Colleagues

=20
I would certainly agree with Marc's suggestion, and hope that WAPOR =
would
also take this up in collaboration with AAPOR.

=20
The election in the Philippines when Marcos was president is another =
example
of the exit poll thought to be more accurate than the election itself.

=20
Robert Worcester

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

From: Marc Sapir [mailto:marcsapir@COMCAST.NET]=20
Sent: Fri 20/08/2004 00:39=20
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu=20
Cc:=20
Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

=09

=09

The article forwarded by Warren Mitofsky certainly provides evidence
that the exit poll outcome was not just an accidental error. I still
think this should be corroborated with an investigation. If the

polling

was not ethically performed AAPOR should take the appropriate stand
publicly.=20

=09

Marc Sapir MD, MPH
Executive Director
Retro Poll
www.retropoll.org

=09

=09

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Warren
Mitofsky
Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2004 2:19 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

=09

In case you did not see this it tells something about the people who

did

=09

the interviewing for the Venezuela exit poll.

=09

www.venezuelanalysis.com/articles.php?artno=1248

=09
Venezuela=92s Opposition Resorts to Phony Exit Polls
Sunday, Aug 15, 2004

=09
By: Jonah Gindin - Venezuelanalysis.com

=09
In the wealthy Caracas neighborhood of Altamira would-be voters are experiencing extended delays, and some have spent as much as 12 hours waiting in line. Across town in the working-class neighborhood of Petare, people have been in line since 4 am. In the upper class neighborhood of

=09
Altamira, where voters are almost unanimously against President Chavez, they are blaming the delays on Chavista sabotage; and in Petare, a bastion of Chavez support, the chaos is the now familiar result of opposition dirty tricks.

=09
Outside one of the Altamira voting centers, S=FAmate volunteers conduct exit polls and provide support for those still in line. S=FAmate, a self-described civil association, is an arm of the opposition umbrella group the Democratic Coordinator. According to S=FAmate, there are forty-five thousand of these volunteers all over the country=ADat least one at every single voting station, and at those voting stations deemed

more
=09
important, there are as many as twenty.

=09
Altamira, apparently, is one such location. Twenty conscripts stand around outside the voting center, clipboard in hand waiting for unsuspecting citizens to emerge, fresh from having voted. =93Good afternoon,=94 = they
purr,
=93would you mind telling us if you voted =91Yes=92 or =91No=92?=94
and =
=93Yes,
yes,
yes,=94 is the most common response.

=09
=93How many =91No=92 votes have you received?=94 I asked, playing the
=

na=EFve
reporter.
=09
=93Let=92s see,=94 she offered, tapping her tennis shoes, =93there are
=
no
=91Nos=92
on
this page, and one on this page. I have one =91No=92.=94
=09
=93Just one?=94 I persisted.
=09
=93Well, I don=92t know about the others, but I have just one,=94 she
answered,
then, spotting some emerging voters in the distance, she scampered
of to
=09
collect more =93Yeses.=94
=09
According to co-director Maria Corina Machado, S=FAmate is an
objective
non-partisan civil association. When asked why S=FAmate has worked
exclusively with the Venezuelan opposition since its inception in
2002,
Machado said that their overtures to the government were regularly
rebuffed. Machado neglected to mention that one of the reasons the
government may have been hesitant to work with her group is because
she
was
a participant in the 2002 coup that briefly overthrew Ch=E1vez=ADshe
signed
the
infamous decree of dictator-for-a-day Pedro Carmona. She is
currently
being investigated for treason, for having received funds from a
foreign
=09
government (the U.S.) earmarked for ousting the Chavez government.
=09
Due to S=FAmate=92s infamy as an arm of Venezuela=92s opposition =
umbrella
group
the Democratic Coordinador, Machado noted that volunteers stationed
in
Chavista neighborhoods would not reveal their identities. Since
campaigning ended on Thursday, and political groups are not
permitted to
=09
solicit votes at voting centers on Sunday, S=FAmate has instructed its
volunteers to pose as =91good samaritans=92.
=09
The role of the volunteers, according Machado, is to help citizens
to
resolve any problems they may encounter during the voting process.

For example, if someone comes to a voting center to vote and their name is not on the list that will happen.

According to one of S=FAmate's Altamira volunteers, we are here to provide food for the people in line, to provide them with water, to help them in any way we can to facilitate the voting process. And to do exit polls, to see if they voted Yes or No.

And you have volunteers providing food in all the lines all over the country?

Yes, absolutely. Everywhere, responded another white-clad S=FAmate pollster.

But I was just in Petare, a very Chavista neighbourhood, and I didn't notice anyone from S=FAmate handing out food or water, I said coyly.

That's because the people in those neighbourhoods don't like the Coordinadora, not because the Coordinadora doesn't want to help them, she exclaimed, visibly perturbed.

So if you can't get into Chavista neighborhoods, you can't do exit polls there, right? I asked.

No=85=94 she hesitated, I'm sure they are doing exit polls everywhere.

End of interview.

In light of Democratic Coordinator leader Enrique Mendoza's pronouncement last week that he would be releasing his exit poll results this afternoon, S=FAmate's less than representative polling may be cause for concern.

At this point, the opposition seems to be more or less aware of the likelihood that they will lose today's vote. And with the optimistic attitudes of both the Carter Center and the Organization of American States regarding the transparency of the voting process, it would appear that a Chavez victory will have to be grudgingly accepted by at least those sectors of the opposition nominally committed to the democratic process.

In that case, perhaps the best that they can hope for is to cast some doubt on the process; to exaggerate some irregularities, to create others. That way, they can refer in passing to problems with the referendum results for the rest of Chavez's tenure as President, never going into any detail, but perpetuating the international stereotype that Chavez has authoritarian tendencies.

And releasing exit polls that directly contradict the official results may be the best way of accomplishing this.

MITOFSKY INTERNATIONAL
1776 Broadway, Suite 1708
New York, NY 10019

212 980-3031
212 980-3107 Fax

www.mitofskyinternational.com
mitofsky@mindspring.com

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Nancy Belden
President, American Association for Public Opinion Research

Belden Russonello & Stewart
1320 19th Street NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
202.822.6090

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====
Date: Fri, 20 Aug 2004 06:50:07 -0400
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Subject: WSJ on Venezuela Referendum
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Rival Groups Say
Chavez Tampered
With Recall Votes
In Venezuela, Charge Raises
Tensions Despite Assurances
Of Fairness by Observers

By DAVID LUHNOW and JOSE DE CORDOBA
Staff Reporters of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL
August 19, 2004; Page A11

CARACAS, Venezuela -- Venezuela's opposition groups accused the government of President Hugo Chavez of stealing the recent referendum election by tampering with electronic voting machines, raising tensions in the world's fifth-largest oil exporter after a relatively peaceful vote.

Opposition leaders charged that as many as 500 of an estimated 8,900 polling stations nationwide used voting machines programmed with an artificial cap to limit the number of votes cast in favor of recalling Mr. Chavez.

"We are not going to accept the results until all of these doubts have been cleared up," opposition leader Enrique Mendoza said.

The Wall Street Journal yesterday viewed results from 24 polling booths. In all of those cases, two or three polling booths registered the same number of "yes" votes in favor of ousting Mr. Chavez, while the amount of "no" votes and the total number of voters all varied. At one polling station in the state of Bolivar, for instance, results showed that 153 voters cast

"yes" ballots versus 215 "no" ballots. At the next booth, 153 voters again cast "yes" ballots versus 237 "no" votes. J.J. Rendon, a political adviser to Bolivar Gov. Antonio Rojas, allowed journalists to examine ballot results showing some of the alleged voting discrepancies.

National Electoral Council official Jorge Rodriguez rejected the tampering accusations as "irresponsible" and "criminal" fabrications.

Officials from the Florida-based company that provided Venezuela with the new voting machines weren't available for comment yesterday, but they had said after the vote that the machines worked perfectly.

If opposition claims are correct, the pattern of voting caps will repeat itself at many more polling stations. The charges will fan suspicions among some Venezuelans about the official results, which according to the latest official count showed Mr. Chavez won 59% to 41%.

Many opposition supporters refuse to accept the results despite the fact that both the Atlanta-based Carter Center and the Organization of American States said they found no evidence of fraud.

Small groups of opposition protesters gathered in various cities across the country, but the protests appeared peaceful.

ROAD TO RECALL

The government and the international observers agreed Tuesday to carry out a limited audit of the results to determine if the electronic results matched the paper ballots that voters cast. In a bid to ease doubts, the government and observers from the Carter Center and the OAS late yesterday began to audit ballot boxes from 150 polling stations to determine if the electronic results matched the paper ballots that voters cast. But opposition leaders declined to take part in the audit, contending that the government has held the boxes since Sunday's contest and may have been able to tamper with them.

The recall vote was unusual in that it was electronic -- something several U.S. states will try with the coming November elections. During the referendum, voters punched their choice into a machine, which produced a paper record of their vote and which they then deposited into a ballot box.

Other factors have fueled doubts about the results. An exit poll carried out during the vote by New York polling firm Penn, Schoen, Berland & Associates found the opposition won 59% to 41%. The survey interviewed more than 20,000 voters and had a margin of error of plus or minus 1%.

Cesar Gaviria, head of the OAS, suggested after the election that the Penn Schoen exit poll was flawed. After trying to hire 12 Venezuela-based polling centers to help carry out the survey, Penn Schoen decided to train volunteers from a civic group called Sumate, which promoted the referendum. One diplomat in Venezuela said it wasn't a good idea to use "activists" in carrying out the survey because they might be biased. But the company says the pollsters were trained to be impartial.

The polling company, which has counted former President Clinton among its

clients, stood by its results. "We are perfectly willing to believe the exit poll could be slightly off. But what we're looking at here is a 34-point difference between our poll and the official results," said Raj Kumar, a principal at Penn Schoen. "And, frankly, we cannot explain what biases there could have been in the exit poll to create such a disparate result."

Pre-election polls by other companies, however, cast doubt on arguments that the election results were rigged. Several surveys, including one by the Washington-based firm of prominent U.S. pollster Stan Greenberg, had shown Mr. Chavez with a comfortable lead weeks ahead of the contest.

Before the vote, the Venezuelan electoral authority was criticized by opposition leaders for hiring a little-known company run by a young Venezuelan to carry out the electronic voting. The Boca Raton, Fla., company, Smartmatic, took another hit when it was revealed in May that one of its partners, a company called Bizta Corp., was partly owned by the Venezuelan government. The company quickly bought out the government's stake to avoid the appearance of a conflict of interest.

--John Harwood in Washington contributed to this article.

Write to David Luhnnow at <mailto:david.luhnnow@wsj.com>david.luhnnow@wsj.com4 and Jose de Cordoba at <mailto:jose.decordoba@wsj.com>jose.decordoba@wsj.com5 URL for this article:

<http://online.wsj.com/article_email/article_print//article/0,,SB109284268900594763,00.html><http://online.wsj.com/article/0,,SB109284268900594763,00.html>

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====
Date: Fri, 20 Aug 2004 06:58:44 -0400
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Subject: More from AP Venezuela Referendum
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

August 19, 2004
By THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

Filed at 9:45 p.m. ET

CARACAS, Venezuela (AP) -- A U.S. pollster whose firm wrongly predicted President Hugo Chavez would lose a recall referendum on Thursday defended the exit poll, which has

landed in the center of a national controversy.

The poll by Penn, Schoen & Berland Associates has become such a hot issue because the opposition, which spent more than a year mounting the drive to force Chavez from office, insists it shows the results from Sunday's referendum itself were fraudulent.

Former President Carter and the secretary general of the Organization of American States, Cesar Gaviria, both monitored the vote and endorsed the referendum results.

The exit poll, released 4 1/2 hours before voting stations closed, said 59 percent would vote Chavez out of office. But in fact, the opposite was true -- Chavez ended up trouncing his enemies and capturing 59 percent of the vote.

Pollster Doug Schoen said his firm has been involved in polling for years and recently correctly called elections in the Dominican Republic and Mexico.

"We've done this all over the world," Schoen said in a telephone interview. "To be off by 34 points as we are alleged to be, strains credulity -- there was no real independent verification of the electronic count. There was almost certainly fraud in the central counting process," he said.

The opposition also claims electronic voting machines were rigged, but has provided no conclusive evidence.

Carter and Gaviria, both experienced election monitors, have said their independent sampling of results conformed with the official results.

Critics of the exit poll have questioned how it was conducted because Penn, Schoen & Berland worked with a U.S.-funded Venezuela group that the Chavez government considers to be sided with the opposition.

The firm had members of Sumate, a Venezuelan group that helped organize the recall initiative, do the fieldwork for the poll, election observers said.

Schoen said his firm "worked with a wide variety of volunteers that were provided by Sumate" but that they "were trained to administer the poll."

Venezuelan Minister of Communications Jesse Chacon said it was a mistake for Sumate to be involved because it might have skewed the results of the poll.

"If you use an activist as a pollster, he will eventually begin to act like an activist," Chacon told The Associated

Press.

Roberto Abdul, a Sumate official, said the nonprofit organization received a \$53,400 grant from the National Endowment for Democracy, which in turn receives funds from the U.S. Congress but did not use any of those funds to pay for the exit polling.

The issue is potentially explosive because even before the referendum, Chavez himself cited Washington's funding of Sumate as evidence that the Bush administration was financing efforts to oust him -- an allegation U.S. officials deny.

Chris Sabatini, senior program officer for the National Endowment for Democracy, defended Sumate as "independent and impartial."

"Exit polls are notoriously unreliable," Sabatini said by telephone from Washington. "Just because they're off doesn't mean that the group that conducted them is partial to one side."

^-----

AP reporters Juan Pablo Toro in Caracas and Will Lester in Washington contributed to this report.

<http://www.nytimes.com/aponline/international/AP-Venezuela-Recall.html?ex=1093978835&ei=1&en=a664fc4637df82fd>

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Fri, 20 Aug 2004 09:16:38 -0400
Reply-To: Melissa Marcello <mmarcello@PURSUANTRESEARCH.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Melissa Marcello <mmarcello@PURSUANTRESEARCH.COM>
Subject: Re: More from AP Venezuela Referendum
Comments: To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <6.1.1.1.2.20040820065751.0bf45d38@pop.mindspring.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

This result is not all that surprising to me. One of the major problems =
is
that our field is cluttered with "polling firms" that are more skilled =
at
crafting messages and advising a candidate on getting elected than they =

are
constructing sound survey instruments, drawing the appropriate samples =
and
producing an unbiased report of research findings. =20

I've witnessed some of the research that has come out of such places and
frankly it is embarrassing to me as a professional in this field. =20

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Warren Mitofsky
Sent: Friday, August 20, 2004 6:59 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: More from AP Venezuela Referendum

U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

August 19, 2004

By THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

Filed at 9:45 p.m. ET

CARACAS, Venezuela (AP) -- A U.S. pollster whose firm
wrongly predicted President Hugo Chavez would lose a recall
referendum on Thursday defended the exit poll, which has
landed in the center of a national controversy.

The poll by Penn, Schoen & Berland Associates has become
such a hot issue because the opposition, which spent more
than a year mounting the drive to force Chavez from office,
insists it shows the results from Sunday's referendum
itself were fraudulent.

Former President Carter and the secretary general of the
Organization of American States, Cesar Gaviria, both
monitored the vote and endorsed the referendum results.

The exit poll, released 4 1/2 hours before voting stations
closed, said 59 percent would vote Chavez out of office.
But in fact, the opposite was true -- Chavez ended up
trouncing his enemies and capturing 59 percent of the vote.

Pollster Doug Schoen said his firm has been involved in
polling for years and recently correctly called elections
in the Dominican Republic and Mexico.

"We've done this all over the world," Schoen said in a
telephone interview. "To be off by 34 points as we are
alleged to be, strains credulity -- there was no real
independent verification of the electronic count. There was
almost certainly fraud in the central counting process,"
he said.

The opposition also claims electronic voting machines were
rigged, but has provided no conclusive evidence.

Carter and Gaviria, both experienced election monitors, have said their independent sampling of results conformed with the official results.

Critics of the exit poll have questioned how it was conducted because Penn, Schoen & Berland worked with a U.S.-funded Venezuela group that the Chavez government considers to be sided with the opposition.

The firm had members of Sumate, a Venezuelan group that helped organize the recall initiative, do the fieldwork for the poll, election observers said.

Schoen said his firm "worked with a wide variety of volunteers that were provided by Sumate" but that they "were trained to administer the poll."

Venezuelan Minister of Communications Jesse Chacon said it was a mistake for Sumate to be involved because it might have skewed the results of the poll.

"If you use an activist as a pollster, he will eventually begin to act like an activist," Chacon told The Associated Press.

Roberto Abdul, a Sumate official, said the nonprofit organization received a \$53,400 grant from the National Endowment for Democracy, which in turn receives funds from the U.S. Congress but did not use any of those funds to pay for the exit polling.

The issue is potentially explosive because even before the referendum, Chavez himself cited Washington's funding of Sumate as evidence that the Bush administration was financing efforts to oust him -- an allegation U.S. officials deny.

Chris Sabatini, senior program officer for the National Endowment for Democracy, defended Sumate as "independent and impartial."

"Exit polls are notoriously unreliable," Sabatini said by telephone from Washington. "Just because they're off doesn't mean that the group that conducted them is partial to one side."

^-----

AP reporters Juan Pablo Toro in Caracas and Will Lester in Washington contributed to this report.

<http://www.nytimes.com/aponline/international/AP-Venezuela-Recall.html?ex=3D10>

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====
Date: Fri, 20 Aug 2004 07:12:21 -0700
Reply-To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>
Subject: Re: More from AP Venezuela Referendum
Comments: To: Melissa Marcello <mmarcello@PURSUANTRESEARCH.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <[002401c486b7\\$f0a32f60\\$0701a8c0@Laptop](mailto:002401c486b7$f0a32f60$0701a8c0@Laptop)>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Although the Wall Street Journal article leans a bit toward providing the opposition's view of the Venezuela vote, both articles inevitably show that Chavez was expected to win by most advance polls and that it is unlikely that the opposition charges could be valid. The problem here is that Schoen's work has fueled the opposition's disgruntlement in a way that reduces the possibility of social peace in Venezuela and that creates the feel of impropriety because it is certainly what the National Endowment for Democracy desires. This connection is both a black eye for pollsters, for democracy and for peace in the world. Schoen's work for Clinton or in Mexico notwithstanding his defense of the use of the Sumate organization (one of the actors trying to oust Chavez) to conduct the poll (as quoted in the AP-NYT article) is not the language of a scientist or a social scientist of repute. At this point anyone ought to admit that using Sumate may not have been a good idea and he should be offering an in-depth public investigation of how they performed their work. Saying they were trained to be impartial is a laugher, the kind of thing you'd expect a slippery politician to say, not someone who wants to maintain professional or academic credibility. And it once again raises the question of ethical behavior.

Marc Sapir MD, MPH
Executive Director
Retro Poll
www.retropoll.org

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Melissa Marcello
Sent: Friday, August 20, 2004 5:17 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: More from AP Venezuela Referendum

This result is not all that surprising to me. One of the major problems is that our field is cluttered with "polling firms" that are more skilled at crafting messages and advising a candidate on getting elected than they are constructing sound survey instruments, drawing the appropriate samples and producing an unbiased report of research findings. =20

I've witnessed some of the research that has come out of such places and frankly it is embarrassing to me as a professional in this field. =20

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Warren Mitofsky
Sent: Friday, August 20, 2004 6:59 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: More from AP Venezuela Referendum

U.S. Poll Firm in Hot Water in Venezuela

August 19, 2004
By THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

Filed at 9:45 p.m. ET

CARACAS, Venezuela (AP) -- A U.S. pollster whose firm wrongly predicted President Hugo Chavez would lose a recall referendum on Thursday defended the exit poll, which has landed in the center of a national controversy.

The poll by Penn, Schoen & Berland Associates has become such a hot issue because the opposition, which spent more than a year mounting the drive to force Chavez from office, insists it shows the results from Sunday's referendum itself were fraudulent.

Former President Carter and the secretary general of the Organization of American States, Cesar Gaviria, both monitored the vote and endorsed the referendum results.

The exit poll, released 4 1/2 hours before voting stations closed, said 59 percent would vote Chavez out of office. But in fact, the opposite was true -- Chavez ended up trouncing his enemies and capturing 59 percent of the vote.

Pollster Doug Schoen said his firm has been involved in polling for years and recently correctly called elections in the Dominican Republic and Mexico.

``We've done this all over the world," Schoen said in a telephone interview. ``To be off by 34 points as we are alleged to be, strains credulity -- there was no real independent verification of the electronic count. There was almost certainly fraud in the central counting process," he said.

The opposition also claims electronic voting machines were rigged, but has provided no conclusive evidence.

Carter and Gaviria, both experienced election monitors, have said their independent sampling of results conformed with the official results.

Critics of the exit poll have questioned how it was conducted because Penn, Schoen & Berland worked with a U.S.-funded Venezuela group that the Chavez government considers to be sided with the opposition.

The firm had members of Sumate, a Venezuelan group that helped organize the recall initiative, do the fieldwork for the poll, election observers said.

