

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 LOG0409"

---

Date: Wed, 1 Sep 2004 06:07:16 -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: "jwerner@jwdp.com" <jwerner@jwdp.com>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain

With regard to the issue of response rate, I'd like first to quote ABC News' "Poll Vault" {[http://abcnews.go.com/sections/us/DailyNews/poll\\_methodology.html](http://abcnews.go.com/sections/us/DailyNews/poll_methodology.html)]  
"Even given a probability sample, it cannot be assumed that a higher response rate ensures greater data integrity. Research over many years, including a variety of studies reported at the annual meeting of the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) in May 2003, has found no significant biases as a result of response rate differences. As far back as 1981, in "Questions & Answers in Attitude Surveys," Prof. Howard Schuman of the University of Michigan, describing two samples with different response rates but similar results, reported, "Apparently the answers and associations we investigate are largely unrelated to factors affecting these response rate differences." (p332.)"  
As for weighting, of course if it's done carefully it can compensate for deviations from the population. ABC says they weight according to a scheme of "48 cells based on age, race, sex and education", but I am not sure if such weighting is iterated for each of the 50 states, or if all polls are so meticulously handled.

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: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM]  
Sent: Tuesday, August 31, 2004 8:14 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Literary Digest redux?

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](mailto: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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Wed, 1 Sep 2004 05:37:13 -0500  
Reply-To: "Newport, Frank" <[Frank\\_Newport@GALLUP.COM](mailto:Frank_Newport@GALLUP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Newport, Frank" <[Frank\\_Newport@GALLUP.COM](mailto:Frank_Newport@GALLUP.COM)>  
Subject: Schwarzenegger's Assertion  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

=20

Arnold Schwarzenegger's assertion in his speech at the GOP convention on Tuesday night that "The president did not go into Iraq because the polls told him it was popular. As a matter of fact, the polls said just the opposite" is incorrect. =20

A majority of Americans did support the idea of the invasion of Iraq before George W. Bush made the decision to commence military action in March 2003. CNN/USA Today/Gallup's March 14-15 2003 poll showed 64% of Americans favored "invading Iraq with U.S. ground troops in an attempt to remove Saddam Hussein from power", and 57% agreed that the Bush administration "has made a convincing case about the need for the U.S. to take military action against Iraq." A March 17 2003 CNN/USA Today/Gallup poll asked: "Do you approve or disapprove of Bush's decision to go to war if Saddam Hussein does not leave Iraq in the next 48 hours?" Sixty-six percent of Americans approved; 30% disapproved.=20

Furthermore, Schwarzenegger's statement that "leadership isn't about polls" can be translated to imply that leadership isn't about the paying attention to the views of the people, which in a democracy is a dangerous precedent.=20

Frank Newport  
Editor in Chief  
The Gallup Poll  
Princeton

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

=====  
Date: Wed, 1 Sep 2004 10:36:41 -0400  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Consultants Deliver Politics To Voters' Inboxes, at a Price  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Consultants Deliver Politics To Voters' Inboxes, at a Price

By Jeffrey H. Birnbaum  
Washington Post Staff Writer  
Sunday, August 29, 2004; Page A01

Millions of Americans who are already trying to fight off unwanted electronic mail from direct marketers are about to get deluged by another source: politicians and lobbying groups.

For the first time, a nationwide list of registered voters has been cross-referenced with multiple lists of e-mail addresses collected from magazine subscribers, catalogue shoppers, online poll participants and the like. The result is that legislators, candidates for office and interest groups can buy more than 25 million e-mail addresses of registered voters and contact them at will.

See the rest of the story at:

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A42517-2004Aug28.html>

--

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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Wed, 1 Sep 2004 16:53:51 +0200

Reply-To: Edith de Leeuw <[edithl@XS4ALL.NL](mailto:edithl@XS4ALL.NL)>

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

From: Edith de Leeuw <[edithl@XS4ALL.NL](mailto:edithl@XS4ALL.NL)>

Subject: Re: Literary Digest redux?

Comments: To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <[Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU](mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU)>,  
AAPORNET@asu.edu

In-Reply-To: <[C5E0665BB776D311868400805FF5603A0591B566@sscntex.ssc.msu.edu](mailto:C5E0665BB776D311868400805FF5603A0591B566@sscntex.ssc.msu.edu)>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

The big question with nonresponse is that you NEVER know if it will cause bias or not, unless you investigate the nonresponse.

The only REAL smart thing to do is to incorporate routinely a small nonresponse study in your regular survey to investigate whether or not the nonrespondents differ from the respondents. This is something that is now being experimented with at the ISR in Michigan, as Bob Groves informed us at the last nonresponse workshop.

To become a bit philosophical: remember that 'induction' is not a scientific method?

That something was Ok (that is no bias) one time, or two times, or .... does not mean that it will be OK next time. My logic teacher always used the 'turkey example'. There once was a nice little turkey chick and each morning the farmer came and fed it. So each morning the turkey came enthusiastically running to the farmer expecting food. It got fed, until

the morning before thanksgiving...

Warm regards from sunny Amsterdam, Edith de Leeuw

At 06:07 AM 9/1/2004 -0400, Ehrlich, Nathaniel wrote:

>With regard to the issue of response rate, I'd like first to quote ABC News'

>"Poll

>Vault" [[http://abcnews.go.com/sections/us/DailyNews/poll\\_methodology.html](http://abcnews.go.com/sections/us/DailyNews/poll_methodology.html)]

>"Even given a probability sample, it cannot be assumed that a higher

>response rate ensures greater data integrity. Research over many years,

>including a variety of studies reported at the annual meeting of the

>American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) in May 2003, has

>found no significant biases as a result of response rate differences. As far

>back as 1981, in "Questions & Answers in Attitude Surveys," Prof. Howard

>Schuman of the University of Michigan, describing two samples with different

>response rates but similar results, reported, "Apparently the answers and

>associations we investigate are largely unrelated to factors affecting these

>response rate differences." (p332.)"