Schoen said his firm ``worked with a wide variety of volunteers that were provided by Sumate" but that they ``were trained to administer the poll."

Venezuelan Minister of Communications Jesse Chacon said it was a mistake for Sumate to be involved because it might have skewed the results of the poll.

``If you use an activist as a pollster, he will eventually begin to act like an activist," Chacon told The Associated Press.

Roberto Abdul, a Sumate official, said the nonprofit organization received a \$53,400 grant from the National Endowment for Democracy, which in turn receives funds from the U.S. Congress but did not use any of those funds to pay for the exit polling.

The issue is potentially explosive because even before the referendum, Chavez himself cited Washington's funding of Sumate as evidence that the Bush administration was financing efforts to oust him -- an allegation U.S. officials deny.

Chris Sabatini, senior program officer for the National Endowment for Democracy, defended Sumate as ``independent and impartial."

``Exit polls are notoriously unreliable," Sabatini said by telephone from Washington. ``Just because they're off

doesn't mean that the group that conducted them is partial to one side."

^-----

AP reporters Juan Pablo Toro in Caracas and Will Lester in Washington contributed to this report.

<http://www.nytimes.com/aponline/international/AP-Venezuela-Recall.html?ex=1093978835&ei=3D1&en|64fc4637df82fd>

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Fri, 20 Aug 2004 14:44:05 -0700
Reply-To: Toni Genalo <ToniGenalo@ASU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Toni Genalo <ToniGenalo@ASU.EDU>
Subject: Resolving discrepant data
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Can anyone guide me to literature on the standards for resolving discrepant data on both self-administered and interviewer administered questionnaires? We know what we want to do when they skip an item they should have answered, we also think we know what we want to do. It would help us to know what others do when respondent or interviewer answer an item they should have skipped which conflicts with the screen question, or what you do when the answer is out of range. If you don't know the literature could you give me an idea of what your standards are please.

Thanks!

=20

Toni Genalo

Director of Data Collection

Prevention Research Center
P.O. Box 876005
Tempe, AZ 85287-6005
ASU
480-727-6142 480-727-6282(FAX)

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail
=====

Date: Fri, 20 Aug 2004 15:18:32 -0700
Reply-To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>
Subject: FW: Venezuela Nixes Gringo Complots
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

=20

=20

Marc Sapir MD, MPH
Executive Director
Retro Poll
www.retropoll.org

=20

<<http://graphics7.nytimes.com/images/misc/logoprinter.gif>>
<http://www.nytimes.com/adx/bin/adx_click.html?type=3Dgoto&page=3Dwww.nytimes.com/printer-friendly&pos=3Dposition1&camp=3Dfoxsearch50a-nyt5&ad=3Dgard=3Dgardenstate%2Findex%5Fnyt%2Ehtml>=20

August 20, 2004

The Chavez Victory: A Blow to the Bush Administration

By JUAN FORERO

<<http://graphics7.nytimes.com/images/dropcap/c.gif>> ARACAS, Venezuela, Aug. 19 - When President Hugo Chavez was ousted in a coup two years ago, the Bush administration celebrated, calling the ouster his own doing. The rest of Latin America was left fuming by the overthrow and expressed strong support for Mr. Chavez as he was almost immediately swept back into power in a popular uprising.

On Sunday, when Mr. Chavez triumphed over his adversaries in a referendum on whether he should be recalled from office, countries from Brazil to Argentina, Colombia to Spain heartily congratulated him. The

United States remained silent for more than a day, until a State Department spokesman, Adam Ereli, offered tepid backing for the "preliminary results."=20

The resounding victory was a blow to the Bush administration, which has struggled with how to deal with Mr. Ch=E1vez, a leftist firebrand who presides over the world's fifth-largest oil exporter and has opposed Washington on every major initiative in Latin America. "There's no doubt in my mind that at least in the White House - I don't know about the State Department - there was a deep desire to see Ch=E1vez lose," said former President Jimmy Carter, whose Carter Center monitored the election and who has briefed American officials on his efforts to broker a peace between the government and its opponents.=20

Now, the United States has the challenge of constructing, from the ground up, a new relationship with Mr. Ch=E1vez, who has done everything imaginable to antagonize what he calls "the colossus to the north."=20

He has used an expletive to describe President Bush, threatened to hold back oil sales if the United States invaded, and expanded Venezuela's ties with Cuba. His campaign to win in the vote was built largely on demonizing the United States.=20

"The Bush government will be defeated on Sunday," Mr. Ch=E1vez told reporters three days before the recall vote. "The confrontation in Venezuela is not really with this opposition. The opposition has a master, whose name is George W. Bush."

American diplomats privately say they do not think that Mr. Ch=E1vez believes his public statements, and that he manipulates latent anti-Americanism for political gain. But American policy has been largely counterproductive, only contributing to Mr. Ch=E1vez's increasingly hostile barbs.

The United States long ago threw its lot in with an opposition movement that is being discredited by foreign diplomats and many Venezuelans for insisting that fraud took place when the preponderance of evidence indicates it did not.

The United States has also provided money to groups like S=Famate, which violated elections norms early on Monday by distributing results of a survey of voters leaving the polls that showed Mr. Ch=E1vez losing by a wide margin. Mr. Ch=E1vez seized on this financing of anti-government groups, channeled through the National Endowment for Democracy, to whip his supporters into an anti-American frenzy.

"The United States is stuck in a time warp," said Riordan Roett, director of Latin American studies at The Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies at Johns Hopkins University. "It is using tools from the cold war, when money from the National Endowment for Democracy was useful in funding anti-Communist movements."

The United States policy has largely been out of step with the rest of the region. Washington has been unable to grasp the widespread reaction

against free market changes across Latin America, changes now being rolled back by left-leaning leaders. In Venezuela, the United States has operated on the presumption that Mr. Chavez's opponents had more support, clearly underestimating that most Venezuelans would vote to keep him in office.

"It's not that the U.S. is not paying attention, it's that their calculation and strategy was wrong," said Eduardo Gamarra, a Bolivian who is director of the Latin America and Caribbean Center at Florida International University in Miami. "And it's been wrong because it's been based on the false assumption that Chavez is not popular, on the false assumption that he's a dictator."

After Mr. Chavez's resounding win, the Bush administration set itself apart from the rest of the region, calling on the Venezuelan government's electoral board to "allow a transparent audit," though international monitors pronounced the election free and fair. On Tuesday, Mr. Ereli, the State Department spokesman, dodged questions from reporters about why the United States was not congratulating Mr. Chavez.

A senior State Department official later said the United States' reticence was intended to defuse tensions in Venezuela, not to dismiss the results. He said Washington would issue a broader statement backing the results after a final audit.

Not all of Washington's diplomatic moves here have failed. Ambassador Charles Shapiro, newly arrived in Venezuela when Mr. Chavez was briefly ousted in 2002, met frequently with him, patching up a relationship that was battered after the White House expressed support for the interim government that replaced him. The United States has also remained a loyal buyer of Venezuelan crude oil. American giants like Exxon Mobil and ChevronTexaco are producing oil and eyeing an expansion into largely undeveloped natural gas fields that are open to foreign investment. Those companies, and other major multinational businesses, provided Venezuela with much-needed foreign earnings when the opposition called nationwide strikes that battered the economy. =20

Those commercial links can strengthen the bond between Venezuela and the United States, which is dependent on Venezuelan crude.

"The business sector, the large business sector, has understood better the making of foreign policy than our government," Mr. Gamarra said. "They looked at it from the perspective of what business opportunities ought to be." Better relations with Mr. Chavez are possible. With his presidency more secure since the vote, he has appeared open to reconciliation. He has invited opposition leaders to lunch and has expressed the wish for a new beginning with the United States.

"I would hope that President Chavez would now cool that anti-U.S. rhetoric," Mr. Carter said. "There's no doubt that Chavez is a charismatic figure, very fiery in his rhetoric, which I deplore. But that's his personal characteristic, one of the avenues of his popularity among Venezuelans. I think now, though, that he is not campaigning for

anything."

(Steven R.Weisman contributed reporting from Washington for this article.)=20

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail
=====

Date: Fri, 20 Aug 2004 23:54:29 -0400
Reply-To: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>
Subject: Venezuela recall fuels electronic voting debate
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: multipart/mixed; x-avg-checked=avg-ok-516532E7;
boundary="Boundary_(ID_qnb42Dwbm0Od/rfs1R+MEA)"

--Boundary_(ID_qnb42Dwbm0Od/rfs1R+MEA)
Content-type: text/plain; x-avg-checked=avg-ok-516532E7; charset=us-ascii;
format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 8bit

Interesting in the light of the difference between the poll results and the final results of the election.....and what conceivably could happen here.....

Venezuela recall fuels e-voting debate
issues could recur in U.S., critics say
Bob Dart - Cox Washington Bureau
Atlanta Journal Constitution, Friday, August 20, 2004

Washington --- The disputed presidential recall referendum in Venezuela offers ominous lessons about the use of electronic voting machines in U.S. elections this November, critics of the process are warning.

Venezuelan opposition leaders are refusing to accept the results of the e-voting and won't even participate in a partial audit of the results overseen by international observers led by former President Jimmy Carter.

The losers charge that some of the nearly 20,000 electronic voting machines made by Smartmatic Corp. of Boca Raton, Fla., were rigged to limit the votes in favor of ousting President Hugo Chavez in Sunday's referendum.

And they say the Venezuelan machines' system of giving every voter a paper record similar to an ATM receipt, which allows an audit of the electronic totals, can't be trusted to catch fraud.

Smartmatic defends the results, contending the referendum used "the most transparent, secure and auditable system available," said Mitch Stoller, a company spokesman.

After monitoring the election and verifying Chavez's victory, Carter and the Organization of American States volunteered to audit 150 polling stations, comparing paper receipts that have been certified by voters to the results on the machines.

But opposition leaders charged that the paper receipts had been tampered with by the machines' military guardians.

The recall "was a massive fraud against Venezuelans' will," opposition leader Enrique Mendoza said in a nationally televised news conference. "The opposition will not accept the audit."

"It would be impossible" for the scenario outlined by the opposition to have happened, Stoller said. He said the opposition was involved in approving the system before the referendum. "We welcome further audits," he said, noting that the Smartmatic machines produce the paper trail that critics charge is lacking in U.S. e-voting.

Nearly 50 million Americans --- including all Georgians --- will vote in November on touch-screen electronic machines, said Kimball Brace, president of Election Data Services, which provides electoral consulting services to state and local governments. Most machines will not provide paper receipts.

That compares to 53 million voters who will use optical scan systems, 22 million who will use punch cards, 22 million who will use lever machines and only 1 million who will cast paper ballots.

The disputed election provides some guidance for use of electronic voting machines in the United States, say those skeptical of the technology.

"The first lesson from Venezuela is that without paper ballots, there is no recourse for a disputed election," said Avi Rubin, a computer-science professor at Johns Hopkins University. "The second lesson is that paper ballots are useless unless they are verified by voters and stored in a secure manner.

"Finally, it is important to count the paper ballots in many precincts and also to compare the final results to exit polls," he said.

Rubin has analyzed software on the voting machines and believes they are not protected from hackers.

The critics say a statistically significant sample comparison of paper and electronic ballots that all parties could agree to should be part of the election process. In Venezuela, opposition leaders dismissed the "quick count" audit that the country's National Electoral Council did on 199 of the 19,800 machines.

"You have to make these decisions to conduct an audit before you know the results of the election," explained Kim Alexander, president of the California Voter Project, a nonpartisan group seeking reforms in e-voting.

"Whether you're talking about the U.S. or Venezuela or Brazil, election officials are in over their heads with this equipment and haven't thought

through" all the possible ramifications, she said. "You can't make this up as you go along."

To even make such an audit possible, "a voter-verified paper trail for every voter and every machine" is needed, said Rep. Rush Holt, D-N.J., who has introduced legislation to require such receipts.

The foundation of democracy is faith of the citizenry that every vote counts, the critics of e-voting point out. If election results this fall are questioned and e-voting results cannot be verified, the whole system is shaken.

"I fear that will be the case," Holt said. "If there are a lot of irregularities observed, it will be a victory for cynicism and a defeat for democracy."

--- The Associated Press and Knight Ridder Newspapers contributed to this article.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

--Boundary_(ID_qnb42Dwbm0Od/rfs1R+MEA)
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-avg=cert;
x-avg-checked=avg-ok-516532E7
Content-disposition: inline

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).
Version: 6.0.732 / Virus Database: 486 - Release Date: 7/29/2004

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

--Boundary_(ID_qnb42Dwbm0Od/rfs1R+MEA)--

=====
Date: Sun, 22 Aug 2004 13:45:25 -0400
Reply-To: JoyceR@cfmc.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Joyce Rachelson <jrachels@CONCENTRIC.NET>
Subject: Darwin Awards
Comments: To: Jokes for Us <jfus@cfmc.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

This year's eight nominees:

Nominee No. 1 [San Jose Mercury News] An unidentified man, using a shotgun like a club to break a former girlfriend's windshield, accidentally shot himself to death when the gun discharged, blowing a hole in his gut.

Nominee No. 2 [Kalamazoo Gazette] James Burns, 34, (a mechanic) of Alamo, MI, was killed in March as he was trying to repair what >police describe as a "farm-type truck." Burns got a friend to drive the truck on a highway while Burns hung underneath so that he could ascertain the source of a troubling noise. Burns' clothes caught on something, however, and the other man found Burns "wrapped in the drive shaft!"

Nominee No. 3 [Hickory Daily Record] Ken Charles Barger, 47, accidentally shot himself to death in December in Newton , NC . Awakening to the sound of a ringing telephone beside his bed, he reached for the phone but grabbed >instead a Smith &Wesson 38 Special, which discharged when he drew it to his ear.

Nominee No. 4 [UPI, Toronto] Police said a lawyer demonstrating the safety of windows in a downtown Toronto skyscraper crashed through a pane with his shoulder and plunged 24 floors to his death. A police spokesman said Garry Hoy, 39, fell into the courtyard of the Toronto Dominion Bank Tower early Friday evening as he was explaining the strength of the building's windows to visiting law students. Hoy previously has conducted demonstrations of window strength according to police reports. Peter Lawson, managing partner of the firm Holden Day Wilson, told the Toronto Sun newspaper that Hoy was "one of the best and brightest" members of the 200-man association.

Nominee No. 5 [Bloomberg News Service] A terrible diet and a room with no ventilation are being blamed for the death of a man who was killed by his own gas emissions. There was no mark on his body, and an autopsy showed large amounts of methane gas in his system. His diet had consisted primarily of beans and cabbage (and a couple of other things). It was just the right combination of foods. It appears that the man died in his sleep from breathing the poisonous cloud that was hanging over his bed. Had he been outside or had his windows been opened, it wouldn't have been fatal. But the man was shut up in his nearly airtight bedroom. According to the article, "He was a big man with a huge capacity for creating "this deadly gas." Three of the rescuers got sick, and one was hospitalized.

Nominee No. 6 [The News of the Weird] Michael Anderson Godwin made News of the Weird posthumously. He had spent several years awaiting South Carolina 's electric chair on a murder conviction before having his sentence reduced to life in prison. While sitting on a metal toilet in his cell attempting to fix his small TV set, he bit into a wire and was electrocuted.

Nominee No. 7 [The Indianapolis Star] A cigarette lighter may have

triggered a fatal explosion in Dunkirk , IN. A Jay County man, using a cigarette lighter to check the barrel of a muzzle loader, was killed Monday night when the weapon discharged in his face, sheriff's investigators said. Gregory David Pryor, 19, died in his parents' rural Dunkirk home at about 11:30 PM. Investigators said Pryor was cleaning a 54-caliber muzzle-loader that had not been firing properly. He was using the lighter to look into the barrel when the gunpowder ignited.

Finally, THE WINNER!!! [Arkansas Democrat Gazette] Two local men were injured when their pickup truck left the road and struck a tree near Cotton Patch on State Highway 38 early Monday. Woodruff County deputy Dovey Snyder reported the accident shortly after midnight Monday. Thurston Poole, 33, of Des Arc, and Billy Ray Wallis, 38, of Little Rock, were returning to Des Arc after a frog gigging trip. On an overcast Sunday night, Poole 's pickup truck headlights malfunctioned. The two men concluded that the headlight fuse on the older-model truck had burned out. As a replacement fuse was not available, Wallis noticed that the .22 caliber bullet from his pistol fit perfectly into the fuse box next to the steering-wheel column. Upon inserting the bullet the headlights again began to operate properly, and the two men proceeded on eastbound toward the White River Bridge. After traveling approximately 20 miles, and just before crossing the river, the bullet apparently overheated, discharged, and struck Poole in the testicles. The vehicleswerved sharply right, exiting the pavement, and striking a tree. Poole suffered only minor cuts and abrasions from the accident, but will require extensive surgery to repair the damage to his testicles, which will never operate as intended. Wallis sustained a broken clavicle and was treated and released. "Thank God we weren't on that bridge when Thurston shot his balls off, or we might both be dead," stated Wallis. "I've been a trooper for 10 years in this part of the world, but this is a first for me. I can't believe that those two would admit how this accident happened," said Snyder.

Upon being notified of the wreck, Lavinia (Poole 's wife) asked how many frogs the boys had caught and did anyone get them from the truck?

(Though Poole and Wallis did not die as a result of their misadventure as normally required by Darwin Award Official Rules, it can be argued that Poole HAD, in fact, effectively remove himself from the gene pool.)

--

Joyce Rachelson, VP
Director of Product Sales
CfMC
915 Broadway, Suite 609
New York, NY 10010
(212) 777-5120
(212) 777-5217 FAX
JoyceR@CfMC.com
<http://www.CfMC.com>

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Sun, 22 Aug 2004 13:49:11 -0400
Reply-To: JoyceR@cfmc.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Joyce Rachelson <jrachels@CONCENTRIC.NET>
Subject: Appology
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Sorry, I clicked the wrong button and my Darwin Awards post went to AAPOR.

I will try to be more careful in the future.

Joyce

--

Joyce Rachelson, VP
Director of Product Sales
CfMC
915 Broadway, Suite 609
New York, NY 10010
(212) 777-5120
(212) 777-5217 FAX
JoyceR@CfMC.com
<http://www.CfMC.com>

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Mon, 23 Aug 2004 08:58:05 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Exit polls in Venezuela
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

8/20/04
Exit polls in Venezuela
US News & World Report
By Michael Barone
http://www.usnews.com/usnews/opinion/baroneweb/mb_040820.htm

"Were NY Pollsters Just Playing a Joke on Chavez?" That was the typically

cheeky headline on an item about the Venezuela election in The Hotline political digest (nationaljournal.com) this week. The item quoted a press release from the polling firm Penn, Schoen & Berland Assoc. saying, "Exit Poll Results Show Major Defeat for Chavez." The release, dated 7:30 p.m., said, "With Venezuela's voting set to end at 8 p.m. EST according to election officials, final exit poll results from Penn, Schoen & Berland Associates, an independent New York-based polling firm, show a major victory for the 'Yes' movement, defeating Chavez in the Venezuela presidential recall referendum." The poll showed 59 percent in favor of recalling Chavez, 41 percent against.

The next morning, Chavez was declared the winner by an almost exact opposite margin. "About 58 percent said 'no' to a recall, while 42 percent said 'yes,'" wrote the Washington Post.

The Hotline was evidently having a little fun twitting a polling firm. But was the result as clear as they-and official election observer Jimmy Carter-thought? There is good reason to believe it was not. In fact, it's something of a scandal that American news media have been taking the official vote count in Venezuela at face value. There is very good reason to believe that the exit poll had the result right, and that Chavez's election officials-and Carter and the American media-got it wrong.

Let us look at the reasons.

Venezuela's President Hugo Chavez has been running an authoritarian regime. By various means he has taken control of the legislature, the courts, the armed services and the police. His thugs have been intimidating and even killing the regime's opponents. The literature on this is voluminous, but consider these reports from the Wall Street Journal: www.opinionjournal.com/extra/?id=110005494 and www.opinionjournal.com/wsj/?id=110005478. Chavez is an ally of Cuba's Fidel Castro and an enemy of the United States, and he has shown no commitment to democratic principles. He sought to block the referendum by extralegal means and, having failed at that, resorted to intimidation to win it. There is no reason to believe that he would stop at election fraud.

One weapon against such fraud is the exit poll. As Doug Schoen of Penn Schoen points out, his firm has conducted exit polls in Mexico and, just a few days ago, in the Dominican Republic, which produced results very close to the election results. His partner Mark Penn points out that the firm conducted two previous exit polls in Venezuela, both of which were on the mark. Warren Mitofsky's firm, Mitofsky International, has produced exit polls with similar results in Mexico and Russia. Mitofsky recalls that in 1994, Mexican President Carlos Salinas, seeking credibility with foreign investors for that year's Mexican elections, asked him for advice on what to do. Allow independent exit polls, Mitofsky advised, sponsored by the media, and allow the results to be announced soon after the voting. Mitofsky's exit poll results, announced soon after the polls closed, did in fact come close to the official results, as did another Mitofsky poll in 2000. More important, they provided independent confirmation of the fairness of the count.

Interestingly, Mitofsky points out that Jimmy Carter has opposed

independent exit polls in countries where he has observed elections. In 1994, Mitofsky says, he persuaded South Africa's election authorities from allowing exit polls. As a result, there was considerable confusion and skepticism in the course of the five-day election process. Nevertheless, the chief South African election official tried to persuade Mexico not to allow exit polls. Salinas, fortunately, showed better judgment.

In Venezuela, Schoen's firm was hired by businessmen who were almost surely opponents of Chavez. The Chavez regime intimidated local interviewing firms, who refused to provide interviewers for Penn Schoen at the polls. As a result, the firm trained volunteers. Critics of the firm might argue that these volunteers, undoubtedly mostly anti-Chavez, may have tried to present a false result.

But that would in fact be difficult to do. Mitofsky points out that in countries emerging from autocracy into democracy, about 90 percent of voters approached by exit pollsters agree to participate. That is almost double the rate in the United States. Moreover, exit pollers work in teams; there would have to be massive collusion for them to produce fraudulent results. The Penn Schoen exit poll was conducted at about 200 polling places and produced more than 20,000 responses. Changing those results from something like 42-58 (the Chavez announced figure) to 59-41 would be quite a feat. The firm employed supervisors to make sure the polling was done right. And its results by precinct can be checked against the official results reported for that precinct.

In contrast, it would be far easier, given the touch-screen voting method and central tabulation used in Venezuela, for the central counting center to falsify the results. All you would have to do is program the computer to count every sixth "yes" vote as a "no." That would transform a 59-41 vote to 42-58. And the results would still show pro-Chavez areas voting for him and anti-Chavez areas going the other way—just by different margins.

Jimmy Carter did not remain in Venezuela long after the polling and, after a superficial look at the central counting center, pronounced the election fair and the result accurate. He could not have determined whether the counting computer was misprogrammed. Chavez had every motive for cheating: polls before the election mostly showed him under 50 percent, and he should have reasonably concluded that those not for him were against. Adjusting the count was one sure way to win.

By way of comparison, Penn Schoen has no motive whatever for cheating. It is a reputable American firm in a competitive business. Over more than 20 years it has worked for successful American politicians like Bill Clinton in 1996, Hillary Rodham Clinton in 2001, Michael Bloomberg in 2001 and many others. I have had experience, as a political consultant and a political writer, dealing with Penn Schoen during that whole time, and have found the firm to be reliable and fully observant of professional standards. They are high on my list of Democratic, Republican and independent polling firms whose numbers I trust and whose professional integrity I respect. Penn and Schoen are not likely to squander a hard-won good reputation to please a client in a foreign country where they are not likely to work again any time soon.

Schoen has little doubt what happened. "I think it was a massive fraud," he told me. "Our internal sourcing tells us that there was fraud in the central commission." This was not the first time he has encountered such things. "The same thing happened in Serbia in 1992, by [President Slobodan] Milosevic. He did it again in the local elections in 1996. As a result, hundreds of thousands of people died. Had he been caught [in this fraud] in 1992, this would not have happened."

In Venezuela this year, as in Serbia in 1992, I think it's overwhelmingly likely that the exit poll was far closer than the officially announced results to the way people actually voted.

Unhappily, the prospects for Venezuela are not much better than they were for Serbia. The Chavez regime has been given a patina of respectability by Jimmy Carter and the New York Times editorial page that it almost certainly does not deserve. Warren Mitofsky was not involved in Venezuela, and is a competitor of Penn Schoen, but he draws similar conclusions to Schoen's. "I find it extraordinary that, with only one exit poll and no quick count, people are willing to take one side's word," he told me. "This doesn't smell good."

Independent exit polls are one of the guarantors of democracy in countries emerging from or under authoritarian rule. Political junkies may think it amusing that there is such a wide discrepancy between an exit poll and official results. But for people in Venezuela and perhaps in other parts of Latin America it's more likely to be tragic.

--

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

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====
Date: Mon, 23 Aug 2004 09:11:26 -0400
Reply-To: Colleen Porter <cporter@PHHP.UFL.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Colleen Porter <cporter@PHHP.UFL.EDU>
Subject: Interviewing after a hurricane
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
Content-disposition: inline

We are nearing the end of about five months of field work on a big (n=17,000) statewide RDD survey about health insurance. I gotta confess, when I watched the news and saw the roof of the Ft. Myers post office fly off, my first thought was, "Omigosh, I might have letters there!" (since we are in the midst of a mail followup).

This, of course, was horribly selfish, and I've since repented.

Since our project was in the field at a fairly leisurely academic pace, this isn't quite so damaging to us, although certainly the current mail effort seems to be disproportionately ineffective in the areas with the greatest utility outages.

It also brought back memories of 1985, when I was a Census interviewer.

The CPS (current population survey) is the big monthly survey that provides all kinds of information about labor force issues such as unemployment, as well as poverty, health insurance, etc. It is (or has this changed recently?) conducted in the week that the 19th falls, and asks about labor force activity during the previous week.

When Hurricane Kate hit my area in November 1985, it struck on Thursday of CPS week. The good thing about hurricanes is you know they are coming, and we were authorized all kinds of overtime to get as much done as possible before the storm hit. But my area was so huge that it was impossible to be everywhere...and so I had to go out on the Saturday after the storm as well.

I was driving a '71 beetle, which is a pretty good car on the dirt roads of the last rural area I had to visit. But I had to finally abandon it and finish on foot, due to the downed trees. I remember crawling under power lines, and getting caked with sand. As it turned out, it was a pretty productive afternoon. Most folks were home, and with no power for the distractions of TV, etc., they were willing to talk. I listened to their stories of the hurricane as well as the answers to my questions. When they found out that my own home had been destroyed, I got a lot of sympathy cooperation.

Prior to the hurricane, we had lived in a mobile home on the border of the two counties that I covered. A pine tree had been caught up in a twister, and sliced down into the roof, landing on my side of the bed (obviously, I wasn't there at the time). We had to find someplace else to live, and I started by driving around the neighborhood near my children's school, looking for rentals. When I dialed the first telephone number, it turned out to be one of my SIPP respondents (a longitudinal survey; I'd been visiting her every few months for almost two years). Of course, I wasn't going to mention that connection (as part of protecting her privacy), but she insisted that I sounded familiar, so I did admit how we had met. It turned out to be the perfect house, and she was willing to give us a lease just for the five months we would be remaining in the area because, "I'm much more comfortable renting to someone I know." (Nowadays, the trend in our field is to do more centralized interviewing, without that followup of the same interviewer from visit to visit, and I wonder if we have lost something in the drive for efficiency?)

I was in Orlando last Wednesday, 5 days after the storm, and the downed powerlines and snarled traffic were still pretty grim. That was the week that CPS field representatives were going to be trying to collect data? I really do wish them well.

And of course, every area has its own challenges for public opinion research. We never have to worry about snow on Election Day down here.

Colleen

Colleen K. Porter
cporter@phhp.ufl.edu
phone: 352\273-6068, fax: 352\273-6075
University of Florida
Location: 101 Newell Drive, Rm. 4148
US Mail: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====
Date: Mon, 23 Aug 2004 07:48:35 -0700
Reply-To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>
Subject: Re: Exit polls in Venezuela
Comments: To: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <0I2W00JIIHHG19@chimmx05.algx.net>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

The U.S. News and World Report article that Leo Simonetta posted is truly a wondrous piece of opinion and distortion. I'm not going to grace the AAPOR list-serve with an unneeded refutation. I will point out only two things. Warren Mitofsky is cited a number of times in valid points, but in a way that suggests (without ever stating it) that he agrees with the point of view of the writer about Venezuela. It's not exactly out of context, but then it's not exactly in context either, because Warren hasn't said anything about the Venezuela situation that would back Barone's extreme views, at least not that we've heard or seen. The more important point is that Barone claims (but doesn't quote directly) Shoen strongly defends the exit poll results and methodology,

and attacks the actual vote, as NED does, as most probably fraudulent. This assertion is both unsupported, and unsupportable.

=20

Enough has come out in the media about the methods used in this exit poll to recognize the absurdity of trying to use it to question the election. Barone's assertions (and presumably Schoen's) are somewhat akin to George Bush and his Cabinet still trying to bolster the obvious fabrication that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction in 2003 and worked with the Al Qaeda terrorist network before 2001. "But he is our U.S. President," some say. "Isn't that testimony to his credibility?" Many 12 year olds could refute that logic. Every published defense by Shoen et al of the use of Sumate pollsters, NED funds to Sumate, and early release of results as having some legitimacy, while continuing the attacks on yet another U.S. appointed nemesis, Hugo Chavez, does further damage to the public perception of polling as not objective. Elastic only stretches just so far before it loses its elasticity or breaks. Someone needs to tell Schoen that in no uncertain terms.=20

=20

The moral: When the world becomes overpopulated enough with people who replace truths with their ideological convictions in the way Barone, professional propagandists, religious fundamentalists and other self-righteous sectarians tend to do, our future history as a species will indeed be grim. Either we, as a nation, believe in democracy or we don't. If we defend running around the world looking for ways to oust anyone the U.S. government doesn't want in power then we become tyranny itself. =20

=20

Marc Sapir MD, MPH
Executive Director
Retro Poll
www.retropoll.org

=20

=20

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

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

Sent: Monday, August 23, 2004 4:58 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Exit polls in Venezuela

=20

8/20/04

Exit polls in Venezuela
US News & World Report
By Michael Barone

http://www.usnews.com/usnews/opinion/baroneweb/mb_040820.htm

=20

"Were NY Pollsters Just Playing a Joke on Chavez?" That was the typically cheeky headline on an item about the Venezuela election in The Hotline political digest (nationaljournal.com) this week. The item quoted a press release from the polling firm Penn, Schoen & Berland Assoc. saying, "Exit Poll Results Show Major Defeat for Chavez." The release, dated 7:30

p.m.,

said, "With Venezuela's voting set to end at 8 p.m. EST according to election officials, final exit poll results from Penn, Schoen & Berland Associates, an independent New York-based polling firm, show a major victory for the 'Yes' movement, defeating Chavez in the Venezuela presidential recall referendum." The poll showed 59 percent in favor of recalling Chavez, 41 percent against.

=20

The next morning, Chavez was declared the winner by an almost exact opposite margin. "About 58 percent said 'no' to a recall, while 42 percent said 'yes,'" wrote the Washington Post.

=20

The Hotline was evidently having a little fun twitting a polling firm.

But

was the result as clear as they-and official election observer Jimmy Carter-thought? There is good reason to believe it was not. In fact, it's

something of a scandal that American news media have been taking the official vote count in Venezuela at face value. There is very good reason

to believe that the exit poll had the result right, and that Chavez's election officials-and Carter and the American media-got it wrong.

=20

Let us look at the reasons.

=20

Venezuela's President Hugo Chavez has been running an authoritarian regime.

By various means he has taken control of the legislature, the courts, the armed services and the police. His thugs have been intimidating and even killing the regime's opponents. The literature on this is voluminous, but

consider these reports from the Wall Street Journal:

www.opinionjournal.com/extra/?id=110005494 and

www.opinionjournal.com/wsj/?id=110005478. Chavez is an ally of Cuba's Fidel

Castro and an enemy of the United States, and he has shown no commitment to

democratic principles. He sought to block the referendum by extralegal means and, having failed at that, resorted to intimidation to win it.

There

is no reason to believe that he would stop at election fraud.

=20

One weapon against such fraud is the exit poll. As Doug Schoen of Penn Schoen points out, his firm has conducted exit polls in Mexico and, just

a

few days ago, in the Dominican Republic, which produced results very close

to the election results. His partner Mark Penn points out that the firm conducted two previous exit polls in Venezuela, both of which were on the

mark. Warren Mitofsky's firm, Mitofsky International, has produced exit polls with similar results in Mexico and Russia. Mitofsky recalls that

in
1994, Mexican President Carlos Salinas, seeking credibility with foreign investors for that year's Mexican elections, asked him for advice on what to do. Allow independent exit polls, Mitofsky advised, sponsored by the media, and allow the results to be announced soon after the voting. Mitofsky's exit poll results, announced soon after the polls closed, did in fact come close to the official results, as did another Mitofsky poll in 2000. More important, they provided independent confirmation of the fairness of the count.

=20
Interestingly, Mitofsky points out that Jimmy Carter has opposed independent exit polls in countries where he has observed elections. In 1994, Mitofsky says, he persuaded South Africa's election authorities from allowing exit polls. As a result, there was considerable confusion and skepticism in the course of the five-day election process. Nevertheless, the chief South African election official tried to persuade Mexico not to allow exit polls. Salinas, fortunately, showed better judgment.

=20
In Venezuela, Schoen's firm was hired by businessmen who were almost surely opponents of Chavez. The Chavez regime intimidated local interviewing firms, who refused to provide interviewers for Penn Schoen at the polls. As a result, the firm trained volunteers. Critics of the firm might argue that these volunteers, undoubtedly mostly anti-Chavez, may have tried to present a false result.

=20
But that would in fact be difficult to do. Mitofsky points out that in countries emerging from autocracy into democracy, about 90 percent of voters approached by exit pollsters agree to participate. That is almost double the rate in the United States. Moreover, exit pollsters work in teams; there would have to be massive collusion for them to produce fraudulent results. The Penn Schoen exit poll was conducted at about 200 polling places and produced more than 20,000 responses. Changing those results from something like 42-58 (the Chavez announced figure) to 59-41 would be quite a feat. The firm employed supervisors to make sure the polling was done right. And its results by precinct can be checked against the official results reported for that precinct.

=20
In contrast, it would be far easier, given the touch-screen voting method and central tabulation used in Venezuela, for the central counting center to falsify the results. All you would have to do is program the computer to

count every sixth "yes" vote as a "no." That would transform a 59-41 vote to 42-58. And the results would still show pro-Chavez areas voting for him and anti-Chavez areas going the other way-just by different margins.

=20
Jimmy Carter did not remain in Venezuela long after the polling and, after a superficial look at the central counting center, pronounced the election fair and the result accurate. He could not have determined whether the counting computer was misprogrammed. Chavez had every motive for cheating:

polls before the election mostly showed him under 50 percent, and he should have reasonably concluded that those not for him were against. Adjusting the count was one sure way to win.

=20
By way of comparison, Penn Schoen has no motive whatever for cheating. It is a reputable American firm in a competitive business. Over more than 20

years it has worked for successful American politicians like Bill Clinton in 1996, Hillary Rodham Clinton in 2001, Michael Bloomberg in 2001 and many others. I have had experience, as a political consultant and a political writer, dealing with Penn Schoen during that whole time, and have found the firm to be reliable and fully observant of professional standards. They are high on my list of Democratic, Republican and independent polling firms whose numbers I trust and whose professional integrity I respect. Penn and Schoen are not likely to squander a hard-won good reputation to please a client in a foreign country where they are not likely to work again any time soon.

=20
Schoen has little doubt what happened. "I think it was a massive fraud," he told me. "Our internal sourcing tells us that there was fraud in the central commission." This was not the first time he has encountered such things. "The same thing happened in Serbia in 1992, by [President Slobodan] Milosevic. He did it again in the local elections in 1996. As a result, hundreds of thousands of people died. Had he been caught [in this fraud] in 1992, this would not have happened."

=20
In Venezuela this year, as in Serbia in 1992, I think it's overwhelmingly likely that the exit poll was far closer than the officially announced results to the way people actually voted.

=20

Unhappily, the prospects for Venezuela are not much better than they were for Serbia. The Chavez regime has been given a patina of respectability by Jimmy Carter and the New York Times editorial page that it almost certainly does not deserve. Warren Mitofsky was not involved in Venezuela, and is a competitor of Penn Schoen, but he draws similar conclusions to Schoen's. "I find it extraordinary that, with only one exit poll and no quick count, people are willing to take one side's word," he told me. "This doesn't smell good."

=20
Independent exit polls are one of the guarantors of democracy in countries emerging from or under authoritarian rule. Political junkies may think it amusing that there is such a wide discrepancy between an exit poll and official results. But for people in Venezuela and perhaps in other parts of Latin America it's more likely to be tragic.

=20
=20
=20
=20

--
Leo G. Simonetta
Research Director
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road, Suite 101
Baltimore MD 21209
=20

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====
Date: Mon, 23 Aug 2004 12:18:34 -0500
Reply-To: "Michael B. Conaway" <Michael.Conaway@UA.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Michael B. Conaway" <Michael.Conaway@UA.EDU>
Subject: Re: Exit polls in Venezuela
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
In-Reply-To: <0I2W00JIIHHG19@chimmx05.algx.net>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

As for the value of exit polls in detecting election fraud in a particular case, that is and must be determined by the circumstances of that case. I would be interested to hear whether any reason was advanced by Jimmy Carter for opposing exit polls in South Africa. Surely the failure to have exit polls was not the sole cause of the "considerable confusion and skepticism in the course of the five-day election process" which seems to be argued in Barone's piece. Barone's phrasing makes it unclear whether the source of this observation is Warren Mitofsky or himself.

Furthermore, surely the main question is what led to this huge gap between PSB's prediction and the measures that were consistent with the outcome. If we assume that PSB correctly measured voter sentiment that was not reflected in the outcome of the race, we must also assume that any measurements that coincided with the outcome were themselves seriously flawed. I read of at least one account of exit polling that coincided with the results. Does anyone know about these other measurements? It seems to me that we should be looking at these as well.

To establish that it's own exit poll was appropriately designed and executed, PSB could provide some details on the methodology and their role in supervising the data collection. I have seen several bits on the internet of dubious authority; but it's getting pretty exhausting to keep filtering through all the internet debris. The last time I checked, I found no mention whatsoever of this affair on their website (BTW, it can be difficult to get to their actual home page: <http://www.psb surveys.com/home>; the web address of their parent company is <http://www.wpp.com>. The roster of PSB's sister companies can be found at <http://www.wppdirectory.com/search.jsp>). Those of you who know folks at PSB might make this suggestion to them. Perhaps PSB hasn't done so already merely because they have their hands full trying to get a handle on exactly what did happen; but if that's the case, I wish they would say so.

At 07:58 AM 8/23/2004, you wrote:

>8/20/04

>Exit polls in Venezuela

>US News & World Report

>By Michael Barone

>http://www.usnews.com/usnews/opinion/baroneweb/mb_040820.htm

>

>"Were NY Pollsters Just Playing a Joke on Chavez?" That was the typically

>cheeky headline on an item about the Venezuela election in The Hotline

>political digest (nationaljournal.com) this week. The item quoted a press

>release from the polling firm Penn, Schoen & Berland Assoc. saying, "Exit

>Poll Results Show Major Defeat for Chavez." The release, dated 7:30 p.m.,

>said, "With Venezuela's voting set to end at 8 p.m. EST according to

>election officials, final exit poll results from Penn, Schoen & Berland

>Associates, an independent New York-based polling firm, show a major

>victory for the 'Yes' movement, defeating Chavez in the Venezuela

>presidential recall referendum." The poll showed 59 percent in favor of

>recalling Chavez, 41 percent against.

>

>The next morning, Chavez was declared the winner by an almost exact

>opposite margin. "About 58 percent said 'no' to a recall, while 42 percent
>said 'yes,'" wrote the Washington Post.

>

>The Hotline was evidently having a little fun twitting a polling firm. But
>was the result as clear as they-and official election observer Jimmy
>Carter-thought? There is good reason to believe it was not. In fact, it's
>something of a scandal that American news media have been taking the
>official vote count in Venezuela at face value. There is very good reason
>to believe that the exit poll had the result right, and that Chavez's
>election officials-and Carter and the American media-got it wrong.

>

>Let us look at the reasons.

>

>Venezuela's President Hugo Chavez has been running an authoritarian regime.

>By various means he has taken control of the legislature, the courts, the
>armed services and the police. His thugs have been intimidating and even
>killing the regime's opponents. The literature on this is voluminous, but
>consider these reports from the Wall Street Journal:

>www.opinionjournal.com/extra/?id=110005494 and

>www.opinionjournal.com/wsj/?id=110005478. Chavez is an ally of Cuba's Fidel

>Castro and an enemy of the United States, and he has shown no commitment to
>democratic principles. He sought to block the referendum by extralegal
>means and, having failed at that, resorted to intimidation to win it. There
>is no reason to believe that he would stop at election fraud.

>

>One weapon against such fraud is the exit poll. As Doug Schoen of Penn
>Schoen points out, his firm has conducted exit polls in Mexico and, just a
>few days ago, in the Dominican Republic, which produced results very close
>to the election results. His partner Mark Penn points out that the firm
>conducted two previous exit polls in Venezuela, both of which were on the
>mark. Warren Mitofsky's firm, Mitofsky International, has produced exit
>polls with similar results in Mexico and Russia. Mitofsky recalls that in
>1994, Mexican President Carlos Salinas, seeking credibility with foreign
>investors for that year's Mexican elections, asked him for advice on what
>to do. Allow independent exit polls, Mitofsky advised, sponsored by the
>media, and allow the results to be announced soon after the voting.
>Mitofsky's exit poll results, announced soon after the polls closed, did in
>fact come close to the official results, as did another Mitofsky poll in
>2000. More important, they provided independent confirmation of the
>fairness of the count.