>As for weighting, of course if it's done carefully it can compensate for

>deviations from the population. ABC says they weight according to a scheme

>of "48 cells based on age, race, sex and education", but I am not sure if

>such weighting is iterated for each of the 50 states, or if all polls are so

>meticulously handled.

>

>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: Jan Werner [<mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM>]

>Sent: Tuesday, August 31, 2004 8:14 PM

>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>Subject: Re: Literary Digest redux?

>

>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](mailto: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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>set aapornet nomail  
>On your return send: set aapornet mail

Dr. Edith D. de Leeuw, Methodika  
Plantage Doklaan 40, NL-1018 CN Amsterdam  
tel + 31 20 622 34 38 fax + 31 20 330 25 97  
e-mail [edithl@xs4all.nl](mailto:edithl@xs4all.nl)

-----  
De noordzee, de noordzee....  
Sign the Green Peace petition at <http://www.steundenoordzee.nl/index.php>  
Let future generation enjoy our seas too

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

-----  
Date: Wed, 1 Sep 2004 11:23:20 -0400  
Reply-To: Roger Tourangeau <[rtourangeau@SURVEY.UMD.EDU](mailto:rtourangeau@SURVEY.UMD.EDU)>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Roger Tourangeau <rtourangeau@SURVEY.UMD.EDU>  
Subject: Reminder: JPSM Distinguished Lecture  
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. There will be a reception immediately afterwards.

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.

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

=====  
Date: Wed, 1 Sep 2004 12:27:18 -0400  
Reply-To: [JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM](mailto:JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM)

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "J. Ann Selzer" <JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM>  
Subject: Potential position opening  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

My small but mighty company may have two openings in the near future--one for a research assistant who can work with banners and check reporters' stories and analysts' reports (among other duties); the other for a senior research analyst who can think and write independently. The work is varied and challenging and increasingly visible.

This is a good job for someone ready to tackle interesting research questions with policy implications. It requires excellent writing skills and a disciplined research mind.

Selzer & Company conducts public opinion polls for two Midwestern newspapers and has growing expertise in health insurance policy, in addition to other areas. Yes, the position requires residence in Des Moines, so please do not reply if you think you could do this job from a remote location. We offer health insurance, life insurance, disability, and a company contribution to a retirement savings plan upon vesting. Des Moines was recently named one of the nation's "best bargains" by Forbes magazine in the "Porch Swing Communities" category. It was also named the nation's "hippest city" by Fast Company. Clearly, something is happening here.

If you're interested, fax or mail a cover letter and resume to J. Ann Selzer at 515.271.5710. If you e-mail, please put "Selzer & Company" in the subject heading and copy and paste your letter and resume into the e-mail window--in other words, avoid attachments. Thanks for your interest.

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.  
Selzer & Company, Inc.  
520 42nd Street  
Des Moines, Iowa 50312  
515.271.5700

visit our website: [www.SelzerCo.com](http://www.SelzerCo.com)

E-mail address for purposes of this list: [JAnnSelzer@aol.com](mailto:JAnnSelzer@aol.com); otherwise, contact [JASelzer@SelzerCo.com](mailto:JASelzer@SelzerCo.com).

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

Date: Wed, 1 Sep 2004 13:30:16 -0400



Reply-To: "Eyerman, Joe D." <eyerman@RTI.ORG>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Eyerman, Joe D." <eyerman@RTI.ORG>  
Subject: SAPOR Call for Papers - deadline approaching!  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

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. 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>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Wed, 1 Sep 2004 16:29:35 -0400  
Reply-To: LDElia@SCARBOROUGH.COM  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Lise D'Elia <LDElia@SCARBOROUGH.COM>  
Subject: paper in archive  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Comments: cc: ngrube@ifd-allensbach.de, tpetersen@ifd-allensbach.de  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Could you please mail me a hard copy of the paper listed below that is in your archives?

Erp Ring: Questionnaire Monotony Endangers the Comparability of Results. It Should Be Avoided.

It was a Paper Presentad at the WAPOR/ESOMAR Conference in Venice 1976.

Thomas Petersen informed me that I am able to obtain a hard copy of it.

Please mail it to this address below:

Scarborough Research  
770 Broadway 13th floor  
New York, NY 10003-9595  
(646) 654-8418

Thanks,  
Lisa D'Elia

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

=====  
Date: Wed, 1 Sep 2004 17:43:52 -0400  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: CATI versus ASCASI  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

A former colleague of mine (now at the CDC) is considering a study using CATI and ACASI. She has some concerns about whether data collected in these two manners is suitable to be combined.

I referred her to Couper, Singer & Tourangeau (2003) but I was wondering if there were any articles that might shed some light on differences in sensitive data collected using these two methods.

--  
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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Wed, 1 Sep 2004 23:14:42 -0700  
Reply-To: Mackie de Leon <[mackiedeleon@YAHOO.COM](mailto:mackiedeleon@YAHOO.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mackie de Leon <[mackiedeleon@YAHOO.COM](mailto:mackiedeleon@YAHOO.COM)>  
Subject: surveying electoral votes than popular votes  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Hello AAPOR members,

I'm Mackie de Leon and I'm observing your polls from beyond the shores of the US.

I just wanted to know why the practice of electoral polling in the US is based on the popular vote for the entire nation rather than the popular vote by state to later determine which states are won by a particular candidate and thus determining the electoral vote.

The reason I'm saying this is because cable news reports indicate a tight race and I feel a more valid methodology would be to do the polls by state to get the valid count which is the electoral vote.

I remember seeing the practice I mentioned above in the last national election through a consortium of state universities doing local polls.