>

>Interestingly, Mitofsky points out that Jimmy Carter has opposed
>independent exit polls in countries where he has observed elections. In
>1994, Mitofsky says, he persuaded South Africa's election authorities from
>allowing exit polls. As a result, there was considerable confusion and
>skepticism in the course of the five-day election process. Nevertheless,
>the chief South African election official tried to persuade Mexico not to
>allow exit polls. Salinas, fortunately, showed better judgment.

>

>In Venezuela, Schoen's firm was hired by businessmen who were almost surely
>opponents of Chavez. The Chavez regime intimidated local interviewing
>firms, who refused to provide interviewers for Penn Schoen at the polls. As
>a result, the firm trained volunteers. Critics of the firm might argue that
>these volunteers, undoubtedly mostly anti-Chavez, may have tried to present

>a false result.

>

>But that would in fact be difficult to do. Mitofsky points out that in
>countries emerging from autocracy into democracy, about 90 percent of
>voters approached by exit pollsters agree to participate. That is almost
>double the rate in the United States. Moreover, exit pollers work in teams;
>there would have to be massive collusion for them to produce fraudulent
>results. The Penn Schoen exit poll was conducted at about 200 polling
>places and produced more than 20,000 responses. Changing those results from
>something like 42-58 (the Chavez announced figure) to 59-41 would be quite
>a feat. The firm employed supervisors to make sure the polling was done
>right. And its results by precinct can be checked against the official
>results reported for that precinct.

>

>In contrast, it would be far easier, given the touch-screen voting method
>and central tabulation used in Venezuela, for the central counting center
>to falsify the results. All you would have to do is program the computer to
>count every sixth "yes" vote as a "no." That would transform a 59-41 vote
>to 42-58. And the results would still show pro-Chavez areas voting for him
>and anti-Chavez areas going the other way-just by different margins.

>

>Jimmy Carter did not remain in Venezuela long after the polling and, after
>a superficial look at the central counting center, pronounced the election
>fair and the result accurate. He could not have determined whether the
>counting computer was misprogrammed. Chavez had every motive for cheating:
>polls before the election mostly showed him under 50 percent, and he should
>have reasonably concluded that those not for him were against. Adjusting
>the count was one sure way to win.

>

>By way of comparison, Penn Schoen has no motive whatever for cheating. It
>is a reputable American firm in a competitive business. Over more than 20
>years it has worked for successful American politicians like Bill Clinton
>in 1996, Hillary Rodham Clinton in 2001, Michael Bloomberg in 2001 and many
>others. I have had experience, as a political consultant and a political
>writer, dealing with Penn Schoen during that whole time, and have found the
>firm to be reliable and fully observant of professional standards. They are
>high on my list of Democratic, Republican and independent polling firms
>whose numbers I trust and whose professional integrity I respect. Penn and
>Schoen are not likely to squander a hard-won good reputation to please a
>client in a foreign country where they are not likely to work again any
>time soon.

>

>Schoen has little doubt what happened. "I think it was a massive fraud," he
>told me. "Our internal sourcing tells us that there was fraud in the
>central commission." This was not the first time he has encountered such
>things. "The same thing happened in Serbia in 1992, by [President Slobodan]
>Milosevic. He did it again in the local elections in 1996. As a result,
>hundreds of thousands of people died. Had he been caught [in this fraud] in
>1992, this would not have happened."

>

>In Venezuela this year, as in Serbia in 1992, I think it's overwhelmingly
>likely that the exit poll was far closer than the officially announced
>results to the way people actually voted.

>

>Unhappily, the prospects for Venezuela are not much better than they were
>for Serbia. The Chavez regime has been given a patina of respectability by
>Jimmy Carter and the New York Times editorial page that it almost certainly
>does not deserve. Warren Mitofsky was not involved in Venezuela, and is a
>competitor of Penn Schoen, but he draws similar conclusions to Schoen's. "I
>find it extraordinary that, with only one exit poll and no quick count,
>people are willing to take one side's word," he told me. "This doesn't
>smell good."

>
>Independent exit polls are one of the guarantors of democracy in countries
>emerging from or under authoritarian rule. Political junkies may think it
>amusing that there is such a wide discrepancy between an exit poll and
>official results. But for people in Venezuela and perhaps in other parts of
>Latin America it's more likely to be tragic.

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

>-----
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
>set aapornet nomail
>On your return send: set aapornet mail

Michael B. Conaway, J.D.
Institute for Social Science Research
University of Alabama
Box 870216
Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0216
(205) 348-9649 Telephone
(205) 348-2849 Facsimile

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Mon, 23 Aug 2004 16:26:31 -0400
Reply-To: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>
Subject: Article by Jimmy Carter re Venezuelan recall vote
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: multipart/mixed; x-avg-checked=avg-ok-43522BF2;

boundary="Boundary_(ID_R2Y0jJziRiZR+SuzjK3g2g)"

--Boundary_(ID_R2Y0jJziRiZR+SuzjK3g2g)

Content-type: text/plain; x-avg-checked=avg-ok-43522BF2; charset=iso-8859-1;
format=flowed

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Here is Jimmy Carter's comment re the Venezuelan recall vote.

Election monitors work to build nations' trust

By JIMMY CARTER

Atlanta Journal and Constitution, Published on: 08/23/04

One of the primary goals of modern society is to enhance a worldwide commitment to democracy. With so many national differences concerning preferred electoral processes, it helps to have a general definition of a democratic government. The dictionary says it is "a government in which the supreme power is vested in the people and exercised by them through a system of representation usually involving periodically held free elections."

The Carter Center now monitors an average of five troubled democratic elections each year so far a total of 51. Our prerequisites for involvement are to be invited by all major political parties and by the central election commission; to be assured that electoral procedures are fair and balanced among candidates, applied according to the law; and to be convinced that without our presence the election might not be successful.

A crucial requirement for inspiring trust is that we always remain absolutely neutral among competing candidates. It is also necessary for us to understand the complex interrelationships among the competing political contenders and be able to detect any fraudulent practices or intimidation that might subvert the free will of the citizens.

Our largest national challenge has been helping with the establishment of democracy in Indonesia, with elections held last month and five years earlier after decades of dictatorial rule. Perhaps our most intriguing involvement has been a series of elections and referendums held in Venezuela during the past six years. In both these cases, despite gloomy forecasts, the election processes have been honest and transparent and the results have expressed the will of the people.

In 1998, Hugo Chavez was elected president of Venezuela when the two major political parties had fallen into disrepute after dominating the governments for 40 years. There was a subsequent referendum to approve a new constitution and then, in 2000, another nationwide election for local,

=20
state and national offices.

Chavez prevailed by close to 60 percent in both presidential elections,=20
which were judged by us to reflect the will of the people, but a strong and=
=20
determined opposition force remained determined to remove him from office.

We criticized the constitutional referendum for being too rushed to allow=20
debate, and we said that some of the national legislative and local=20
election outcomes in 2000 were uncertain given irregularities and poor=20
audits. We did not question the presidential election, however, with its=20
wide vote margin.

With tacit approval from Washington, a military coup against Chavez was=20
successful in April 2002 and the United States immediately recognized the=20
anointed leader, but an aroused Venezuelan public and condemnation of the=20
coup by Mexico and other Latin American governments resulted in Chavez=20
being restored to office after two days in custody. The next attempt to=20
depose him was with a series of nationwide strikes that shut down oil=20
production and almost destroyed the nation's economy. The government=20
survived, but the political confrontation continued.

In January 2003, I proposed that a peculiar provision in the new=20
constitution be implemented that provided for the people to decide in a=20
referendum whether Chavez should leave office or complete his term. Both=20
the opposition and the president agreed to abide by this decision, and the=
=20

Organization of American states joined The Carter Center in reducing=20
tension, ensuring communication between the contending political groups,=20
monitoring the gathering of necessary petitions, and observing a recall=20
referendum.

The Aug. 15 vote in Venezuela was the culmination of this process, and a=20
large number of other international observers were invited, including Latin=
=20
American presidents and members of the U.S. Congress. Because of intense=20
distrust expressed by the opposition, extra care was taken to ensure=20
secrecy and accuracy of the voters' decisions.

An electronic voting and tabulation system was developed by a=20
Venezuelan-American consortium led by SmartMatic that permitted=20
touch-screen voting, with each choice backed up by a paper ballot that was=
=20
examined by the voter and then placed in a sealed box. We international=20
monitors assured that the machines were tested in advance, and we observed=
=20
the voting throughout the nation.

At the end of the voting day, results from each of the 20,000 machines were=
=20
certified by poll workers and party observers and transmitted on telephone=
=20
lines (CANTV, Verizon and others) to election headquarters in Caracas.

All paper ballots were retained under military guard in the local regions.=

=20

As predicted by several public opinion polls and also confirmed by our=20 independent vote tabulation, Venezuelan citizens once again expressed=20 support for Chavez, this time by a 59 percent to 41 percent margin. He will=

=20

now serve the remaining 2 1/2 years of this term (and be eligible for=20 re-election).

A post-election audit is being conducted to assure that there are no=20

significant disparities between the electronically transmitted data and the=

=20

results obtained from counting paper ballots.

Our responsibilities don't end when the final votes are counted. There=20

needs to be good-faith acceptance of the results by both winners and=20

losers, and some degree of reconciliation if distrust or disharmony is=20

deep. Especially in Venezuela, it will be necessary to establish a=20

continuing dialogue between the government and the still-antagonistic=20

opposition leaders. We have already begun this.

Regardless of whether foreign governments approve of a political decision=20

made by citizens of a sovereign and democratic country, the only legitimate=

=20

recourse is to honor the decision, to cooperate whenever possible and to=20

promote possible leadership changes through democratic means.

Former U.S. President Jimmy Carter chairs the Atlanta-based Carter Center,=

=20

a nongovernmental organization advancing peace and health worldwide.

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

--Boundary_(ID_R2Y0jJziRiZR+SuzjK3g2g)

Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-avg=cert;

x-avg-checked=avg-ok-43522BF2

Content-disposition: inline

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.

Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).

Version: 6.0.732 / Virus Database: 486 - Release Date: 7/29/2004

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

Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

--Boundary_(ID_R2Y0jJziRiZR+SuzjK3g2g)--

Date: Mon, 23 Aug 2004 16:44:10 -0400
Reply-To: pd@kerr-downs.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Phillip Downs <pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM>
Subject: Canadian internet panel
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Has anyone had luck with a provider of a Canadian internet panel of 1) consumers and 2) purchasing agents (owner, office manager) for small businesses? Thanks, Phillip

Phillip E. Downs, PhD
Kerr & Downs Research
2992 Habersham Drive
Tallahassee, FL 32309
Phone: 850.906.3111
Fax: 850.906.3112
www.kerr-downs.com

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Tue, 24 Aug 2004 08:59:18 -0400
Reply-To: Mike Margolis <michael.margolis@UC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Margolis <michael.margolis@UC.EDU>
Subject: Re: Exit polls in Venezuela
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
In-Reply-To: <200408240456.ASD84300@mprelay2.uc.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" ; format="flowed"

As we speculate about the accuracy or integrity of the Schoen exit poll in Venezuela's recall election, we should also keep in mind the April 2002 coup. I recommend "The Revolution will not be Televised." That the well-reviewed film has received little attention may say as much about the ownership of the mass media in the USA as in Venezuela.

SYNOPSIS: On April 11th, 2002, Irish documentarians Kim Bartley and Donnacha O'Briain were in Venezuela, with the intention of making a movie about the nation's democratically elected president, Hugo Chavez, whose support comes mostly from the country's impoverished,

who make up 80% of the population. The film took a seriously unexpected turn when the filmmakers found themselves in the heart of a coup d'etat, trapped in the president's palace as Chavez's right-wing oligarchic opposition overthrew the leader. Chavez was able to return to power within 48 hours, buoyed by public support, but this film captures those frightening moments and days in which a nation's political future was fought over using both bullets and manipulation of the media. Venezuela's television networks, all owned by oil companies except for the state channel which the coup brought down, reported distorted interpretations of the coup, as proven by this movie's footage, which was then picked up by international news organizations like CNN. This movie also addresses what the White House thought about this coup in the world's fifth largest producer of oil (providing 14% of the United States' petroleum).

See <http://www.au-cinema.com/The-Revolution-Will-Not.htm> or conduct your own search.

Mike Margolis

--

Michael Margolis

Tel:

513-556-3310

Department of Political Science

Fax: 513-556-2314

U. of Cincinnati

POBox 210375

Cincinnati, OH 45221-0375

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

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

Date: Tue, 24 Aug 2004 11:04:59 -0400

Reply-To: jmellis@vcu.edu

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Jim Ellis <jmellis@VCU.EDU>

Organization: SERL

Subject: Re: Interviewing after a hurricane

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

In-Reply-To: <s129b4cc.036@fuji.hp.ufl.edu>

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Colleen,

I just came back from a trip Port Charlotte last Thursday-Friday to help with some family members and property issues. I was surprised at the = very

concentrated pattern of damage -- even 5-10 miles north of Port = Charlotte

there was very little sign of damage, but traveling south on I-75 it = became

more and more intense with every quarter mile of driving. In Port = Charlotte

itself, it looks more like a 10-mile wide tornado hit, rather than a hurricane. At least it did to me. But I am not familiar with hurricanes = or tornadoes!

Last year Hurricane Isabel knocked us off course for awhile with = telephone interviewing -- and in the middle of a big crunch that we were already having trouble keeping up with! We lost power to our call center for 3 = days. The eastern part of Virginia was hard hit by Isabel, while the western = part got off pretty easily. We monitored the Dominion Virginia Power web site = for progress on restoration of electric power (using that as a proxy for = when people might think that a survey call was not too tacky, and when they = might actually be at home with working phone service, although of course we = knew that phones often work when electric power does not). We held back = sample in some areas of the state for several days while we concentrated on the = areas with less damage. Anecdotally, I do not recall getting a lot of people wondering why we were doing surveys at a time like this, but we had some patter prepared in case people were offended.

Jim Ellis
Virginia Commonwealth University

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Colleen Porter
Sent: Monday, August 23, 2004 9:11 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Interviewing after a hurricane

We are nearing the end of about five months of field work on a big (n=3D17,000) statewide RDD survey about health insurance. I gotta confess, when I watched the news and saw the roof of the Ft. Myers post office fly off, my first thought was, "Omigosh, I might have letters there!" (since we are in the midst of a mail followup).

This, of course, was horribly selfish, and I've since repented.

Since our project was in the field at a fairly leisurely academic pace, this isn't quite so damaging to us, although certainly the current mail effort seems to be disproportionately ineffective in the areas with the greatest utility outages.

It also brought back memories of 1985, when I was a Census interviewer. The CPS (current population survey) is the big monthly survey that provides all kinds of information about labor force issues such as

unemployment, as well as poverty, health insurance, etc. It is (or has this changed recently?) conducted in the week that the 19th falls, and asks about labor force activity during the previous week.

When Hurricane Kate hit my area in November 1985, it struck on Thursday of CPS week. The good thing about hurricanes is you know they are coming, and we were authorized all kinds of overtime to get as much done as possible before the storm hit. But my area was so huge that it was impossible to be everywhere...and so I had to go out on the Saturday after the storm as well.

I was driving a '71 beetle, which is a pretty good car on the dirt roads of the last rural area I had to visit. But I had to finally abandon it and finish on foot, due to the downed trees. I remember crawling under power lines, and getting caked with sand. As it turned out, it was a pretty productive afternoon. Most folks were home, and with no power for the distractions of TV, etc., they were willing to talk. I listened to their stories of the hurricane as well as the answers to my questions. When they found out that my own home had been destroyed, I got a lot of sympathy cooperation.

Prior to the hurricane, we had lived in a mobile home on the border of the two counties that I covered. A pine tree had been caught up in a twister, and sliced down into the roof, landing on my side of the bed (obviously, I wasn't there at the time). We had to find someplace else to live, and I started by driving around the neighborhood near my children's school, looking for rentals. When I dialed the first telephone number, it turned out to be one of my SIPP respondents (a longitudinal survey; I'd been visiting her every few months for almost two years). Of course, I wasn't going to mention that connection (as part of protecting her privacy), but she insisted that I sounded familiar, so I did admit how we had met. It turned out to be the perfect house, and she was willing to give us a lease just for the five months we would be remaining in the area because, "I'm much more comfortable renting to someone I know." (Nowadays, the trend in our field is to do more centralized interviewing, without that followup of the same interviewer from visit to visit, and I wonder if we have lost something in the drive for efficiency?)

I was in Orlando last Wednesday, 5 days after the storm, and the downed powerlines and snarled traffic were still pretty grim. That was the week that CPS field representatives were going to be trying to collect data? I really do wish them well.

And of course, every area has its own challenges for public opinion research. We never have to worry about snow on Election Day down here.

Colleen

Colleen K. Porter
cporter@phhp.ufl.edu
phone: 352\273-6068, fax: 352\273-6075
University of Florida
Location: 101 Newell Drive, Rm. 4148
US Mail: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Wed, 25 Aug 2004 10:05:08 -0400
Reply-To: Eric Plutzer <exp12@PSU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Eric Plutzer <exp12@PSU.EDU>
Subject: Exit polls in Venezuela
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
In-Reply-To: <200408250450.AAA174060@f05n16.cac.psu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

I've read the many contributions with regarding the Venezuelan election and exit poll with fascination and ambivalence. I'll also admit to shifting my assessments of what's likely to be true with each exchange. There seem to be enough claims to create an argument in either direction (so long as one discounts competing claims). And yet both can't be completely (or even largely) correct.

The simplest explanation is that no amount of training can insure that partisan interviewers will not skew results.

In the absence of grants I resorted to the use of partisan interviewers in two surveys during the 1980s. One employed counselors at an abortion clinic who interviewed clients about experiences relevant to pending legislation. We had the luxury of conducting a pre-test and closely monitored and debriefed the counselor/interviewers over a four month period. I stand 100% behind the results (which did not fully support what the clinic would have liked the results to have been) because of the close scrutiny. At about the same time I worked with a public interest group that conducted a poll over seven days with limited supervision. For a host of reasons -- many of them unintended behaviors by the interviewers -- I concluded that the results were hopelessly contaminated and biased in the direction of the volunteers' leanings.

A one-shot exit poll staffed by volunteers from the opposition group in my

mind raises just too many questions to outweigh the judgment of the Carter Center staff. The latter have years of experience; the volunteers were doing this for the first time. The volunteers, even when trying to be neutral, probably have little idea of how appearance (dressing in expensive clothes in barrio voting precincts), inflection, or other little quirks of soliciting voters and assuring confidentiality might skew results in a country with the recent experiences of political violence. Even if the Schoen staff did everything "right" in terms of sample selection, supervisor and interviewer training, the risks of severe bias would remain.

The use of partisan volunteers can work. But the conditions for making it work -- pretests, frequent monitoring and debriefing of interviewers -- were not present in the recent Venezuelan election and are probably not possible for a one-shot exit poll. In contrast, the Carter Center audit seems to rule out the any kind of small but widespread reprogramming of the voting machines.

So in the absence of extraordinary documentation of the field practices of the poll, it seems imprudent to assume that the poll was on the mark. And if we can't assume that, it fails to serve as a reliable check against the possibility of fraud. Exit polls can play a major role, but only when sponsorship and implementation is completely non-partisan.

Eric

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Wed, 25 Aug 2004 11:33:17 -0400
Reply-To: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>
Subject: Venezuela
Comments: To: aapor <aapornet@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Nancy Belden indicated that AAPOR would consider the questions that have arisen about the Venezuelan referendum and exit poll. This seems a case where AAPOR can make an important contribution, and a competent but disinterested review committee for this purpose seems better than each of us speculating as to what really occurred. Howard

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Wed, 25 Aug 2004 17:33:40 -0700

Reply-To: Ulises Beltran <ulisesb@INTERNET.COM.MX>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Ulises Beltran <ulisesb@INTERNET.COM.MX>
Subject: Venezuelan exit poll
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I think Nancy's suggestion of reviewing the Venezuelan exit poll is a good

idea. I would encourage Aapor to look at least to one of the two other exit polls done in Venezuela. I only know that one of them was done by CECA, sponsored by the Central University, and the other one was sponsored by Venevisión, the local network. Both exit polls produced the same results that Schon & Penn. I have not been able to contact CECA, but they seem to be a reliable local pollster. The Venevisión poll can be ignored, considering that the owner of the network has been one of the most conspicuous leaders of the opposition.