Am I correct in my impression that the main consideration for not practicing the abovementioned is cost?

Thanks.

---

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

---

Date: Thu, 2 Sep 2004 09:14:06 -0400  
Reply-To: Colleen Porter <[cporter@PHHP.UFL.EDU](mailto:cporter@PHHP.UFL.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Colleen Porter <[cporter@PHHP.UFL.EDU](mailto:cporter@PHHP.UFL.EDU)>  
Subject: Followup RE: hurricane  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit  
Content-disposition: inline

So we finished the hurricane-marred fieldwork on that statewide health insurance study, and began work on an experiment designed to replicate

the conditions of the health insurance study (same instrument, same interviewers), but using a sample whose insurance status is known (in order to explore why people who are enrolled in Medicaid may not report Medicaid coverage on a survey).

And we were so earnest about replicating the conditions of the original survey that we even arranged for another hurricane to hit the state during this study period as well.

Let it be said that we take "uniform exposure" seriously.

Colleen  
(very despondent because I was supposed to be leaving for a week in Brazil)

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

=====  
Date: Thu, 2 Sep 2004 17:36:15 -0400  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: The Venezuela Exit Poll Problem  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

The Economist has a good article by one of the Carter Center election observers.

What really happened in Venezuela?  
[http://www.economist.com/world/la/displayStory.cfm?story\\_id=3157671](http://www.economist.com/world/la/displayStory.cfm?story_id=3157671)

--  
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>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Fri, 3 Sep 2004 08:28:14 -0500  
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>  
Subject: Message from the AAPOR Executive Office  
Comments: To: AAPORNet@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Good Morning=20  
=20

It has come to our attention that an individual by the name of David A. Owolabi has been sending e-mails about people in poverty to AAPOR members. He claims to be a member of AAPOR, but he is not. It is not clear how he obtained AAPOR members' e-mail addresses, but our suggestion is to simply delete any messages from him.

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

-----  
Date: Fri, 3 Sep 2004 11:26:27 -0500  
Reply-To: [sfrank@stcloudstate.edu](mailto:sfrank@stcloudstate.edu)  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Steve Frank <[sfrank@STCLOUDSTATE.EDU](mailto:sfrank@STCLOUDSTATE.EDU)>  
Organization: scsu  
Subject: Re: Message from the AAPOR Executive Office  
Comments: To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Comments: cc: Michelle Hammes <[mhammes@stcloudstate.edu](mailto:mhammes@stcloudstate.edu)>  
In-Reply-To: <[5647BFA1A58A3449B66CAFBB28A4510F7F421E@cerium.goAMP.com](mailto:5647BFA1A58A3449B66CAFBB28A4510F7F421E@cerium.goAMP.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

-----  
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](mailto:sfsurvey@stcloudstate.edu)  
Personal Homepage <http://web.stcloudstate.edu/sfrank>  
SCSU Survey Homepage <http://web.stcloudstate.edu/scsusurvey>

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Mike Flanagan

Sent: Friday, September 03, 2004 8:28 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Message from the AAPOR Executive Office

Good Morning

It has come to our attention that an individual by the name of David A. Owolabi has been sending e-mails about people in poverty to AAPOR members. He claims to be a member of AAPOR, but he is not. It is not clear how he obtained AAPOR members' e-mail addresses, but our suggestion is to simply delete any messages from him.

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

Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

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

Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

-----  
Date: Fri, 3 Sep 2004 15:31:52 -0500

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

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

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

Organization: Market Shares Corporation

Subject: Convention Poll

Comments: To: "aapornet@asu.edu" <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=windows-1252; format=flowed

Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

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

<[http://www.time.com/time/press\\_releases](http://www.time.com/time/press_releases)>

Friday, Sep. 03, 2004

Campaign 2004: Bush Opens Double-Digit Lead

TIME Poll: Among likely voters, 52% would vote for President George

Bush, while 41% would vote for John Kerry and 3% would vote for Ralph Nader

New York: For the first time since the Presidential race became a two person contest last spring, there is a clear leader, the latest TIME poll shows. If the 2004 election for President were held today, 52% of likely voters surveyed would vote for President George W. Bush, 41% would vote for Democratic nominee John Kerry, and 3% would vote for Ralph Nader, according to a new TIME poll conducted from Aug. 31 to Sept. 2. Poll results are available on TIME.com and will appear in the

upcoming issue of TIME magazine, on newsstands Monday, Sept. 6.

Most important issues: When asked what they consider are the most important issues, 25% of registered voters cited the economy as the top issue, followed by 24% who cited the war on terrorism as the top issue. The situation in Iraq was rated the top issue by 17% of registered voters, moral values issues such as gay marriage and abortion were the top issue for 16% of respondents, and health care was the most important issue for 11% of respondents.

Bush vs. Kerry:

The economy: 47% trust President Bush more to handle the economy, while 45% trust Kerry.

Health care: 48% trust Senator Kerry to handle health care issues, while 42% trust Bush.

Iraq: 53% trust Bush to handle the situation in Iraq, while 41% trust Kerry.

Terrorism: 57% trust Bush to handle the war on terrorism, while 36% trust Kerry.

Understanding the needs of people: 47% said they trust Kerry to understand the needs of people like themselves, while 44% trusted Bush to understand their needs.

Providing strong leadership: 56% said they trust Bush to provide strong leadership in difficult times, while 37% said they trust Kerry to provide leadership in difficult times.

Tax policy: 49% trust Bush to handle tax policy, while 40% trust Kerry.

Commanding the Armed Forces: 54% said they trust Bush to be commander-in-chief of the armed forces, while 39% said they trust Kerry.

Bush on the Issues:

Iraq: Half (50%) of those surveyed approve of the way President Bush is handling the situation in Iraq, while 46% disapprove. In last week's TIME poll, 48% approved of the way Bush was handling the situation in Iraq and 48% disapproved.

Terrorism: Almost two thirds (59%) said they approve of how President Bush is handling the war on terrorism, while 38% disapprove. Last week's TIME poll found 55% approved of Bush's handling of the war on terrorism, while 40% disapproved.

The Economy: Survey respondents were split on the President's handling of the economy. Almost half (48%) said they approved of Bush's handling of the economy, while 48% said they disapproved.

Other results include:

Was U.S. Right Going to War with Iraq? Over half of those surveyed (52%) think the U.S. was right in going to war with Iraq, while 41% think the U.S. was wrong to go to war.

Have the United States' actions in Iraq made the world safer? Almost half (45%) think the United States' actions in Iraq have made the world safer, while 45% think the world is more dangerous. In a similar TIME poll taken Aug. 3 – 5, over half (52%) said the world was more dangerous, and 38% said the world was safer.

###

Methodology: The TIME Poll was conducted August 31 – September 2 by telephone among a random sample of 1,316 adults, including 1,128 reported registered voters and 926 likely voters. The margin of error for registered voters is +/- 3% points, and +/- 4% points for likely voters. Schulman, Ronca, & Bucuvalas (SRBI) Public Affairs conducted the poll, and more complete results are attached.

Contacts:

Ty Trippet, 212-522-3640

Jennifer Zawadzinski, 212-522-9046

Copyright © 2004 Time Inc. All rights reserved.

Reproduction in whole or in part without permission is prohibited.

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

Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail  
=====

Date: Fri, 3 Sep 2004 17:18:00 -0400

Reply-To: [agreenberg@greenbergresearch.com](mailto:agreenberg@greenbergresearch.com)

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

From: Anna Greenberg <[agreenberg@GREENBERGRESEARCH.COM](mailto:agreenberg@GREENBERGRESEARCH.COM)>

Subject: Re: Convention Poll

Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

In-Reply-To: <[4138D4B8.4030506@marketsharescorp.com](mailto:4138D4B8.4030506@marketsharescorp.com)>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

Here's another take:

<http://americanresearchgroup.com/presballot/>

John Kerry and George W. Bush remain tied in the race for president both among Americans registered to vote and among likely voters according to a nationwide survey from the American Research Group, Inc. In the ballot preference between Kerry and Bush among registered voters, 48% say they would vote for Kerry and 46% say they would vote for Bush. When Ralph Nader is added to the ballot, 46% of registered voters say they would vote for Kerry, 45% say they would vote for Bush, and 3% say they would vote for Nader.

Among registered voters considered likely to vote in November, Bush is at 48% and Kerry is at 47% in a two-way ballot. With Nader in the race, Bush and Kerry are tied at 47% each among likely voters and Nader is at 3%.

The results presented here are based on 1,014 completed telephone interviews conducted among a nationwide random sample of registered voters. Of the total sample of 1,014 registered voters, 800 are likely voters in November. The interviews were completed August 30 through September 1, 2004. The theoretical margin of error for the total sample of registered voters is plus or minus 3 percentage points, 95% of the time, on questions where opinion is evenly split. The theoretical margin of error for the sample of



likely voters is plus or minus 3.5 percentage points, 95% of the time, on questions where opinion is evenly split.

While Kerry was leading among Independents by 10 percentage points in a two-way match-up in August, Kerry leads by 5 percentage points among Independents in the latest survey.

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

From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM]  
Sent: Friday, September 03, 2004 4:32 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Convention Poll

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

<[http://www.time.com/time/press\\_releases](http://www.time.com/time/press_releases)>

Friday, Sep. 03, 2004

Campaign 2004: Bush Opens Double-Digit Lead

TIME Poll: Among likely voters, 52% would vote for President George Bush, while 41% would vote for John Kerry and 3% would vote for Ralph Nader

New York: For the first time since the Presidential race became a two person contest last spring, there is a clear leader, the latest TIME poll shows. If the 2004 election for President were held today, 52% of likely voters surveyed would vote for President George W. Bush, 41% would vote for Democratic nominee John Kerry, and 3% would vote for Ralph Nader, according to a new TIME poll conducted from Aug. 31 to Sept. 2. Poll results are available on TIME.com and will appear in the upcoming issue of TIME magazine, on newsstands Monday, Sept. 6.

Most important issues: When asked what they consider are the most important issues, 25% of registered voters cited the economy as the top issue, followed by 24% who cited the war on terrorism as the top issue. The situation in Iraq was rated the top issue by 17% of registered voters, moral values issues such as gay marriage and abortion were the top issue for 16% of respondents, and health care was the most important issue for 11% of respondents.

Bush vs. Kerry:

The economy: 47% trust President Bush more to handle the economy, while 45% trust Kerry.

Health care: 48% trust Senator Kerry to handle health care issues, while 42% trust Bush.

Iraq: 53% trust Bush to handle the situation in Iraq, while 41% trust Kerry.

Terrorism: 57% trust Bush to handle the war on terrorism, while 36% trust Kerry.

Understanding the needs of people: 47% said they trust Kerry to understand the needs of people like themselves, while 44% trusted Bush to understand their needs.

Providing strong leadership: 56% said they trust Bush to provide strong leadership in difficult times, while 37% said they trust Kerry to provide leadership in difficult times.

Tax policy: 49% trust Bush to handle tax policy, while 40% trust Kerry.  
Commanding the Armed Forces: 54% said they trust Bush to be commander-in-chief of the armed forces, while 39% said they trust Kerry.

**Bush on the Issues:**

Iraq: Half (50%) of those surveyed approve of the way President Bush is handling the situation in Iraq, while 46% disapprove. In last week's TIME poll, 48% approved of the way Bush was handling the situation in Iraq and 48% disapproved.