Ulises Beltrán
BGC, Ulises Beltrán y Asocs., S. C.
México

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====
Date: Wed, 25 Aug 2004 21:37:31 -0700
Reply-To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>
Subject: Re: Exit polls in Venezuela
Comments: To: Eric Plutzer <exp12@PSU.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <5.1.0.14.2.20040825093449.0f1921b0@mail.psu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Eric,

Your points are well made, I think. But did you also notice that in one of the articles sent around the author had interviewed people from the Sumate organization that actually did the polling and--far beyond not wearing the proper attire--they admitted that Sumate avoided polling in the poor areas. That would probably lead to error even in an affluent country, but in a nation where 80% of the people live in poverty that piece of information alone--if it can be corroborated--is enough to discount the effort. I'd be interested in Schoen's answer to that assertion. And I think that any impartial investigation ought to begin with such obvious issues first. Either they did or didn't. If they avoided most of the poor districts, regardless of the reason, no further investigation is needed, unless they can show a carefully constructed

weighted model. But even that modeling would be suspect if they had hundreds of people polling in affluent districts, as the article suggested. Why would they do that? In other words, I agree with your concerns about individual biases, but I'm more concerned about a system problem similar to the removal of tens of thousands of mostly Democrats and African Americans from the voter roles in Florida before the 2000 election using a technique of loosely matching their names to those of convicted felons in other states. That wasn't an accidental event, in my opinion.

Marc

Marc Sapir MD, MPH
Executive Director
Retro Poll
www.retropoll.org

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Eric Plutzer
Sent: Wednesday, August 25, 2004 6:05 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Exit polls in Venezuela

I've read the many contributions with regarding the Venezuelan election and exit poll with fascination and ambivalence. I'll also admit to shifting my assessments of what's likely to be true with each exchange. There seem to be enough claims to create an argument in either direction (so long as one discounts competing claims). And yet both can't be completely (or even largely) correct.

The simplest explanation is that no amount of training can insure that partisan interviewers will not skew results.

In the absence of grants I resorted to the use of partisan interviewers in two surveys during the 1980s. One employed counselors at an abortion clinic who interviewed clients about experiences relevant to pending legislation. We had the luxury of conducting a pre-test and closely monitored and debriefed the counselor/interviewers over a four month period. I stand 100% behind the results (which did not fully support what the clinic would have liked the results to have been) because of the close scrutiny. At about the same time I worked with a public interest group that conducted a poll over seven days with limited supervision. For a host of reasons -- many of them unintended behaviors by the interviewers -- I concluded that the results were hopelessly contaminated and biased in the

direction of the volunteers' leanings.

A one-shot exit poll staffed by volunteers from the opposition group in my mind raises just too many questions to outweigh the judgment of the Carter Center staff. The latter have years of experience; the volunteers were doing this for the first time. The volunteers, even when trying to be neutral, probably have little idea of how appearance (dressing in expensive clothes in barrio voting precincts), inflection, or other little quirks of soliciting voters and assuring confidentiality might skew results in a country with the recent experiences of political violence. Even if the Schoen staff did everything "right" in terms of sample selection, supervisor and interviewer training, the risks of severe bias would remain.

The use of partisan volunteers can work. But the conditions for making it work -- pretests, frequent monitoring and debriefing of interviewers -- were not present in the recent Venezuelan election and are probably not possible for a one-shot exit poll. In contrast, the Carter Center audit seems to rule out the any kind of small but widespread reprogramming of the voting machines.

So in the absence of extraordinary documentation of the field practices of the poll, it seems imprudent to assume that the poll was on the mark. And if we can't assume that, it fails to serve as a reliable check against the possibility of fraud. Exit polls can play a major role, but only when sponsorship and implementation is completely non-partisan.

Eric

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====
Date: Thu, 26 Aug 2004 09:43:17 -0400
Reply-To: Brian Dautch <bdautch@CMOR.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Brian Dautch <bdautch@CMOR.ORG>

Subject: Re: Exit polls in Venezuela
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <004f01c48b26\$69beb320\$988cb443@RetroPoll>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Here's an interesting piece from the Trinidad and Tobago Express...I tried to cut and paste the article, but their website wouldn't let me. The writer (a Senator in Trinidad and Tobago) refers to Penn, Schoen as "very respected," claims that some Venezuelan voters were assigned polling places far from home, and relies on election results from Venezuelan embassies from around the world.

Just thought it might add a different angle to the discussion...

<http://www.trinidadexpress.com/index.pl/article_opinion?id=35172472>

Brian

Brian Dautch
Director of Government Affairs

CMOR
Promoting and Advocating Survey Research
7475 Wisconsin Ave., Suite 300
Bethesda, MD 20814
(301) 654-6601
bdautch@cmor.org <<mailto:bdautch@cmor.org>>

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Marc Sapir
Sent: Thursday, August 26, 2004 12:38 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Exit polls in Venezuela

Eric,

Your points are well made, I think. But did you also notice that in one of the articles sent around the author had interviewed people from the Sumate organization that actually did the polling and--far beyond not wearing the proper attire--they admitted that Sumate avoided polling in the poor areas. That would probably lead to error even in an affluent country, but in a nation where 80% of the people live in poverty that piece of information alone--if it can be corroborated--is enough to discount the effort. I'd be interested in Schoen's answer to that assertion. And I think that any impartial investigation ought to begin with such obvious issues first. Either they did or didn't. If they avoided most of the poor districts, regardless of the reason, no further investigation is needed, unless they can show a carefully constructed weighted model. But even that modeling would be suspect if they had hundreds of people polling in affluent districts, as the article

suggested. Why would they do that? In other words, I agree with your concerns about individual biases, but I'm more concerned about a system problem similar to the removal of tens of thousands of mostly Democrats and African Americans from the voter roles in Florida before the 2000 election using a technique of loosely matching their names to those of convicted felons in other states. That wasn't an accidental event, in my opinion.

Marc

Marc Sapir MD, MPH
Executive Director
Retro Poll
www.retropoll.org

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Eric Plutzer
Sent: Wednesday, August 25, 2004 6:05 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Exit polls in Venezuela

I've read the many contributions with regarding the Venezuelan election and exit poll with fascination and ambivalence. I'll also admit to shifting my assessments of what's likely to be true with each exchange. There seem to be enough claims to create an argument in either direction (so long as one discounts competing claims). And yet both can't be completely (or even largely) correct.

The simplest explanation is that no amount of training can insure that partisan interviewers will not skew results.

In the absence of grants I resorted to the use of partisan interviewers in two surveys during the 1980s. One employed counselors at an abortion clinic who interviewed clients about experiences relevant to pending legislation. We had the luxury of conducting a pre-test and closely monitored and debriefed the counselor/interviewers over a four month period. I stand 100% behind the results (which did not fully support what the clinic would have liked the results to have been) because of the close scrutiny. At about the same time I worked with a public interest group that conducted a poll over seven days with limited supervision. For a host of reasons -- many of them unintended behaviors by the interviewers -- I concluded that the results were hopelessly contaminated and biased in the direction of the volunteers' leanings.

A one-shot exit poll staffed by volunteers from the opposition group in my mind raises just too many questions to outweigh the judgment of the Carter Center staff. The latter have years of experience; the volunteers were doing this for the first time. The volunteers, even when trying to be neutral, probably have little idea of how appearance (dressing in expensive clothes in barrio voting precincts), inflection, or other little quirks of soliciting voters and assuring confidentiality might skew results in a country with the recent experiences of political violence. Even if the Schoen staff did everything "right" in terms of sample selection, supervisor and interviewer training, the risks of severe bias would remain.

The use of partisan volunteers can work. But the conditions for making it work -- pretests, frequent monitoring and debriefing of interviewers -- were not present in the recent Venezuelan election and are probably not possible for a one-shot exit poll. In contrast, the Carter Center audit seems to rule out the any kind of small but widespread reprogramming of the voting machines.

So in the absence of extraordinary documentation of the field practices of the poll, it seems imprudent to assume that the poll was on the mark. And if we can't assume that, it fails to serve as a reliable check against the possibility of fraud. Exit polls can play a major role, but only when sponsorship and implementation is completely non-partisan.

Eric

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail
=====

Date: Thu, 26 Aug 2004 06:45:11 -0700
Reply-To: Steven Hertzberg <steven@VOTEWATCH.US>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Steven Hertzberg <steven@VOTEWATCH.US>
Subject: Re: Venezuela
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <412CB13D.1070400@umich.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=Windows-1252
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

A Venezuelan exit poll review committee is an excellent idea. But given there is a U.S. presidential election in November, it may be beneficial to also consider proactive steps that may be taken for the upcoming and future elections.

Given the slim margin of victory expected between the candidates, along with the error rate inherent in the election system (see Caltech/MIT report on election 2000), it may once again be difficult to accurately predict the results via exit polling on election day. How can we better prepare for this challenge, mitigate risk and be in a strong position to address post election day news media questions?

Does it make sense to be proactive? If so, I'd appreciate your thoughts regarding the steps that may be taken prior to November.

Fyi, Votewatch is seeking to assess the error rate in the election system, as well as determine causality and bias. We hope that our data collection and analysis efforts will eventually help develop stronger exit polling methodologies.

Steven Hertzberg
Votewatch Corporation
San Francisco, California 94123

<http://www.votewatch.us>
Your Eye on Elections

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Howard Schuman
Sent: Wednesday, August 25, 2004 8:33 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Venezuela

Nancy Belden indicated that AAPOR would consider the questions that have arisen about the Venezuelan referendum and exit poll. This seems a case where AAPOR can make an important contribution, and a competent but disinterested review committee for this purpose seems better than each of us speculating as to what really occurred. Howard

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

Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).
Version: 6.0.742 / Virus Database: 495 - Release Date: 8/19/2004

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Thu, 26 Aug 2004 08:57:03 -0700
Reply-To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>
Subject: Re: Exit polls in Venezuela
Comments: To: Brian Dautch <bdautch@CMOR.ORG>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <JBEDKAIABLANFCDKJEICEEICGAA.bdautch@cmor.org>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

This article is even more of a stretch than the U.S. News and World Report article. It is shot through with the same inaccuracies and adds nothing new. Reading it you'd think Chavez was wildly unpopular and that polls done before the elections showing him winning strongly never happened. It even tries to ignore the fact that half of the signatures on the recall petition were contested by the Election Commission but that Jimmy Carter convinced Chavez to not force the called-for re-appearance of signers with IDs in order to avoid inflaming the opposition passions. You can see the author's bias when he calls the turnout low. It wasn't low. It was higher than U.S. Presidential elections. And who backs this Trinidad paper with its CNN links and a circulation of only 20,000?

Marc Sapir MD, MPH
Executive Director
Retro Poll
www.retropoll.org

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Brian Dautch
Sent: Thursday, August 26, 2004 5:43 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Exit polls in Venezuela

Here's an interesting piece from the Trinidad and Tobago Express...I tried to cut and paste the article, but their website wouldn't let me. The

writer

(a Senator in Trinidad and Tobago) refers to Penn, Schoen as "very respected," claims that some Venezuelan voters were assigned polling places far from home, and relies on election results from Venezuelan embassies from around the world.

Just thought it might add a different angle to the discussion...

<http://www.trinidadexpress.com/index.pl/article_opinion?id5172472>

Brian

Brian Dautch
Director of Government Affairs

CMOR
Promoting and Advocating Survey Research
7475 Wisconsin Ave., Suite 300
Bethesda, MD 20814
(301) 654-6601
bdautch@cmor.org <<mailto:bdautch@cmor.org>>

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Marc Sapir
Sent: Thursday, August 26, 2004 12:38 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Exit polls in Venezuela

Eric,

Your points are well made, I think. But did you also notice that in one of the articles sent around the author had interviewed people from the Sumate organization that actually did the polling and--far beyond not wearing the proper attire--they admitted that Sumate avoided polling in the poor areas. That would probably lead to error even in an affluent country, but in a nation where 80% of the people live in poverty that piece of information alone--if it can be corroborated--is enough to discount the effort. I'd be interested in Schoen's answer to that assertion. And I think that any impartial investigation ought to begin with such obvious issues first. Either they did or didn't. If they avoided most of the poor districts, regardless of the reason, no further investigation is needed, unless they can show a carefully constructed weighted model. But even that modeling would be suspect if they had hundreds of people polling in affluent districts, as the article suggested. Why would they do that? In other words, I agree with your concerns about individual biases, but I'm more concerned about a system problem similar to the removal of tens of thousands of mostly Democrats and African Americans from the voter roles in Florida before the 2000 election using a technique of loosely matching their names to those of convicted felons in other states. That wasn't an accidental event, in my

opinion.

Marc

Marc Sapir MD, MPH
Executive Director
Retro Poll
www.retropoll.org

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Eric Plutzer
Sent: Wednesday, August 25, 2004 6:05 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Exit polls in Venezuela

I've read the many contributions with regarding the Venezuelan election and exit poll with fascination and ambivalence. I'll also admit to shifting my assessments of what's likely to be true with each exchange. There seem to be enough claims to create an argument in either direction (so long as one discounts competing claims). And yet both can't be completely (or even largely) correct.

The simplest explanation is that no amount of training can insure that partisan interviewers will not skew results.

In the absence of grants I resorted to the use of partisan interviewers in two surveys during the 1980s. One employed counselors at an abortion clinic who interviewed clients about experiences relevant to pending legislation. We had the luxury of conducting a pre-test and closely monitored and debriefed the counselor/interviewers over a four month period. I stand 100% behind the results (which did not fully support what the clinic would have liked the results to have been) because of the close scrutiny. At about the same time I worked with a public interest group that conducted a poll over seven days with limited supervision. For a host of reasons -- many of them unintended behaviors by the interviewers -- I concluded that the results were hopelessly contaminated and biased in the direction of the volunteers' leanings.

A one-shot exit poll staffed by volunteers from the opposition group in my mind raises just too many questions to outweigh the judgment of the Carter Center staff. The latter have years of experience; the volunteers were doing this for the first time. The volunteers, even when trying to be

neutral, probably have little idea of how appearance (dressing in expensive clothes in barrio voting precincts), inflection, or other little quirks of soliciting voters and assuring confidentiality might skew results in a country with the recent experiences of political violence. Even if the Schoen staff did everything "right" in terms of sample selection, supervisor and interviewer training, the risks of severe bias would remain.

The use of partisan volunteers can work. But the conditions for making it work -- pretests, frequent monitoring and debriefing of interviewers -- were not present in the recent Venezuelan election and are probably not possible for a one-shot exit poll. In contrast, the Carter Center audit seems to rule out the any kind of small but widespread reprogramming of the voting machines.

So in the absence of extraordinary documentation of the field practices of the poll, it seems imprudent to assume that the poll was on the mark. And if we can't assume that, it fails to serve as a reliable check against the possibility of fraud. Exit polls can play a major role, but only when sponsorship and implementation is completely non-partisan.

Eric

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail
=====

Date: Thu, 26 Aug 2004 15:01:05 -0400
Reply-To: beveridg@optonline.net
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>
Subject: Republicans and NON-Voters in NEW YORK CITY
Comments: To: Maria Terrone <mterrone@qc1.qc.edu>, Maria Matteo <mmatteo@qc.edu>, "Qcsoclis@Qc. Edu" <qcsoclis@qc.edu>, AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>, Community Urban List <COMURB_R21@EMAIL.RUTGERS.EDU>, Jay Hershenson <Jay.Hershenson@domino1.cuny.edu>
Comments: cc: CUNY UFS Discussion Forum <SENATE-FORUM@LISTSERV.CUNY.EDU>, "JLMandell@aol.com" <JLMandell@aol.com>, Sydney <sbeveridge@optonline.net>, ddadey@citizensunion.org
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Dear All:

Recently, in honor of the election and the upcoming GOP Convention two of my Gotham Gazette Columns concerned Republicans and Non-Voting in New York. Yesterday, I discussed them with Amy Eddings during All Things Considered. The links, including the audio, are below.

All Things

WNYC Local

A Guide to NY Republicans
by Amy Eddings

NEW YORK, NY (2004-08-25) About five thousand Republican delegates will storm into the Democratic stronghold that is New York next week, adding their numbers to about half million registered Republicans here. Republicans make up only about fifteen percent of the registered voters in New York City. So who are they? And where are they?

Joining us in the studio is demographer Andrew Beveridge. He's a Sociology Professor at Queens College and a contributor to the magazine, Gotham Gazette.

http://www.publicbroadcasting.net/wnyc/news.newsmain?action=article&ARTICLE_ID=677442

© Copyright 2004, WNYC

Download the free Real Audio Player.

New York City Is a Non-Voting Town
by Andrew Beveridge
August, 2004

Though it is common to call New York City a Democratic town, Democrats are actually in the minority. In election after election, the solid majority is made up of non-voters.

That is how roughly only 15 percent of all New Yorkers eligible to vote made Michael Bloomberg the mayor in 2001. In the last presidential election, in 2000, fewer than half of New Yorkers eligible to vote bothered to do so - and that is the highest it ever gets.

So who are these non-voters?
<http://www.gothamgazette.com/article/demographics/20040811/5/1083>

Who Are NYC's Republicans?
by Andrew Beveridge
January, 2004

As the Republicans prepare for their first-ever national convention to take place in New York City, are they struggling to come up with a welcoming committee of native New Yorkers? Surely, Republican Governor George Pataki will play a part, but what about Republicans specifically from the city? It is true that for almost 10 years New York City's mayor has been a Republican, but both Rudy Giuliani and Michael Bloomberg used to be Democrats, and they won election in part because they were willing to abandon many now-core national GOP positions, including banning abortion and not granting gay people full equality.

<http://www.gothamgazette.com/article/Demographics/20040126/5/853>

Andrew A. Beveridge
Professor of Sociology
Queens College and Grad Ctr CUNY
Suite 233 Powdermaker Hall
65-30 Kissena Blvd
Flushing, NY 11367-1597
Phone: 718-997-2837
FAX: 718-997-2820
email: beveridg@optonline.net
web: www.socialexplorer.com
Home Office
50 Merriam Avenue
Bronxville, NY 10708-2743
Phone: 914-337-6237
FAX: 914-337-8210
email: beveridg@optonline.net

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Fri, 27 Aug 2004 13:42:22 -0500
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: Two Job Opportunities
Comments: To: AAPORNet@asu.edu
Comments: cc: areale@pollingcompany.com
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Two Job Opportunities =20
=20
Position Opening: Research Analyst=20

=20

the polling company(tm), inc./ WomanTrend, a full-service market research firm headquartered in Washington DC, seeks a qualified Research Analyst for immediate hire.=20

=20

Job Description: The Research Analyst will be involved in all stages of project development, planning and execution with respect to proposals, research program design, sample and questionnaire construction, data analysis, and report writing for quantitative and qualitative research.=20

=20

The Research Analyst must have strong methodological background and advanced knowledge of various research methods as well as experience with relevant software programs and interfacing with data collection centers.

=20

The Research Analyst will report to the President and CEO and work with Project Managers and other Research Analysts on all phases of projects.

=20

Qualifications: Applicants should have 3+ years experience in the survey research field, be able to manage several tasks at the same time, work with a dedicated team of analysts and project managers, and willing to work in a small group and fast-paced environment. The applicant must be skilled in survey methodology, particularly sample design, and should have extensive knowledge of SPSS, MS Word, Access and Excel and Internet applications. Strong writing skills and statistical knowledge is a must. Candidate must have Bachelor's Degree, with higher education a plus. Salary requirements should be addressed in cover letter. =20

=20

Please send updated resumes and at least three references to info@pollingcompany.com or fax them to (202) 467-6551. For more information about the polling company(tm), inc., please access our website at www.pollingcompany.com <<http://www.pollingcompany.com/>> .

=20

=20

=20

Position Opening: Project Consultant=20

=20

the polling company(tm), inc./ WomanTrend, a full-service market research firm headquartered in Washington DC, seeks a qualified Project Consultant for immediate hire.=20

=20

Candidates with a strong background in one or all of the following areas of expertise should apply: methodology, sampling and weighting, qualitative and quantitative analysis, proposal composition, focus group moderation, focus group recruitment, survey development, and business development.=20

=20

The ideal candidate will possess strong organizational, professional, analytical, interpersonal and communication skills. The candidate must have an ability to learn quickly, think creatively, work well independently, write concise sharp analysis, and contribute to internal meetings. =20

=20

Project Consultants will be responsible for assisting President and CEO and Project Managers on a project-by-project basis. This is not considered a full-time or salaried position, but is ideal for graduate students, part-time workers or independent consultants who are engaged with other projects. =20

=20

Qualifications: Applicants should have 3+ years experience in related areas of expertise and be willing to work in a small group environment. Applicants must be familiar with research methodology, particularly sample design, and should have extensive knowledge of SPSS, MS Word,

Access and Excel and Internet applications. Strong writing skills and statistical knowledge is a must. Candidate must have Bachelor's Degree, with higher education a plus. Salary requirements for this temporary position should be addressed in cover letter. Please note areas of expertise and industry background in cover letter as well. =20

=20

Please send resumes and references to info@pollingcompany.com or fax them to (202)467-6551. For more information about the polling company(tm), inc., please access our website at www.pollingcompany.com <<http://www.pollingcompany.com/>> .

=20

=20

=20

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Fri, 27 Aug 2004 14:35:56 -0500
Reply-To: "Charles H. Franklin" <franklin@POLISCI.WISC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Charles H. Franklin" <franklin@POLISCI.WISC.EDU>
Subject: 2004 Election Panel Study (Wave 1) Data Now Available
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; format=flowed; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

2004 Election Panel Study, Wave I, Data Now Available

The Center for the Study of Elections and Democracy (CSED) at Brigham Young University and the Wisconsin Advertising Project at the University of Wisconsin, Madison are conducting a panel study this election year to better understand the link between campaign communications and voter behavior.