Terrorism: Almost two thirds (59%) said they approve of how President Bush is handling the war on terrorism, while 38% disapprove. Last week's TIME poll found 55% approved of Bush's handling of the war on terrorism, while 40% disapproved.

The Economy: Survey respondents were split on the President's handling of the economy. Almost half (48%) said they approved of Bush's handling of the economy, while 48% said they disapproved.

**Other results include:**

Was U.S. Right Going to War with Iraq? Over half of those surveyed (52%) think the U.S. was right in going to war with Iraq, while 41% think the U.S. was wrong to go to war.

Have the United States' actions in Iraq made the world safer? Almost half (45%) think the United States' actions in Iraq have made the world safer, while 45% think the world is more dangerous. In a similar TIME poll taken Aug. 3 – 5, over half (52%) said the world was more dangerous, and 38% said the world was safer.

###

**Methodology:** The TIME Poll was conducted August 31 – September 2 by telephone among a random sample of 1,316 adults, including 1,128 reported registered voters and 926 likely voters. The margin of error for registered voters is +/- 3% points, and +/- 4% points for likely voters. Schulman, Ronca, & Bucuvalas (SRBI) Public Affairs conducted the poll, and more complete results are attached.

**Contacts:**

Ty Trippet, 212-522-3640  
Jennifer Zawadzinski, 212-522-9046

Copyright © 2004 Time Inc. All rights reserved.  
Reproduction in whole or in part without permission is prohibited.

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Fri, 3 Sep 2004 17:28:42 -0400  
Reply-To: JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "J. Ann Selzer" <JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM>  
Subject: Re: Convention Polls  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

One study is of likely voters; the other of registered voters. I don't expect them to look the same. JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.  
Selzer & Company, Inc.  
Des Moines, Iowa 50312  
515.271.5700

visit our website: [www.SelzerCo.com](http://www.SelzerCo.com)

E-mail address for purposes of this list: [JAnnSelzer@aol.com](mailto:JAnnSelzer@aol.com); otherwise, contact [JASelzer@SelzerCo.com](mailto:JASelzer@SelzerCo.com).

---

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

---

Date: Fri, 3 Sep 2004 18:24:17 -0400  
Reply-To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Jan Werner <[jwerner@JWDP.COM](mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM)>  
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing  
Subject: Re: Convention Poll  
Comments: To: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <[4138D4B8.4030506@marketsharescorp.com](mailto:4138D4B8.4030506@marketsharescorp.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=windows-1252; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

The biggest problem with the Time poll is that it was entirely conducted while the Republican convention was taking place and dominating the daily news, which would certainly be expected to bias the sample.

For comparison, the only national presidential poll that I could find that was conducted at any time during the Democratic convention in July was a Newsweek poll from Princeton Survey Associates that began interviewing on the last day of the Democratic convention and continued the following day (July 29-30). That poll showed Kerry leading 49-42.

Jan Werner

---

Nick Panagakis wrote:

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

>

> <[http://www.time.com/time/press\\_releases](http://www.time.com/time/press_releases)>

> Friday, Sep. 03, 2004

> Campaign 2004: Bush Opens Double-Digit Lead

> TIME Poll: Among likely voters, 52% would vote for President George

> Bush, while 41% would vote for John Kerry and 3% would vote for Ralph Nader

>

> New York: For the first time since the Presidential race became a two

> person contest last spring, there is a clear leader, the latest TIME

> poll shows. If the 2004 election for President were held today, 52% of

> likely voters surveyed would vote for President George W. Bush, 41%

> would vote for Democratic nominee John Kerry, and 3% would vote for

> Ralph Nader, according to a new TIME poll conducted from Aug. 31 to

> Sept. 2. Poll results are available on TIME.com and will appear in the

> upcoming issue of TIME magazine, on newsstands Monday, Sept. 6.

>

> Most important issues: When asked what they consider are the most

> important issues, 25% of registered voters cited the economy as the top

> issue, followed by 24% who cited the war on terrorism as the top issue.

> The situation in Iraq was rated the top issue by 17% of registered

> voters, moral values issues such as gay marriage and abortion were the

> top issue for 16% of respondents, and health care was the most important

> issue for 11% of respondents.

>

> Bush vs. Kerry:

> The economy: 47% trust President Bush more to handle the economy, while

> 45% trust Kerry.

> Health care: 48% trust Senator Kerry to handle health care issues, while

> 42% trust Bush.

> Iraq: 53% trust Bush to handle the situation in Iraq, while 41% trust

> Kerry.

> Terrorism: 57% trust Bush to handle the war on terrorism, while 36%

> trust Kerry.

> Understanding the needs of people: 47% said they trust Kerry to

> understand the needs of people like themselves, while 44% trusted Bush

> to understand their needs.

> Providing strong leadership: 56% said they trust Bush to provide strong

> leadership in difficult times, while 37% said they trust Kerry to

> provide leadership in difficult times.

> Tax policy: 49% trust Bush to handle tax policy, while 40% trust Kerry.

> Commanding the Armed Forces: 54% said they trust Bush to be

> commander-in-chief of the armed forces, while 39% said they trust Kerry.

>

> Bush on the Issues:

> Iraq: Half (50%) of those surveyed approve of the way President Bush is

> handling the situation in Iraq, while 46% disapprove. In last week's

> TIME poll, 48% approved of the way Bush was handling the situation in

> Iraq and 48% disapproved.  
> Terrorism: Almost two thirds (59%) said they approve of how President  
> Bush is handling the war on terrorism, while 38% disapprove. Last week's  
> TIME poll found 55% approved of Bush's handling of the war on terrorism,  
> while 40% disapproved.  
> The Economy: Survey respondents were split on the President's handling  
> of the economy. Almost half (48%) said the approved of Bush's handling  
> of the economy, while 48% said the disapproved.