We are making these survey data available to the research community as quickly as possible so that other scholars can conduct micro-level analysis of the dynamics of voting behavior immediately, as well as after the election.

We are conducting a three-wave panel study to measure the impact of campaign communications at critical points during the campaign. We conducted the first wave over an eight day period between June 24 and July 3, completing 2,782 interviews comprising a random sample of the United States with an oversample of potential voters in presidential and Senate battleground states. We also oversampled voters in Ohio for a representative look at that key state.

The second wave of interviewing will occur in early September. The third wave will begin on Tuesday evening November 2nd (Election Day). These waves will be released as quickly as possible following merging and after consistency checks are completed.

Although much of the instrumentation in the survey is designed to tap the effect of campaign communications on voter behavior, there are a slew of other questions that we hope other scholars can make use of in their research and we are happy to provide real time access to that data as soon as possible over the course of our study and beyond.

The data are available from our web site at

http://csp.polisci.wisc.edu/BYU_UW/Index.asp

The website includes the questionnaire, sample design, benchmark frequencies, press releases and of course the data. Due to the oversampling of battleground states, the data must be weighted. See the sampling description on the website for the details of the design.

We ask users to register so we may contact those using the data with updates and announcements. You are free to use the data as you wish, though the data source should be cited as

The 2004 Election Panel Study, BYU Center for the Study of Elections and Democracy and UW-Madison Wisconsin Advertising Project. Electronic resources from the EPS Web site (http://csp.polisci.wisc.edu/BYU_UW/). Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin, Wisconsin Advertising Project [producer and distributor], 2004, Wave 1.

Principal investigators for the BYU/UW Election Panel Study are David B. Magleby and Kelly D. Patterson at BYU and Kenneth M. Goldstein and Charles H. Franklin at Wisconsin.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Sat, 28 Aug 2004 13:45:58 -0400
Reply-To: Diane Bowers <dbowers@casro.org>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Diane Bowers <dbowers@CASRO.ORG>
Organization: CASRO
Subject: FTC's Rulemaking on CAN SPAM Definitions
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

AAPORnetters: Duane Berlin, counsel to AAPOR and CASRO, has reported = that the FTC has issued its report on their earlier request for public = comment on the definitions and possible expansion of "commercial" in the = CAN SPAM Act. In April, AAPOR joined CASRO in submitting comments, =

urging the FTC to maintain its current "commercial" focus and =
definitions, which do not cover survey research emails. The FTC received =
14,000 public comments on this issue. The FTC's report: (1) confirms =
that CAN SPAM will apply only to "commercial" emails and that survey =
research is not "commercial" and (2) indicates, in distinguishing =
legitimate survey research emails from sales emails, that survey =
research emails are informational rather than commercial. (Fed.Reg., =
Vol. 69, No. 156, 8/13/04) The AAPOR/CASRO comments were among a small =
number of comments specifically cited in the text (and footnotes) of the =
FTC's report. In noting their appreciation of our comments, the FTC =
acknowledged our concerns about "sugging" (marketers who evade CAN SPAM =
"by adding minimal noncommercial content, or by masking commercial =
content as noncommercial information content") and stated that the =
"commercial" definitions and criteria must "prevent such illegitimate =
conduct from being successful." Check with AAPOR or CASRO for the =
complete text of our comments and the FTC's report. Diane Bowers

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====
Date: Sun, 29 Aug 2004 18:59:02 -0400
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Subject: demonstrations
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Just back from the anti-Bush march in New York. Is there any good
info on how these large demonstrations affect public opinion, if at
all?

By the way, the piece below certainly contradicts a lot of received wisdom.

Doug Henwood
Left Business Observer
38 Greene St - 4th fl.
New York NY 10013-2505 USA
voice +1-212-219-0010
fax +1-212-219-0098
cell +1-917-865-2813
email <<mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>>
web <<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>>

Editor & Publisher - August 27, 2004

Challenging a Media Myth: '68 Riots Didn't Doom Humphrey

NEW YORK If you've read or heard it once, you've probably read or heard it a hundred times in the past few weeks: If anti-Bush protests turn violent at the Republican National Convention in New York next week, it will surely doom Sen. John Kerry (news - web sites) to defeat in November. After all, the conventional wisdom holds, this is precisely what happened to Vice President Hubert Humphrey in 1968 after the infamous street battles that took place in Chicago during the Democratic gathering there, at the height of the Vietnam War.

As often is the case in such distant matters, a little research shows that this is plain bunk. Humphrey actually gained in the polls immediately following the convention.

According to Gallup Poll data, in a national survey taken Aug. 7-12, 1968, before the Chicago convention, Republican nominee Richard M. Nixon easily led Humphrey (who was expected to get his party's nod later that month in Chicago) by 38.5% to 26%, with the third-party candidate, Gov. George Wallace, grabbing 16.7%.

So what did the Gallup survey taken on Aug. 30 of that year, immediately after the Chicago convention, with the protestor/police riots still fresh in the public's mind, show? Humphrey actually gained support, with Nixon steady at 38.2%, Humphrey up to 28.7% and Wallace at 19.5%.

In other words, post-riots, Humphrey, who had trailed by 12.5%, had closed the gap to 9.5%.

The next poll, taken Sept. 19-24, showed almost no difference. Only later did Humphrey make his run, nearly catching Nixon in the popular vote (partly due to the vice president belatedly taking a more dovish position on the war).

Another question often raised in accounts of 1968: Why was there such anger among antiwar protestors and dovish Democratic delegates over the convention choosing Humphrey as their candidate?

One explanation: Gallup, in that pre-convention poll taken Aug. 7-12, also asked where people would stand if the peace candidate, Sen. Eugene McCarthy, got the Democratic nod. The result put McCarthy much closer to Nixon than Humphrey at that point: Nixon 38.6%, McCarthy 33.4% and Wallace 15.5%.

Asked to pick the party nominee, 48% named McCarthy, 36% Humphrey.

Perhaps that's why, in the August 30 poll, a vast majority of Americans (76% in favor) said they favored "a nationwide primary election" to select nominees in the future, not party conventions.

--Greg Mitchell is editor of E&P.

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Sun, 29 Aug 2004 19:53:30 -0400
Reply-To: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>
Subject: Re: demonstrations
Comments: To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <p05200f02bd580faa9079@[192.168.1.100]>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Ah, Chicago in 1968. I remember it well, having covered it for what was then Knight Newspapers.

There's another explanation for Humphrey's loss.

The polls in spring of that year showed him far behind, and he had trouble raising money. When he gained on Nixon in late summer and early fall, the money started rolling in, but it was too late to sew up commercial time on the limited number of national television channels that we had then.

Some folks blamed the polls. I blamed the contributors for believing that a poll in March could predict an outcome in November. As it turned out, the difference between Humphrey and Nixon in the popular vote was indistinguishable from rounding error. Any number of trivial things could have changed the outcome.

Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Voice: 919 962-4085 Fax: 919 962-1549
Cell: 919 906-3425 URL: www.unc.edu/~pmeyer

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Sun, 29 Aug 2004 21:54:19 -0400
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Subject: Re: demonstrations
Comments: To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <p05200f02bd580faa9079@[192.168.1.100]>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

From today's Hotline to support Doug's article:

INSIDER POLL

GOP Pros See Little Protest Effect

Protesters monopolized the media attention today, but Convention Daily's survey of Republican Insiders finds that few pols expect the protests to have much effect. Just five of the 47 Insiders said the protesters would mar the convention, while nine argued the backlash would benefit President Bush. "Anti-Bush activists will stir up our base," one Insider said. "We should pay for them to come."

New York teacher John Callanan, who was hoisting an official Bush-Cheney '04 sign as he watched today's march pass 34th St. and 7th Ave., concurred with most Insiders: "I'm in the St. Patrick's Day parade every year," he said, "and it does the exact same thing." So much for disruption and anarchy.

At 06:59 PM 8/29/2004, Doug Henwood wrote:

>Just back from the anti-Bush march in New York. Is there any good
>info on how these large demonstrations affect public opinion, if at
>all?

>

>By the way, the piece below certainly contradicts a lot of received wisdom.

>

>Doug Henwood

>Left Business Observer

>38 Greene St - 4th fl.

>New York NY 10013-2505 USA

>voice +1-212-219-0010

>fax +1-212-219-0098

>cell +1-917-865-2813

>email <<mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>>

>web <<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>>

>

>-----

>

>Editor & Publisher - August 27, 2004

>

>Challenging a Media Myth: '68 Riots Didn't Doom Humphrey

>

>N EW YORK If you've read or heard it once, you've probably read or
>heard it a hundred times in the past few weeks: If anti-Bush protests
>turn violent at the Republican National Convention in New York next
>week, it will surely doom Sen. John Kerry (news - web sites) to
>defeat in November. After all, the conventional wisdom holds, this is
>precisely what happened to Vice President Hubert Humphrey in 1968
>after the infamous street battles that took place in Chicago during
>the Democratic gathering there, at the height of the Vietnam War.

>

>As often is the case in such distant matters, a little research shows
>that this is plain bunk. Humphrey actually gained in the polls
>immediately following the convention.

>

>According to Gallup Poll data, in a national survey taken Aug. 7-12,
>1968, before the Chicago convention, Republican nominee Richard M.
>Nixon easily led Humphrey (who was expected to get his party's nod
>later that month in Chicago) by 38.5% to 26%, with the third-party
>candidate, Gov. George Wallace, grabbing 16.7%.
>
>So what did the Gallup survey taken on Aug. 30 of that year,
>immediately after the Chicago convention, with the protestor/police
>riots still fresh in the public's mind, show? Humphrey actually
>gained support, with Nixon steady at 38.2%, Humphrey up to 28.7% and
>Wallace at 19.5%.
>
>In other words, post-riots, Humphrey, who had trailed by 12.5%, had
>closed the gap to 9.5%.
>
>The next poll, taken Sept. 19-24, showed almost no difference. Only
>later did Humphrey make his run, nearly catching Nixon in the popular
>vote (partly due to the vice president belatedly taking a more dovish
>position on the war).
>
>Another question often raised in accounts of 1968: Why was there such
>anger among antiwar protestors and dovish Democratic delegates over
>the convention choosing Humphrey as their candidate?
>
>One explanation: Gallup, in that pre-convention poll taken Aug. 7-12,
>also asked where people would stand if the peace candidate, Sen.
>Eugene McCarthy, got the Democratic nod. The result put McCarthy much
>closer to Nixon than Humphrey at that point: Nixon 38.6%, McCarthy
>33.4% and Wallace 15.5%.
>
>Asked to pick the party nominee, 48% named McCarthy, 36% Humphrey.
>
>Perhaps that's why, in the August 30 poll, a vast majority of
>Americans (76% in favor) said they favored "a nationwide primary
>election" to select nominees in the future, not party conventions.
>
>--Greg Mitchell is editor of E&P.

>-----
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
>set aapornet nomail
>On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====
Date: Mon, 30 Aug 2004 00:40:49 -0700
Reply-To: phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Phillip J. Trounstine" <phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU>
Subject: Re: demonstrations
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

It will be fascinating to watch how the cable news media play the demonstrations. In 1968, we saw demonstrations against the incumbent party holding its convention. These were said to hurt that party. Whether they really did, as Phil Meyer and Doug Henwood have noted, is likely a myth. But now the demonstrations against the incumbent party holding the convention, according to some of the cable shout jockeys, are said to hurt the party NOT holding the convention. Doesn't it make more sense to argue -- as many do, when there are huge demonstrations against governments abroad -- that demonstrations on this scale are a measure of the boiling unpopularity of the incumbent regime. Will we hear that analysis?

Phil Trounstine
Survey and Policy Research Institute
at San Jose State University
408-924-6993
phil.trounstine@sjsu.edu

Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Sent by: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
08/29/2004 06:54 PM
Please respond to Warren Mitofsky

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
cc:
Subject: Re: demonstrations

From today's Hotline to support Doug's article:

INSIDER POLL

GOP Pros See Little Protest Effect

Protesters monopolized the media attention today, but Convention Daily's survey of Republican Insiders finds that few pols expect the protests to have much effect. Just five of the 47 Insiders said the protesters would mar the convention, while nine argued the backlash would benefit President Bush. "Anti-Bush activists will stir up our base," one Insider said. "We should pay for them to come."

New York teacher John Callanan, who was hoisting an official Bush-Cheney '04 sign as he watched today's march pass 34th St. and 7th Ave., concurred with most Insiders: "I'm in the St. Patrick's Day parade every year," he said, "and it does the exact same thing." So much for disruption and anarchy.

At 06:59 PM 8/29/2004, Doug Henwood wrote:

>Just back from the anti-Bush march in New York. Is there any good
>info on how these large demonstrations affect public opinion, if at
>all?

>

>By the way, the piece below certainly contradicts a lot of received
wisdom.

>

>Doug Henwood

>Left Business Observer

>38 Greene St - 4th fl.

>New York NY 10013-2505 USA

>voice +1-212-219-0010

>fax +1-212-219-0098

>cell +1-917-865-2813

>email <<mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>>

>web <<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>>

>

>-----

>

>Editor & Publisher - August 27, 2004

>

>Challenging a Media Myth: '68 Riots Didn't Doom Humphrey

>

>N EW YORK If you've read or heard it once, you've probably read or
>heard it a hundred times in the past few weeks: If anti-Bush protests
>turn violent at the Republican National Convention in New York next
>week, it will surely doom Sen. John Kerry (news - web sites) to
>defeat in November. After all, the conventional wisdom holds, this is
>precisely what happened to Vice President Hubert Humphrey in 1968
>after the infamous street battles that took place in Chicago during
>the Democratic gathering there, at the height of the Vietnam War.

>

>As often is the case in such distant matters, a little research shows
>that this is plain bunk. Humphrey actually gained in the polls
>immediately following the convention.

>

>According to Gallup Poll data, in a national survey taken Aug. 7-12,
>1968, before the Chicago convention, Republican nominee Richard M.
>Nixon easily led Humphrey (who was expected to get his party's nod
>later that month in Chicago) by 38.5% to 26%, with the third-party
>candidate, Gov. George Wallace, grabbing 16.7%.

>

>So what did the Gallup survey taken on Aug. 30 of that year,
>immediately after the Chicago convention, with the protestor/police
>riots still fresh in the public's mind, show? Humphrey actually
>gained support, with Nixon steady at 38.2%, Humphrey up to 28.7% and
>Wallace at 19.5%.

>

>In other words, post-riots, Humphrey, who had trailed by 12.5%, had
>closed the gap to 9.5%.

>
>The next poll, taken Sept. 19-24, showed almost no difference. Only
>later did Humphrey make his run, nearly catching Nixon in the popular
>vote (partly due to the vice president belatedly taking a more dovish
>position on the war).
>
>Another question often raised in accounts of 1968: Why was there such
>anger among antiwar protestors and dovish Democratic delegates over
>the convention choosing Humphrey as their candidate?
>
>One explanation: Gallup, in that pre-convention poll taken Aug. 7-12,
>also asked where people would stand if the peace candidate, Sen.
>Eugene McCarthy, got the Democratic nod. The result put McCarthy much
>closer to Nixon than Humphrey at that point: Nixon 38.6%, McCarthy
>33.4% and Wallace 15.5%.
>
>Asked to pick the party nominee, 48% named McCarthy, 36% Humphrey.
>
>Perhaps that's why, in the August 30 poll, a vast majority of
>Americans (76% in favor) said they favored "a nationwide primary
>election" to select nominees in the future, not party conventions.
>
>--Greg Mitchell is editor of E&P.

>-----
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
>set aapornet nomail
>On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Mon, 30 Aug 2004 10:54:14 -0400
Reply-To: Johnhuffmanjr@CS.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Johnhuffmanjr@CS.COM
Subject: Position Opening, Survey Operations and Methodology
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

MBNA Customer Insights is hiring for positions to further the company's growth

through research findings. Qualified applicants should have a thorough knowledge of survey research, market research methodologies and applications, data collection methods, sample management, and various analytic techniques.

Location: Wilmington, DE

Please forward resume to John.Huffman@mbna.com or Johnhuffmanjr@cs.com

Company Overview:

MBNA is the world's largest independent credit card issuer, with managed loans over \$90 billion. The company also provides retail deposit, consumer loans, and insurance products. The company maintains its international headquarters in Wilmington, Delaware, and has operations throughout the United States, in Canada, Ireland, and the United Kingdom.

Company Highlights/Work Environment:

We're MBNA, the largest independent credit card lender in the world. What sets us apart from other companies is our commitment to finding the right Customers and keeping them.

This goal helped us become the world's largest issuer of the Gold MasterCard®. As we continue to grow, our Customers remain our top priority.

And that commitment means a world of opportunity for you, because people are the key to success at MBNA. MBNA has more than 25,000 people to serve our Customers in offices from Maine to Florida, from Maryland to California, and at our locations in Canada, the United Kingdom, and Ireland.

If you are highly motivated and want to work in a challenging environment, we want to hear from you. As an MBNA person, you will receive a highly competitive compensation and benefits package as well as exceptional opportunities to grow professionally and personally.

MBNA has attracted national attention for its work environment as well as its business performance. In 2001, the company was named one of Working Mother magazine's top 100 companies for family and work policies for the tenth consecutive year. For the fourth year in a row, FORTUNE magazine ranked MBNA one of the top companies to work for in the United States. Standard & Poor's reported that MBNA had the best five-year annualized return of any bank in the S&P 500.

MBNA has produced consistent earnings increases, averaging 25%, in each of the 44 quarters since it became a public company.

Company Benefits:

Here is a sample of Benefits offered by MBNA:

- Paid Holidays and Vacation
- Access to Fitness Centers
- Intramural Sports
- Healthful Meals
- Insurance, Medical, Dental, and Vision Coverage
- 401(k) Plus Savings Plan
- Access to Childcare

- Financial Assistance with Adoption
- Paid Leave for Parents of Newborns
- Paid Advanced Education

MBNA is proud to support workplace diversity and to be a voluntary Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer.

John Huffman
Vice-President
R&D, Customer Insights
MBNA
Wilmington, DE
(302) 432-4501
Fax (302) 432-3087
John.Huffman@MBNA.com

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Mon, 30 Aug 2004 12:53:08 -0500
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Organization: Market Shares Corporation
Subject: Distance between Zips
Comments: To: "aapornet@asu.edu" <aapornet@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

A colleague of mine is looking for a program that will calculate distances between a zip code for a location or site and zip codes of respondents to a survey.

Does anyone provide such a program? Please let me know so I can send it along.

Thanks

Nick

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Mon, 30 Aug 2004 15:09:22 -0400
Reply-To: rusciano@RIDER.EDU
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
Organization: Rider University
Subject: Re: demonstrations
Comments: To: phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Phil is right-- it will be interesting to see how this plays out. One of the most important messages to come out of a political convention is an impression more than anything else-- i.e. that the country is behind the candidate, since that is the only "audience" in the hall. If, however, there are 200,000 or so people in the streets saying otherwise, it might change the story, particularly if they are peaceful. (Note the front page picture in the New York Times today). Also, the Bush campaign has been very careful to keep demonstrations away from Bush, usually by allowing only supporters into his rallies or by having attendees sign an affidavit supporting Bush/Cheney for re-election. Again, this kind of isolation is ended as an impression if there are sufficient demonstrators outside the convention center, since that cannot be controlled in the same way. So we'll see.

"Phillip J. Trounstine" wrote:

> It will be fascinating to watch how the cable news media play the
> demonstrations. In 1968, we saw demonstrations against the incumbent party
> holding its convention. These were said to hurt that party. Whether they
> really did, as Phil Meyer and Doug Henwood have noted, is likely a myth.
> But now the demonstrations against the incumbent party holding the
> convention, according to some of the cable shout jockeys, are said to hurt
> the party NOT holding the convention. Doesn't it make more sense to argue
> -- as many do, when there are huge demonstrations against governments
> abroad -- that demonstrations on this scale are a measure of the boiling
> unpopularity of the incumbent regime. Will we hear that analysis?

>
> Phil Trounstine
> Survey and Policy Research Institute
> at San Jose State University
> 408-924-6993
> phil.trounstine@sjsu.edu

>
> Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
> Sent by: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
> 08/29/2004 06:54 PM
> Please respond to Warren Mitofsky

>
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> cc:
> Subject: Re: demonstrations

>
> From today's Hotline to support Doug's article:

>
> INSIDER POLL
> GOP Pros See Little Protest Effect
> Protesters monopolized the media attention today, but Convention Daily's
> survey of Republican Insiders finds that few pols expect the protests to
> have much effect. Just five of the 47 Insiders said the protesters would
> mar the convention, while nine argued the backlash would benefit President
> Bush. "Anti-Bush activists will stir up our base," one Insider said. "We

> should pay for them to come."

>

> New York teacher John Callanan, who was hoisting an official Bush-Cheney
> '04 sign as he watched today's march pass 34th St. and 7th Ave., concurred
> with most Insiders: "I'm in the St. Patrick's Day parade every year," he
> said, "and it does the exact same thing." So much for disruption and
> anarchy.