> Other results include:

> Was U.S. Right Going to War with Iraq? Over half of those surveyed (52%)  
> think the U.S. was right in going to war with Iraq, while 41% think the  
> U.S. was wrong to go to war.

> Have the United States' actions in Iraq made the world safer? Almost  
> half (45%) think the United States' actions in Iraq have made the world  
> safer, while 45% think the world is more dangerous. In a similar TIME  
> poll taken Aug. 3 – 5, over half (52%) said the world was more  
> dangerous, and 38% said the world was safer.

> ###

> Methodology: The TIME Poll was conducted August 31 – September 2 by  
> telephone among a random sample of 1,316 adults, including 1,128  
> reported registered voters and 926 likely voters. The margin of error  
> for registered voters is +/- 3% points, and +/- 4% points for likely  
> voters. Schulman, Ronca, & Bucuvalas (SRBI) Public Affairs conducted the  
> poll, and more complete results are attached.

> Contacts:

> Ty Trippet, 212-522-3640  
> Jennifer Zawadzinski, 212-522-9046

> Copyright © 2004 Time Inc. All rights reserved.

> Reproduction in whole or in part without permission is prohibited.

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

> Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

> set aapornet nomail

> On your return send: set aapornet mail

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

Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Fri, 3 Sep 2004 18:46:13 -0400

Reply-To: Howard Schuman <[hschuman@UMICH.EDU](mailto:hschuman@UMICH.EDU)>

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

From: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>  
Subject: [Fwd: Re: Convention Polls]  
Comments: To: aapor <aapornet@asu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Can some knowledgeable aapor members comment on the implications of the distinction made by J. Ann Selzer, though doubtless it depends on the questions used to determine "likely" and maybe even "registered"?

It would also be helpful if national polls could be broken down by broad region or into clearly red, clearly blue, and unclear states, even though data on individual states are not practical. One commentator suggested that the main effect of the Republican Convention may have been to increase Bush support in the South, but not much in swing states. If that were the case and were to hold, it could even conceivably--and ironically--lead to Bush winning the popular vote but losing the electoral count. I don't claim that to be at all likely, but it would be useful to have some sort of three-way division of national polls that have 1200 or more cases. hs.

One study is of likely voters; the other of registered voters. I don't expect them to look the same. JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.  
Selzer & Company, Inc.  
Des Moines, Iowa 50312  
515.271.5700

visit our website: [www.SelzerCo.com](http://www.SelzerCo.com)

E-mail address for purposes of this list: [JAnnSelzer@aol.com](mailto:JAnnSelzer@aol.com); otherwise, contact [JASelzer@SelzerCo.com](mailto:JASelzer@SelzerCo.com).

---

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

---

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

---

Date: Sat, 4 Sep 2004 08:37:01 -0400  
Reply-To: [agreenberg@greenbergresearch.com](mailto:agreenberg@greenbergresearch.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Anna Greenberg <[agreenberg@GREENBERGRESEARCH.COM](mailto:agreenberg@GREENBERGRESEARCH.COM)>  
Subject: Re: [Fwd: Re: Convention Polls]  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[4138F435.1000401@umich.edu](mailto:4138F435.1000401@umich.edu)>

MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The ARG poll has Bush up 1 point with likely voters and down 2 points with registered voters. The Time poll has Bush up 11 points with likely voters.

Low propensity voters tend to be less educated and less affluent and therefore more Democratic. Conversely, high propensity voters tend to be better educated and more affluent and therefore more Republican. So, registered voters samples (which only use one screening question "are you registered to vote at this address?") tend to be more Democratic than likely voter samples that use multiple screens (e.g., voted in 2000, voted in 2002, likelihood of voting in 2004).

Polls should be broken down into battleground states versus national. Bush has generally performs better in national polls than in the battleground states because he has a national television buy in addition to the battleground states while Kerry and other groups are only advertising in battleground states.

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

From: Howard Schuman [mailto:hschuman@UMICH.EDU]  
Sent: Friday, September 03, 2004 6:46 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: [Fwd: Re: Convention Polls]

Can some knowledgeable aapor members comment on the implications of the distinction made by J. Ann Selzer, though doubtless it depends on the questions used to determine "likely" and maybe even "registered"?

It would also be helpful if national polls could be broken down by broad region or into clearly red, clearly blue, and unclear states, even though data on individual states are not practical. One commentator suggested that the main effect of the Republican Convention may have been to increase Bush support in the South, but not much in swing states. If that were the case and were to hold, it could even conceivably--and ironically--lead to Bush winning the popular vote but losing the electoral count. I don't claim that to be at all likely, but it would be useful to have some sort of three-way division of national polls that have 1200 or more cases. hs.

One study is of likely voters; the other of registered voters. I don't expect them to look the same. JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.  
Selzer & Company, Inc.  
Des Moines, Iowa 50312  
515.271.5700

visit our website: [www.SelzerCo.com](http://www.SelzerCo.com)

E-mail address for purposes of this list: [JAnnSelzer@aol.com](mailto:JAnnSelzer@aol.com); otherwise,

contact JASelzer@SelzerCo.com.