>

> At 06:59 PM 8/29/2004, Doug Henwood wrote:

>>Just back from the anti-Bush march in New York. Is there any good
>>info on how these large demonstrations affect public opinion, if at
>>all?

>>

>>By the way, the piece below certainly contradicts a lot of received
> wisdom.

>>

>>Doug Henwood

>>Left Business Observer

>>38 Greene St - 4th fl.

>>New York NY 10013-2505 USA

>>voice +1-212-219-0010

>>fax +1-212-219-0098

>>cell +1-917-865-2813

>>email <<mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>>

>>web <<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>>

>>

>>-----

>>

>>Editor & Publisher - August 27, 2004

>>

>>Challenging a Media Myth: '68 Riots Didn't Doom Humphrey

>>

>>N EW YORK If you've read or heard it once, you've probably read or
>>heard it a hundred times in the past few weeks: If anti-Bush protests
>>turn violent at the Republican National Convention in New York next
>>week, it will surely doom Sen. John Kerry (news - web sites) to
>>defeat in November. After all, the conventional wisdom holds, this is
>>precisely what happened to Vice President Hubert Humphrey in 1968
>>after the infamous street battles that took place in Chicago during
>>the Democratic gathering there, at the height of the Vietnam War.

>>

>>As often is the case in such distant matters, a little research shows
>>that this is plain bunk. Humphrey actually gained in the polls
>>immediately following the convention.

>>

>>According to Gallup Poll data, in a national survey taken Aug. 7-12,
>>1968, before the Chicago convention, Republican nominee Richard M.
>>Nixon easily led Humphrey (who was expected to get his party's nod
>>later that month in Chicago) by 38.5% to 26%, with the third-party
>>candidate, Gov. George Wallace, grabbing 16.7%.

>>

>>So what did the Gallup survey taken on Aug. 30 of that year,
>>immediately after the Chicago convention, with the protestor/police
>>riots still fresh in the public's mind, show? Humphrey actually

>>gained support, with Nixon steady at 38.2%, Humphrey up to 28.7% and
>>Wallace at 19.5%.

>>
>>In other words, post-riots, Humphrey, who had trailed by 12.5%, had
>>closed the gap to 9.5%.

>>
>>The next poll, taken Sept. 19-24, showed almost no difference. Only
>>later did Humphrey make his run, nearly catching Nixon in the popular
>>vote (partly due to the vice president belatedly taking a more dovish
>>position on the war).

>>
>>Another question often raised in accounts of 1968: Why was there such
>>anger among antiwar protestors and dovish Democratic delegates over
>>the convention choosing Humphrey as their candidate?

>>
>>One explanation: Gallup, in that pre-convention poll taken Aug. 7-12,
>>also asked where people would stand if the peace candidate, Sen.
>>Eugene McCarthy, got the Democratic nod. The result put McCarthy much
>>closer to Nixon than Humphrey at that point: Nixon 38.6%, McCarthy
>>33.4% and Wallace 15.5%.

>>
>>Asked to pick the party nominee, 48% named McCarthy, 36% Humphrey.

>>
>>Perhaps that's why, in the August 30 poll, a vast majority of
>>Americans (76% in favor) said they favored "a nationwide primary
>>election" to select nominees in the future, not party conventions.

>>
>>--Greg Mitchell is editor of E&P.

>>
>>-----
>>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>>Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
>>set aapornet nomail
>>On your return send: set aapornet mail
>
>-----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> set aapornet nomail
> On your return send: set aapornet mail
>
>-----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Mon, 30 Aug 2004 14:52:13 -0400
Reply-To: Dan Tashjian <tashjian@voyager.net>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Dan Tashjian <tashjian@VOYAGER.NET>
Subject: CATI recommendations

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Is there a consensus among AAPORNETers
about the "best" CATI software available?

Any advice and distinctions would be
greatly appreciated.

Thanks,
Dan Tashjian
Essential Strategies

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Mon, 30 Aug 2004 15:14:34 -0400
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Subject: Re: demonstrations
Comments: To: rusciano@RIDER.EDU, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <41337B61.4BA78570@rider.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Is there any polling evidence on the effects of demonstrations in
general? They make the demonstrators feel good (me included), but I
wonder if they change anyone's mind at all.

--

Doug Henwood
Left Business Observer
38 Greene St - 4th fl.
New York NY 10013-2505 USA
voice +1-212-219-0010
fax +1-212-219-0098
cell +1-917-865-2813
email <<mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>>
web <<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>>

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Mon, 30 Aug 2004 15:47:45 -0400
Reply-To: Michael Cohen <michael.cohen@BTS.GOV>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Michael Cohen <michael.cohen@BTS.GOV>
Subject: Re: Distance between Zips
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu, mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM

Comments: cc: Felix Tagoe <FTagoe@inet.bts.gov>, Mohamad Dipo <MDipo@inet.bts.gov>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable
Content-disposition: inline

My colleague M. Adhi Dipo supplies this response:

Depending on the budget, There are a couple good routing softwares = publicly available. All of them are single mode (highway mode only):

1. DeLorme's Street Atlas USA=AE 2005; (\$49.95 -\$99.95); Capable to route = from point-to-point (zip-to-zip) using build in routing model, build in = highway database and zip code database. We used this software (2002 = version) to locate zip and to compare mileage/routes

2. DeLorme's XMap=AE 4.5 Professional Software; (\$250.00 --plus U.S. = Streets Network 2004 Data.) Datasets need to get purchased separately. = Powerful and scalable mapping software. More customizable than item no 1, = able to import data from outside. Capable to route from point-to-point = with all map datasets using build in routing model.

<http://www.delorme.com/professional/>=20
=20

My colleague Felix Ammah-Tagoe adds:

In addition, there are a number of commercial applications available that = could be helpful to this person. ESRI in California has a suite of = applications that could be customized for this purpose. Their products = are much more versatile than some of the other ones on the market. Their = web site is www.esri.com.

Michael P. Cohen
Assistant Director for Survey Programs
Bureau of Transportation Statistics
400 Seventh Street SW #4432
Washington DC 20590 USA
phone 202-366-9949 fax 202-366-3385

>>> Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM> 08/30/04 01:53PM >>>

A colleague of mine is looking for a program that will calculate distances between a zip code for a location or site and zip codes of respondents to a survey.

Does anyone provide such a program? Please let me know so I can send it along.

Thanks

Nick

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Mon, 30 Aug 2004 15:01:06 -0500
Reply-To: sfrank@stcloudstate.edu
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Steve Frank <sfrank@STCLOUDSTATE.EDU>
Organization: scsu
Subject: effect of demonstrations
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I am at home and can't access the material but I believe Michigan or NORC has asked national samples if they have engaged in various "conventional" or nonconventional activities. They ask respondents if they done various things such as attend a legal rally, participated in a boycott, and then activities such as destroying property.

With respect to the more conventional actives few Americans have gone to a legal rally (I think about 15% while only about 10% disapprove. Only 2% have done the less conventional activities with almost all disapproving.

Of course if I remember right most white Americans disapproved of Dr. King's nonviolent sit ins, etc.

If my figures are wrong please correct me. sf

From Zagat Survey Restaurant Reviews (names of restaurants omitted--who says surveys don't provide useful information

"Duck must have had a long flight -- tired, tough and took 90 minutes to arrive." "My Russian mother makes better French food." "The waiter flipped our pizza onto the floor, face down. He scooped it back up and told us it was okay." "Breaking bread' should not mean you have to use the side of the table"

Dr. Steve Frank, SCSU Professor of Political Science
319 Brown Hall SCSU St. Cloud, MN 56301
Codirector SCSU Survey
President MN Political Science Association

<http://www.mrs.umn.edu/mnpsa/>
(320) 308-4131 Fax (320) 308-5422
email sfsurvey@stcloudstate.edu
Personal Homepage <http://web.stcloudstate.edu/sfrank>
SCSU Survey Homepage <http://web.stcloudstate.edu/scsusurvey>

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Mon, 30 Aug 2004 13:15:15 -0700
Reply-To: Jerold Pearson <jpearson@STANFORD.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jerold Pearson <jpearson@STANFORD.EDU>
Subject: Literary Digest redux?
Comments: To: por@vance.irss.unc.edu, aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Does anyone else get the feeling that the polling biz is about to pull another Literary Digest?

I don't do election polling, and I don't know what statistical techniques various firms are using, but I wonder if the polling outfits aren't falling prey to big time coverage error, seriously undercounting Kerry supporters. Huge numbers of new voters are being registered each week (and are thus not included in the polls we see), more and more younger voters have only cell phones, lower SES voters are more difficult to reach on the phone. I also wonder if the "likely voter" models being used are not out of date or just irrelevant: Ever since the primaries, there seems to be evidence of a larger than usual turnout motivated by intense and widespread desire to defeat Bush. And Kerry is now attracting huge crowds even in swing states (60,000 in Portland, 20,000 I think in Seattle, etc etc) that undermine media reports of his lackluster appeal. This year's likely voter may be quite different from 2000's likely voter.

Also, the internals of the polls we've seen lately indicate that, compared to 2000, Bush is losing support among Hispanics, Blacks, Arabs, Jews, and other demographic groups (most notably, independents). The internals also show that more Bush 2000 voters support Kerry than Gore voters support Bush. So how on earth do the numbers show a dead heat?

Right track/wrong track numbers are dismal for the incumbent, Iraq becomes bloodier and bleaker by the hour, the economy is stuck in low gear and millions are still out of work. Is Fear And Smear enough to make up for all of that?

Again, I don't do election polling, so I could be wrong. But I'd love to hear what others think about this. I am truly baffled.

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

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

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

Date: Mon, 30 Aug 2004 22:20:22 -0400
Reply-To: rusciano@RIDER.EDU
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
Organization: Rider University
Subject: Re: Literary Digest redux?
Comments: To: Jerold Pearson <jpearson@STANFORD.EDU>
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Jerold,

I think many people have been thinking the same thing this year-- i.e. that the polarization of the electorate may raise turnout or affect it in ways that make predictions based upon previous models of "likely voters" unworkable. At the same time, I recall in 1984 people saying "Oh, the Democrats are registering a lot of people" and we know how that turned out. If the thirty-six year cycle for elections holds, we should be up for a major upheaval this election (the last one was 1968). What that means in terms of results remains to be seen though.

Also, the size of crowds does not necessarily serve as a good measure of actual support, although Truman's election indicated that someone perhaps should have been watching that factor.

Frank Rusciano

Jerold Pearson wrote:

- > Does anyone else get the feeling that the polling biz is about to pull
- > another Literary Digest?
- >
- > I don't do election polling, and I don't know what statistical techniques
- > various firms are using, but I wonder if the polling outfits aren't falling
- > prey to big time coverage error, seriously undercounting Kerry
- > supporters. Huge numbers of new voters are being registered each week (and
- > are thus not included in the polls we see), more and more younger voters
- > have only cell phones, lower SES voters are more difficult to reach on the
- > phone. I also wonder if the "likely voter" models being used are not out
- > of date or just irrelevant: Ever since the primaries, there seems to be
- > evidence of a larger than usual turnout motivated by intense and widespread
- > desire to defeat Bush. And Kerry is now attracting huge crowds even in
- > swing states (60,000 in Portland, 20,000 I think in Seattle, etc etc) that
- > undermine media reports of his lackluster appeal. This year's likely voter
- > may be quite different from 2000's likely voter.
- >
- > Also, the internals of the polls we've seen lately indicate that, compared

> to 2000, Bush is losing support among Hispanics, Blacks, Arabs, Jews, and
> other demographic groups (most notably, independents). The internals also
> show that more Bush 2000 voters support Kerry than Gore voters support
> Bush. So how on earth do the numbers show a dead heat?
>
> Right track/wrong track numbers are dismal for the incumbent, Iraq becomes
> bloodier and bleaker by the hour, the economy is stuck in low gear and
> millions are still out of work. Is Fear And Smear enough to make up for
> all of that?
>
> Again, I don't do election polling, so I could be wrong. But I'd love to
> hear what others think about this. I am truly baffled.
>
> Jerold Pearson, '75
> Director of Market Research
> Stanford Alumni Association
> 650-723-9186
> jpearson@stanford.edu
> <http://www.stanford.edu/~jpearson/>
>
> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Tue, 31 Aug 2004 08:09:10 -0400
Reply-To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Literary Digest redux?
Comments: To: "rusciano@RIDER.EDU" <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

The likelihood of a Literary Digest style debacle is substantial, but not, in my opinion, solely because of any fault in the modeling of likely voters or interpretation of results, nor even in the disconnect between the popular vote and the workings of the electoral college.

Recall that the problem in 1936 was sampling error, specifically the use of telephone listings and vehicle ownership records during the Great Depression, a time when a large percentage of citizens owned neither a telephone nor an automobile. Those economically disadvantaged were systematically excluded from the LD poll, but they did show up and vote for FDR.

Current polling tells us that Mr. Kerry's strongest support comes from the 18-35 year old age cohort. In the state of Michigan, the 2000 Census places 32% of the 18+ population in that age category. A conventional calling strategy, using up to 30 attempts to secure an interview from an RDD list places 21% of the respondents in the 18-35 year-old bracket. Analysis of the respondents who were reached and interviewed on the first attempt places 12% in that bracket. The 18-35 year old respondents -- those who were actually

interviewed -- come from households that have a greater number of adults in them than older cohorts, and when they are interviewed, it takes an average of 6.95 call attempts before the interview is completed.

Mr. Kerry also enjoys support from nonwhite citizens. Again using Michigan Census figures, nonwhites comprise 18% of the over-18 year old Michigan population. The conventional strategy yields 13% nonwhites, and the first-attempt completions yields 11% nonwhites.

Mr. Bush is more popular among men, while Mr. Kerry is more favored by women. Women comprise 52% of Michigan's adult population; the conventional call strategy nets 60% women; and 64% of the respondents who complete the survey on the first call attempt are women.

The point is that even with an aggressive call strategy, well-designed RDD lists, and plenty of time to complete a household roster and make a selection, significant differences between the target population and the resultant sample will exist, even with a healthy response rate and small sampling error. These differences, as pointed out, can favor either major-party candidate; overall, I think that Mr. Kerry's support is underestimated. If that is true, the "misoverestimation" of Mr. Bush's popularity may per se influence the outcome of the election.

When one factors in secondary imponderables -- Mr. Nader's presence, or absence, on the ballot in various states; the likelihood of voters actually showing up to vote, the effect of any face-to-face debates, and unforeseen events that might occur in the next 60 days -- we must remember the proverb that prediction is extremely difficult, especially as regards the future.

Nat Ehrlich, Ph.D.

Research Specialist

Michigan State University

Institute for Public Policy and Social Research

Office for Social Research

321 Berkey Hall

East Lansing, MI 48824

517-355-6672

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

From: Frank Rusciano [mailto:rusciano@RIDER.EDU]

Sent: Monday, August 30, 2004 9:20 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: Literary Digest redux?

Importance: High

Jerold,

I think many people have been thinking the same thing this year-- i.e. that the polarization of the electorate may raise turnout or affect it in ways that make predictions based upon previous models of "likely voters" unworkable. At the same time, I recall in 1984 people saying "Oh, the Democrats are registering a lot of people" and we know how that turned out. If the thirty-six year cycle for elections holds, we should be up for a major upheaval this election (the

last one was 1968). What that means in terms of results remains to be seen though.

Also, the size of crowds does not necessarily serve as a good measure of actual support, although Truman's election indicated that someone perhaps should have been watching that factor.

Frank Rusciano

Jerold Pearson wrote:

- > Does anyone else get the feeling that the polling biz is about to pull
- > another Literary Digest?
- >
- > I don't do election polling, and I don't know what statistical techniques
- > various firms are using, but I wonder if the polling outfits aren't
- falling
- > prey to big time coverage error, seriously undercounting Kerry
- > supporters. Huge numbers of new voters are being registered each week
- (and
- > are thus not included in the polls we see), more and more younger voters
- > have only cell phones, lower SES voters are more difficult to reach on the
- > phone. I also wonder if the "likely voter" models being used are not out
- > of date or just irrelevant: Ever since the primaries, there seems to be
- > evidence of a larger than usual turnout motivated by intense and
- widespread
- > desire to defeat Bush. And Kerry is now attracting huge crowds even in
- > swing states (60,000 in Portland, 20,000 I think in Seattle, etc etc) that
- > undermine media reports of his lackluster appeal. This year's likely
- voter
- > may be quite different from 2000's likely voter.
- >
- > Also, the internals of the polls we've seen lately indicate that, compared
- > to 2000, Bush is losing support among Hispanics, Blacks, Arabs, Jews, and
- > other demographic groups (most notably, independents). The internals also
- > show that more Bush 2000 voters support Kerry than Gore voters support
- > Bush. So how on earth do the numbers show a dead heat?
- >
- > Right track/wrong track numbers are dismal for the incumbent, Iraq becomes
- > bloodier and bleaker by the hour, the economy is stuck in low gear and
- > millions are still out of work. Is Fear And Smear enough to make up for
- > all of that?
- >
- > Again, I don't do election polling, so I could be wrong. But I'd love to
- > hear what others think about this. I am truly baffled.
- >
- > Jerold Pearson, '75
- > Director of Market Research
- > Stanford Alumni Association
- > 650-723-9186
- > jpearson@stanford.edu
- > <http://www.stanford.edu/~jpearson/>

>
> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Tue, 31 Aug 2004 09:24:32 -0400
Reply-To: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>
Subject: Re: Literary Digest redux?
Comments: To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <C5E0665BB776D311868400805FF5603A0591B562@sscentex.ssc.msu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

All polling methodology is flawed, but it doesn't matter unless the bias caused by the flaw correlates with something being measured. The Literary Digest sample worked fine in 1932 because party choice did not correlate with economic status. The realigning election of 1936 changed that.

The samples in 1948 didn't capture last-minute decision making. That didn't matter before, because voters made up their minds early. By 1948, campaigns were more media intensive, and decisions were more fluid.

With today's telephone methodology, we're at similar risk because of the low response rate. Up to now, it hasn't mattered because non-respondents tend to be the people who don't vote. That flaw actually helps us by screening out non-voters. Sooner or later there will be an election that breaks the connection between non-response and non-voting. This could be the one.

The good news: I've predicted this particular disaster before, and it didn't happen.

Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Voice: 919 962-4085 Fax: 919 962-1549
Cell: 919 906-3425 URL: www.unc.edu/~pmeyer

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail
=====

Date: Tue, 31 Aug 2004 09:56:54 -0400
Reply-To: "Downey-Sargent, Kathryn - BLS" <Downey-Sargent.Kathryn@BLS.GOV>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Downey-Sargent, Kathryn - BLS" <Downey-Sargent.Kathryn@BLS.GOV>
Subject: FW: poll taken
Comments: To: "AAPOR (AAPORNET@asu.edu)" <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Comments: cc: "cabrenes@juno.com" <cabrenes@juno.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

Does anyone know whether this poll has had any press coverage?

<http://www.zogby.com/news/ReadNews.dbm?ID=855>

On the eve of a Republican National Convention invoking 9/11 symbols, sound bytes and imagery, half (49.3%) of New York City residents and 41% of New York citizens overall say that some of our leaders "knew in advance that attacks were planned on or around September 11, 2001, and that they consciously failed to act," according to the poll conducted by Zogby International. The poll of New York residents was conducted from Tuesday August 24 through Thursday August 26, 2004. Overall results have a margin of sampling error of +/-3.5.

The poll is the first of its kind conducted in America that surveys attitudes regarding US government complicity in the 9/11 tragedy. Despite the acute legal and political implications of this accusation, nearly 30% of registered Republicans and over 38% of those who described themselves as "very conservative" supported the claim.

The charge found very high support among adults under 30 (62.8%), African-Americans (62.5%), Hispanics (60.1%), Asians (59.4%), and "Born Again" Evangelical Christians (47.9%).

Less than two in five (36%) believe that the 9/11 Commission had "answered all the important questions about what actually happened on September 11th," and two in three (66%) New Yorkers (and 56.2% overall) called for another full investigation of the "still unanswered questions" by Congress or Elliot Spitzer, New York's Attorney General. Self-identified "very liberal" New Yorkers supported a new inquiry by a margin of three to one, but so did half (53%) of "very conservative" citizens across the state. The call for a deeper probe was especially strong from Hispanics (75.6%), African-Americans (75.3%) citizens with income from \$15-25K (74.3%), women (62%) and Evangelicals (59.9%).

W. David Kubiak, executive director of 911truth.org, the group that commissioned the poll, expressed genuine surprise that New Yorkers' belief

in the administration's complicity is as high or higher than that seen overseas. "We're familiar with high levels of 9/11 skepticism abroad where there has been open debate of the evidence for US government complicity. On May 26th the Toronto Star reported a national poll showing that 63% of Canadians are also convinced US leaders had 'prior knowledge' of the attacks yet declined to act. There was no US coverage of this startling poll or the facts supporting the Canadians' conclusions, and there has been virtually no debate on the victim families' scores of still unanswered questions. I think these numbers show that most New Yorkers are now fed up with the silence, and that politicians trying to exploit 9/11 do so at their peril. The 9/11 case is not closed and New York's questions are not going away."