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

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

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

-----  
Date: Sat, 4 Sep 2004 09:50:11 -0400  
Reply-To: Mark Schulman <[M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM](mailto:M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mark Schulman <[M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM](mailto:M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM)>  
Subject: Time Magazine Poll: Additional Comments  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable  
Content-disposition: inline

I wanted to comment on our Time Magazine Republican Convention Poll, =  
released yesterday. As you know, the poll finds that Bush had an 11 point =  
lead over Kerry, 52=FD 41  
mong likely voters. We interviewed during the Republican convention, =  
Tuesday thru Thursday, not post-convention.=20

To quote our favorite line, \*polls are a snapshot in time.\* We don't know =  
if yesterday\*s numbers are just the apex of a convention bounce, with the =  
numbers falling back to the ground in a while, or if it marks a real =  
turning point. Previously, the horse-race numbers varied within a fairly =  
tight range, generally in the range of statistical deadlock or very slight =  
Kerry advantage. Yesterday\*s poll marks the first time in our Time polls =  
that a candidate has broken out of that range.=20

Please note that our Time Poll the week before the Republican Convention, =  
together with several other polls, including last week\*s ABC poll, were =  
already finding Kerry slippage, not just in the horserace, but, importantly=  
, in the internal numbers. Among other things, Kerry seemed to go =  
off-message when he got caught up in the Swift Boat accusations and other =  
blistering Republican attacks. His previous edge over Bush on domestic =  
issues, particularly economic stewardship, was already narrowing two weeks =  
ago, for example. And, of course, nominating conventions dominate the =  
news cycle, providing voters with intensive exposure, hence the often-time =



bounce. =20

The Time Poll\*s Bush \*bounce,\* comparing last week\*s numbers to this = week\*s. was a net 9 percentage points among likely voters, and not much = different among registered voters. That\*s a very typical-sized bounce. = Please remember that bounces from party conventions are more the rule than = the exception. Our Gallup colleagues have put together an excellent = history of bounces: =20

<http://www.gallup.com/content/?ci=3D12919> =20

Convention bounces are no longer assured, as Kerry discovered in early = August,=20 getting just a tiny bounce from the Dem convention. The Kerry mini-bounce = or no-bounce was a bigger surprise historically than was the Bush bounce = that we captured this week.

I\*m always pleased to answer any questions about the Time Poll. All of = the major election polls are \*open books.\* We're all aware of the = potential problems lurking in election polling as well, particularly as = coverage issues accelerate. We put supporting documents and data on our = web site ([www.srbi.com](http://www.srbi.com)) following each poll. There\*s a slight delay this = weekend because of an early start of the holiday weekend at SRBI. I hope = to have this week\*s poll up shortly.

Best wishes,  
Mark Schulman  
Schulman, Ronca & Bucuvalas, Inc.

[m.schulman@srbi.com](mailto:m.schulman@srbi.com)

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

---

Date: Sat, 4 Sep 2004 10:02:31 -0400  
Reply-To: Mike Donatello <[MDonatello@COX.NET](mailto:MDonatello@COX.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mike Donatello <[MDonatello@COX.NET](mailto:MDonatello@COX.NET)>  
Subject: FW: Online panel sources?  
Comments: To: AAPORnet <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Relaying a question for a colleague, which I could not answer because I haven't seen any good sources. Any replies appreciated. Thanks.

> What is the best source (book, white paper, etc.) you've seen on the ins and outs, pros and cons of web panels for survey research?

--  
Mike Donatello  
703.582.5680  
MDonatello@cox.net

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

---

Date: Sat, 4 Sep 2004 12:28:50 -0400  
Reply-To: Benoit Gauthier <[gauthier@circum.com](mailto:gauthier@circum.com)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Benoit Gauthier <[gauthier@CIRCUM.COM](mailto:gauthier@CIRCUM.COM)>  
Organization: =?UNKNOWN?Q?R=E9seau?= Circum  
Subject: Modification of call disposition codes  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

(2004.09.04, 12:20)

Hi, all.

I am looking for information on industry standards regarding the handling of call disposition codes. Specifically, I would like to know whether there are established practices regarding changing or not changing some disposition codes to other codes.

The case in point is Refusals. It is the practice of our company to call back Refusals once to attempt to convert them to Completed interviews. Handled by well trained senior interviewers, this practice lowers refusal rates, increases response rates and does not generate diplomatic incidents.

We have programmed our CATI system to allow Refusal codes to be converted only into a limited set of other dispositions in later calls. A Refusal can become a completed interview or an appointment, for example, but cannot become a Ringing-no-response. This is to avoid presenting an overly positive image of our field results.

Do you know whether there are established industry practices in this area? Where could I find information on this topic?

Beno=E9t Gauthier, <mailto:gauthier@circum.com>  
R=E9seau Circum inc. / Circum Network Inc., <http://circum.com>  
=C9cho Sondage inc., <http://echosondage.com>

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

Date: Sat, 4 Sep 2004 18:56:25 +0200  
Reply-To: Edith de Leeuw <[edithl@XS4ALL.NL](mailto:edithl@XS4ALL.NL)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Edith de Leeuw <[edithl@XS4ALL.NL](mailto:edithl@XS4ALL.NL)>  
Subject: Re: Message from the AAPOR Executive Office  
Comments: To: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[5647BFA1A58A3449B66CAFBB28A4510F7F421E@cerium.goAMP.com](mailto:5647BFA1A58A3449B66CAFBB28A4510F7F421E@cerium.goAMP.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

WELL, i checked with the AAPOR directory of members as of July 2004, and if you look under D you will find David Owelabi Ventures in Nigeria. So he appears to be a genuine member. Perhaps a case of wrong alphabetization , which happens sometimes with foreign names

Kind Regards, Edith D de Leeuw (in Europe classified under L, in the USA under D :-))

At 08:28 AM 9/3/2004 -0500, Mike Flanagan wrote:

>Good Morning

>

>It has come to our attention that an individual by the name of David A. >Owolabi has been sending e-mails about people in poverty to AAPOR >members. He claims to be a member of AAPOR, but he is not. It is not >clear how he obtained AAPOR members' e-mail addresses, but our >suggestion is to simply delete any messages from him.