Nicholas Levis of NY911truth.org, an advisor on the poll, agrees, "The 9/11 Commission gave us a plenty of 'recommendations', but far more plentiful were the discrepancies, gaps and omissions in their supposedly 'final' report. How can proposals based on such deficient findings ever make us safe? We think these poll numbers are basically saying, 'Wait just a minute. What about the scores of still outstanding questions? What about the unexplained collapses of WTC 7, our air defenses, official accountability, the chain of command on 9/11, the anthrax, insider trading & FBI field probes? There's so much more to this story that we need to know about.' When such a huge majority of New Yorkers want a new investigation, it will be interesting to see how quickly Attorney General Spitzer and our legislators respond."

SCOPE: The poll covered five areas of related interest: 1) Iraq - do New Yorkers think that our leaders "deliberately misled" us before the war (51.2% do); 2) the 9/11 Commission - did it answer all the "important questions" (only 36% said yes); 3) the inexplicable and largely unreported collapse of the third WTC skyscraper on 9/11 - what was its number (28% of NYC area residents knew); 4) the question on complicity; and 5) how many wanted a new 9/11 probe. All inquiries about questions, responses and demographics should be directed to Zogby International.

SPONSOR: 911truth.org is a coalition of researchers, journalists and victim family members working to expose and resolve the hundreds of critical questions still swirling around 9/11, especially the nearly 400 questions that the Family Steering Committee filed with the 9/11 Commission which they fought to create. Initially welcomed by the commissioners as a "road map" for their inquiry, these queries cut to the heart of 9/11 crimes and accountability. Specifically, they raised the central issues of motive, means and cui bono (who profited?). But the Commission ignored the majority of these questions, opting only to explore system failures, miscommunications and incompetence. The victim families' most incisive issues remain unaddressed to this day. The Zogby International poll was also cosponsored by Walden Three (walden3.org) and 9/11 Citizens Watch (911citizenswatch.org), a watchdog group which has monitored the Commission since its inception and will release its findings, "The 9/11 Omission Report," in several weeks.

On September 9th and 11th, 911Truth.org will cosponsor two large successive inquiries in New York, a preliminary 9/11 Citizens Commission hearing and "Confronting the Evidence: 9/11 and the Search for Truth," a research-focused evidentiary forum. These inquiries will examine many of the

9/11 Commission-shunned questions and discuss preparation of a probable cause complaint demanding a grand jury and criminal investigation from the New York Attorney General. Possible charges range from criminal negligence and gross dereliction of duty to foreknowledge, complicity and subsequent obstruction of justice. For details and developments, see www.911truth.org. For press info, contact Kyle Hence 212-243-7787 kylehence@earthlink.net

Zogby International conducted interviews of 808 adults chosen at random in New York State. All calls were made from Zogby International headquarters in Utica, N.Y., from 8/24/04 through 8/26/04. The margin of error is +/- 3.5 percentage points. Slight weights were added to region, party, age, race, religion, and gender to more accurately reflect the population. Margins of error are higher in sub-groups.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Tue, 31 Aug 2004 10:21:10 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Re: poll taken
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <70E1C0DB4F9B5E4F9CEDB8433F4A68B9047219BA@psbmail2.psb.bls.gov>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Not much - according to Google's news search

This appears to be the press release on a rather unusual website:
http://www.fromthewilderness.com/free/ww3/083004_zogby_poll.shtml

And
<http://english.aljazeera.net/NR/exeres/94E99630-D69F-4034-9495-0F79320C9B33.htm>

Here is a breakdown of the results and some of the question wording:

<http://www.911truth.org/dossier/zogby911.pdf>

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

> -----Original Message-----
> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of
> Downey-Sargent, Kathryn - BLS
> Sent: Tuesday, August 31, 2004 9:57 AM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: FW: poll taken

> Does anyone know whether this poll has had any press coverage?

> <http://www.zogby.com/news/ReadNews.dbm?ID=855>

> On the eve of a Republican National Convention invoking 9/11
> symbols, sound bytes and imagery, half (49.3%) of New York
> City residents and 41% of New York citizens overall say that
> some of our leaders "knew in advance that attacks were
> planned on or around September 11, 2001, and that they
> consciously failed to act," according to the poll conducted
> by Zogby International. The poll of New York residents was
> conducted from Tuesday August 24 through Thursday August 26,
> 2004. Overall results have a margin of sampling error of +/-3.5.

> The poll is the first of its kind conducted in America that
> surveys attitudes regarding US government complicity in the
> 9/11 tragedy. Despite the acute legal and political
> implications of this accusation, nearly 30% of registered
> Republicans and over 38% of those who described themselves as
> "very conservative" supported the claim.

> The charge found very high support among adults under 30
> (62.8%), African-Americans (62.5%), Hispanics (60.1%), Asians
> (59.4%), and "Born Again" Evangelical Christians (47.9%).

> Less than two in five (36%) believe that the 9/11 Commission
> had "answered all the important questions about what actually
> happened on September 11th,"
> and two in three (66%) New Yorkers (and 56.2% overall) called
> for another full investigation of the "still unanswered
> questions" by Congress or Elliot Spitzer, New York's Attorney
> General. Self-identified "very liberal" New Yorkers supported
> a new inquiry by a margin of three to one, but so did half
> (53%) of "very conservative" citizens across the state. The
> call for a deeper probe was especially strong from Hispanics
> (75.6%), African-Americans
> (75.3%) citizens with income from \$15-25K (74.3%), women
> (62%) and Evangelicals (59.9%).

> W. David Kubiak, executive director of 911truth.org, the
> group that commissioned the poll, expressed genuine surprise
> that New Yorkers' belief in the administration's complicity
> is as high or higher than that seen overseas. "We're familiar
> with high levels of 9/11 skepticism abroad where there has

> been open debate of the evidence for US government
> complicity. On May 26th the Toronto Star reported a national
> poll showing that 63% of Canadians are also convinced US
> leaders had 'prior knowledge' of the attacks yet declined to
> act. There was no US coverage of this startling poll or the
> facts supporting the Canadians' conclusions, and there has
> been virtually no debate on the victim families' scores of
> still unanswered questions. I think these numbers show that
> most New Yorkers are now fed up with the silence, and that
> politicians trying to exploit 9/11 do so at their peril. The
> 9/11 case is not closed and New York's questions are not going away."

>
> Nicholas Levis of NY911truth.org, an advisor on the poll,
> agrees, "The 9/11 Commission gave us a plenty of
> 'recommendations', but far more plentiful were the
> discrepancies, gaps and omissions in their supposedly 'final'
> report. How can proposals based on such deficient findings
> ever make us safe? We think these poll numbers are basically
> saying, 'Wait just a minute.
> What about the scores of still outstanding questions? What
> about the unexplained collapses of WTC 7, our air defenses,
> official accountability, the chain of command on 9/11, the
> anthrax, insider trading & FBI field probes? There's so much
> more to this story that we need to know about.'
> When such a huge majority of New Yorkers want a new
> investigation, it will be interesting to see how quickly
> Attorney General Spitzer and our legislators respond."

>
> SCOPE: The poll covered five areas of related interest: 1)
> Iraq - do New Yorkers think that our leaders "deliberately
> misled" us before the war (51.2% do); 2) the 9/11 Commission
> - did it answer all the "important questions" (only 36% said
> yes); 3) the inexplicable and largely unreported collapse of
> the third WTC skyscraper on 9/11 - what was its number (28%
> of NYC area residents knew); 4) the question on complicity;
> and 5) how many wanted a new 9/11 probe. All inquiries about
> questions, responses and demographics should be directed to
> Zogby International.

>
> SPONSOR: 911truth.org is a coalition of researchers,
> journalists and victim family members working to expose and
> resolve the hundreds of critical questions still swirling
> around 9/11, especially the nearly 400 questions that the
> Family Steering Committee filed with the 9/11Commission which
> they fought to create. Initially welcomed by the
> commissioners as a "road map"
> for their inquiry, these queries cut to the heart of 9/11
> crimes and accountability. Specifically, they raised the
> central issues of motive, means and cui bono (who profited?).
> But the Commission ignored the majority of these questions,
> opting only to explore system failures, miscommunications and
> incompetence. The victim families' most incisive issues
> remain unaddressed to this day. The Zogby International poll
> was also cosponsored by Walden Three (walden3.org) and 9/11

> Citizens Watch (911citizenswatch.org), a watchdog group which
> has monitored the Commission since its inception and will
> release its findings, "The 9/11 Omission Report," in several weeks.

>
> On September 9th and 11th, 911Truth.org will cosponsor two
> large successive inquiries in New York, a preliminary 9/11
> Citizens Commission hearing and "Confronting the Evidence:
> 9/11 and the Search for Truth," a research-focused
> evidentiary forum. These inquiries will examine many of the
> 9/11 Commission-shunned questions and discuss preparation of
> a probable cause complaint demanding a grand jury and
> criminal investigation from the New York Attorney General.
> Possible charges range from criminal negligence and gross
> dereliction of duty to foreknowledge, complicity and
> subsequent obstruction of justice. For details and
> developments, see www.911truth.org.
> For press info, contact Kyle Hence 212-243-7787
> kylehence@earthlink.net

>
> Zogby International conducted interviews of 808 adults chosen
> at random in New York State. All calls were made from Zogby
> International headquarters in Utica, N.Y., from 8/24/04
> through 8/26/04. The margin of error is +/- 3.5 percentage
> points. Slight weights were added to region, party, age,
> race, religion, and gender to more accurately reflect the
> population. Margins of error are higher in sub-groups.

>
> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> set aapornet nomail
> On your return send: set aapornet mail

>

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====
Date: Tue, 31 Aug 2004 10:35:41 -0400
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Subject: Re: poll taken
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <0I3B008MXEO3ZS@chimmx02.algx.net>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Leo Simonetta wrote:

>This appears to be the press release on a rather unusual website:
>http://www.fromthewilderness.com/free/ww3/083004_zogby_poll.shtml

Unusual, indeed. A hotbed of conspiracism of a rather embarrassing sort would be more accurate.

--

Doug Henwood
Left Business Observer
38 Greene St - 4th fl.
New York NY 10013-2505 USA
voice +1-212-219-0010
fax +1-212-219-0098
cell +1-917-865-2813
email <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>
web <http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Tue, 31 Aug 2004 10:52:26 -0400
Reply-To: LDElia@SCARBOROUGH.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Lise D'Elia <LDElia@SCARBOROUGH.COM>
Subject: respondent fatigue
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Does anyone know where I can find information about respondent fatigue when taking long surveys?
Or if anyone knows of any studies that have been conducted on this topic?
Please email me.

Thanks,
Lisa D'Elia

Scarborough Research
770 Broadway 13th floor
New York, NY 10003-9595
(646) 654-8418

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Tue, 31 Aug 2004 17:39:45 +0200
Reply-To: Thomas Petersen <tpetersen@IFD-ALLENSBACH.DE>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Thomas Petersen <tpetersen@IFD-ALLENSBACH.DE>
Organization: Institut fuer Demoskopie Allensbach

Subject: Re: respondent fatigue
Comments: To: LDElia@SCARBOROUGH.COM
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <OF153D2E98.E6C4042E-ON85256F01.005163F4-85256F01.0051B4C6@vnuusa.org>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

There is an old but still unseful conference paper:

Erp Ring: Questionnaire Monotony Endangers the Comparability of Results.
It Should Be Avoided. Paper Presentad at the WAPOR/ESOMAR Conference in
Venice 1976. We have a copy in our archives.

Lise D'Elia wrote:

> Does anyone know where I can find information about respondent fatigue when
> taking long surveys?
> Or if anyone knows of any studies that have been conducted on this topic?
> Please email me.

>
> Thanks,
> Lisa D'Elia

>
> Scarborough Research
> 770 Broadway 13th floor
> New York, NY 10003-9595
> (646) 654-8418

>
> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> set aapornet nomail
> On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

Date: Tue, 31 Aug 2004 12:05:09 -0500
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: Job Postings
Comments: To: AAPORNet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Please find below announcements for two research positions in the

> Office of Survey Methods Research of the U.S. Bureau of Labor=20

> Statistics (BLS). This was also posted on SRMSNET earlier today.

>

For further information or to submit applications, please contact:

>

> Statistics and Survey Methodology:

>> Dr. John Eltinge, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Eltinge_J@bls.gov

> <mailto:Eltinge_J@bls.gov <mailto:Eltinge_J@bls.gov> > Fax: (202)
691-7426

>

> Economics:

>> Dr. James Spletzer, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Spletzer_J@bls.gov

> <mailto:Spletzer_J@bls.gov <mailto:Spletzer_J@bls.gov> > Fax: (202)
691-6425

> The first position is for a senior-level researcher in areas of=20

> mathematical statistics relevant to BLS programs. The application=20

> deadline for the senior research position is October 12, 2004.

>

> The second is a dissertation fellowship position for graduate students

> who are beginning Ph.D. research in areas relevant to the Bureau of=20

> Labor Statistics. The deadline for the dissertation fellowship is=20

> December 1, 2004.

>

> In keeping with standard U.S. government regulations, U.S. citizenship

> is required for both positions.

>

> Please feel free to forward this information to colleagues or students

> with the relevant training, experience and research interests.

>

> Persons who are interested in additional information on either=20

> position are very welcome to contact me at the telephone number or=20

> e-mail address listed below.

>

>

> Sincerely,

>

> John L. Eltinge

> Associate Commissioner for Survey Methods Research Office of Survey=20

> Methods Research, PSB 1950 U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics

> 2 Massachusetts Avenue NE

> Washington, DC 20212

>

> Telephone: (202) 691-7404

> E-mail: Eltinge.John@bls.gov

> Fax: (202) 691-7426

>

> _____

>

> Senior Research Position, Office of Survey Methods Research, U.S.

> Bureau of Labor Statistics

>

> For this position, we are seeking an individual with an outstanding=20

> record in the following areas.

- >
- > 1. Knowledge of, and experience in, advanced mathematical statistics,=20
- > statistical research methodology, and sample design and methodology.
- >
- > 2. Ability to make fundamental contributions to problems in frontier=20
- > areas of statistical research that are of critical importance to BLS=20
- > survey programs.
- >
- > 3. Skill in presenting results of research projects.
- >
- > 4. Ability to initiate, plan, and guide research and evaluation=20
- > projects aimed at improving existing statistical methods through=20
- > increased quality and user relevance and reduced costs.
- >
- > 5. Ability to provide guidance and direction to junior and mid-level=20
- > researchers in advanced areas and especially challenging applications=20
- > of mathematical statistics to work with surveys.
- >
- >
- > Details of this position, including duties, salary and application=20
- > procedures, are provided at:
- >
- > <http://jobs2.quickhire.com/dol/show?view=3Dvacancy&job=3D8797>
- <<http://jobs2.quickhire.com/dol/show?view=3Dvacancy&job=3D8797>>=20
- > <<http://jobs2.quickhire.com/dol/show?view=3Dvacancy&job=3D8797>
- <<http://jobs2.quickhire.com/dol/show?view=3Dvacancy&job=3D8797>> >
- >
- >

> _____

> _____

> _____

>

> Dissertation Fellowships, U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics

>

>

> 2005-2006

> Bureau of Labor Statistics

> Dissertation Fellowships

>

> The Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) dissertation fellowship program=20

> is designed to encourage graduate students in statistics, economics,=20

> and survey methodology to develop interests and begin research in=20

> areas of survey design and analysis. The BLS anticipates funding two=20

> fellowships per year.

>

> Eligibility Criteria

> Applicants for fellowships must have successfully passed their=20

> departmental Ph.D. qualifying examinations, and should have completed=20

> almost all coursework. Applicants must submit detailed research=20

> proposals for competitive evaluation by a peer review board=20

> representing the BLS and academia. The proposals should be in topics=20

> of interest to the BLS, such as the design and analysis of complex=20

> sample surveys, small domain estimation, nonresponse, measurement=20

> error, price index theory, seasonal adjustment, or economic=20

> measurement. Proposals for research that would make efficient use of=20

- > confidential BLS microdata or other BLS-specific resources are=20
- > especially encouraged.
- >
- >
- > Conditions of Appointment and Benefits Dissertation fellows will=20
- > conduct their research at the Washington DC headquarters of the BLS.=20
- > The researchers will be employees of the BLS. Salary is commensurate=20
- > with qualifications and experience.
- > Full-time salary will generally be at the GS-11 level (currently
- > \$50,593 - \$65,769 per year). Benefits include health and life=20
- > insurance, a 401(k) type pension plan, and paid vacation.
- >
- > Travel between the BLS and the home university on a periodic basis is=20
- > expected, and will be financed by the BLS.
- >
- > The fellowship appointment is expected to be for one year full time=20
- > (starting anytime between May 15 and December 31, 2005). Extensions=20
- > of the fellowship for up to one additional year are possible.
- >
- > U.S. citizenship is required.
- >
- >
- > Applications
- > The application deadline is December 1, 2004. The following=20
- > information is required of all applicants.
- > 1) A letter of interest outlining the proposed research (1-2 pages).
- > 2) Graduate school transcript, three letters of recommendation, and a=20

- > current curriculum vita.
- >
- > Initial screening of applicants will be carried out by BLS researchers
- > with expertise in statistics, economics, and survey methodology.
- > Applicants will be evaluated on academic performance, the scientific=20
- > merit of the proposal, the feasibility of the proposed work, and the=20
- > value of the proposed research to the BLS and the academic community.
- >
- > Candidates passing the first screening step will be asked to submit a=20
- > detailed research proposal by March 1, 2005. These detailed proposals=20
- > will be peer reviewed by a panel composed of BLS and academic=20
- > researchers.
- >
- >
- > For further information or to submit applications, please contact:
- >
- > Statistics and Survey Methodology:
- >
- > Dr. John Eltinge, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Eltinge_J@bls.gov=20
- > <mailto:Eltinge_J@bls.gov <mailto:Eltinge_J@bls.gov> > Fax: (202)
- 691-7426
- >
- > Economics:
- >
- > Dr. James Spletzer, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Spletzer_J@bls.gov
- > <mailto:Spletzer_J@bls.gov <mailto:Spletzer_J@bls.gov> > Fax: (202)
- 691-6425
- >

>

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====
Date: Tue, 31 Aug 2004 15:52:05 -0400
Reply-To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Literary Digest redux?
Comments: To: Jerold Pearson <jpearson@stanford.edu>
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

Well, we may both be off base, but we won't know until November 3rd. And I should mention that Howard Schuman pointed out that I had used the term sampling error when I should have written a systematic error [in sampling].
Mea culpa.

Nat Ehrlich, Ph.D.
Research Specialist
Michigan State University
Institute for Public Policy and Social Research
Office for Social Research
321 Berkey Hall
East Lansing, MI 48824
517-355-6672

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

From: Jerold Pearson [<mailto:jpearson@stanford.edu>]
Sent: Tuesday, August 31, 2004 1:25 PM
To: Ehrlich, Nathaniel
Subject: Re: Literary Digest redux?

>The likelihood of a Literary Digest style debacle is substantial...
>Recall that the problem in 1936 was sampling error, specifically the use of

>telephone listings and vehicle ownership records during the Great
>Depression, a time when a large percentage of citizens owned neither a
>telephone nor an automobile. Those economically disadvantaged were
>systematically excluded from the LD poll, but they did show up and vote for
>FDR.

Nat,

Yes, that's exactly my point. Thanks for the reply -- it makes me feel a bit more secure that I'm not simply way off base.

Jerold

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====
Date: Tue, 31 Aug 2004 21:13:53 -0400
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing
Subject: Re: Literary Digest redux?
Comments: To: AAPORNET <aapornet@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The common wisdom these days about the 1936 Literary Digest fiasco is that it was the result of selection (sampling frame) bias. There is, however, an alternative view, which is that response rate bias played a substantial, if not decisive, role. The Digest straw poll was conducted using mail ballots and had an overall response rate of around 24%.

Gallup also used mail ballots in 1936 and underestimated Roosevelt's share of the vote by 7% overall and by a median of 12% on a state by state basis, which would have been considered unacceptable even then if it were not for the fact that the Literary Digest straw poll, which had previously shown remarkable accuracy, failed so spectacularly in the same election. Gallup himself has been quoted as blaming the magnitude of his own error on the fact that Republicans tended to return their ballots at a higher rate than Democrats.

In the future, we are not likely to see another polling disaster like the Literary Digest's caused by sampling error, and surely not because certain demographic groups may be under-represented in random samples. That is something that is quickly noticed and easily corrected with appropriate weighting procedures.

What is most likely to cause another polling disaster (as Phil Meyer has noted here recently) is the situation where an unknown underlying cause for non-response correlates highly with whatever the polls are

attempting to measure. As falling response rates in all public opinion polls have been a subject of much discussion lately, this is a far greater cause for concern.

In any event, if another major polling fiasco happens in our lifetimes, it is a given that it will be during a national election, since that is really the only time when most people take much notice of polls and their inaccuracies. Whether or not it will happen this time around is something that we have no rational basis for predicting. That, of course, will not prevent any of us from making such predictions, since no-one will remember if we are wrong, but we can remind everyone of our cleverness if we are right.

Jan Werner

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Vacation hold? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
set aapornet nomail
On your return send: set aapornet mail