>

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

Dr. Edith D. de Leeuw, MethodikA  
Plantage Doklaan 40, NL-1018 CN Amsterdam  
tel + 31 20 622 34 38 fax + 31 20 330 25 97  
e-mail [edithl@xs4all.nl](mailto:edithl@xs4all.nl)  
-----

De noordzee, de noordzee....  
Sign the Green Peace petition at <http://www.steundenordzee.nl/index.php>  
Let future generation enjoy our seas too  
-----

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

---

Date: Sat, 4 Sep 2004 16:01:41 -0400  
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>  
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing  
Subject: Re: FW: Online panel sources?  
Comments: To: Mike Donatello <MDonatello@COX.NET>  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <20040904140235.GZIC12737.lakermmtao03.cox.net@reactor>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The Economist magazine, working with the British online survey firm YouGov.com, has been conducting a weekly online poll on this year's presidential election. The results are made available online at:  
<http://www.economist.com/yougov>

More to the point of your query, in justification of their approach, they commissioned a white paper comparing online and telephone polling from Morris Fiorina and Jon Krosnick of Stanford, which you can download from the site listed above. You should also be able to get it from the direct link: <http://www.economist.com/media/pdf/Paper.pdf>

As a side note, the poll results published by the Economist and YouGov.com display the following notation: "MoE: +/-2%" which is utterly meaningless unless a poll was conducted using a probability sample. This makes me wonder whether the editors at The Economist actually understand the Fiorina/Krosnick paper in the first place.

Jan Werner

---

Mike Donatello wrote:

> Relaying a question for a colleague, which I could not answer because I  
> haven't seen any good sources. Any replies appreciated. Thanks.  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>> What is the best source (book, white paper, etc.) you've seen on the ins  
>  
> and outs, pros and cons of web panels for survey research?  
>  
>  
>  
> --  
> Mike Donatello  
> 703.582.5680  
> MDonatello@cox.net  
>

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

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

---

Date: Sun, 5 Sep 2004 20:58:58 +0200  
Reply-To: Edith de Leeuw <[edithl@XS4ALL.NL](mailto:edithl@XS4ALL.NL)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Edith de Leeuw <[edithl@XS4ALL.NL](mailto:edithl@XS4ALL.NL)>  
Subject: telescoping effects in traumatic situations  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu), [SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU](mailto:SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Dear friends,

I am posting this question for a valued friend and colleague of mine, professor 't Hart. He is supervising the Ph-D thesis of a medical psychiatrist into traumatic events. He warned for memory effects and telescoping in retrospective questions. The question is:  
In general telescoping says that the more traumatic, far reaching an event the shorter one thinks it is in the past. Does the same effect also holds for traumatic losses, like the death of a child, suicide of relative, divorce, etc. His hypothesis is that in such very direct and traumatic losses, telescoping does not arise. But is there any empirical research into this (e.g., with questions regarding death of child or spouse)?

Please send your answers directly to  
Harm 't Hart e-mail: [H.tHart@fss.uu.nl](mailto:H.tHart@fss.uu.nl)

Thanking you in advance, Edith

Dr. Edith D. de Leeuw, Methodika  
Plantage Doklaan 40, NL-1018 CN Amsterdam  
tel + 31 20 622 34 38 fax + 31 20 330 25 97  
e-mail [edithl@xs4all.nl](mailto:edithl@xs4all.nl)

-----  
De noordzee, de noordzee.... The sea, the sea  
Sign the Green Peace petition at <http://www.steundenoordzee.nl/index.php>  
Let future generation enjoy our seas too

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

Date: Sun, 5 Sep 2004 19:45:47 -0400  
Reply-To: [JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM](mailto:JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "J. Ann Selzer" <[JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM](mailto:JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM)>  
Subject: Re: [Fwd: Re: Convention Polls]  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I started this, so I'll say just a bit more. Thanks to David Moore who noted Time reported both the registered voter number and the likely voter number, which differed little.

The ideal sample mirrors the electorate who show up on the upcoming election day. As a sample frame close to the election, a registered voter sample is a good starting place, but it doesn't confine itself to people who actually voter, although they are legally entitled to do so. You get noise from non-voters in other words. In addition, in August and September, you miss late registrants so your frame is not comprehensive.

The Time study compares the two and suggests I'm off-base by trying to draw a distinction. But, I believe it says more about the election than the need for the closest approximation of the voting population as possible.

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.  
Selzer & Company, Inc.  
Des Moines, Iowa 50312  
515.271.5700

visit our website: [www.SelzerCo.com](http://www.SelzerCo.com)

E-mail address for purposes of this list: [JAnnSelzer@aol.com](mailto:JAnnSelzer@aol.com); otherwise, contact [JASelzer@SelzerCo.com](mailto:JASelzer@SelzerCo.com).

In a message dated 9/3/2004 6:09:22 PM Central Daylight Time, [hschuman@UMICH.EDU](mailto:hschuman@UMICH.EDU) writes:  
Can some knowledgeable aapor members comment on the implications of the distinction made by J. Ann Selzer, though doubtless it depends on the questions used to determine "likely" and maybe even "registered"?

It would also be helpful if national polls could be broken down by broad region or into clearly red, clearly blue, and unclear states, even though data on individual states are not practical. One commentator suggested that the main effect of the Republican Convention may have been to increase Bush support in the South, but not much in swing states. If that were the case and were to hold, it could even conceivably--and ironically--lead to Bush winning the popular vote but losing the electoral count. I don't claim that to be at all likely, but

it would be useful to have some sort of three-way division of national polls that have 1200 or more cases.   hs.

One study is of likely voters; the other of registered voters. I don't expect them to look the same. JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.  
Selzer & Company, Inc.  
Des Moines, Iowa 50312  
515.271.5700

visit our website: [www.SelzerCo.com](http://www.SelzerCo.com)

E-mail address for purposes of this list: [JAnnSelzer@aol.com](mailto:JAnnSelzer@aol.com); otherwise, contact [JASelzer@SelzerCo.com](mailto:JASelzer@SelzerCo.com).

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

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

=====

Date: Mon, 6 Sep 2004 13:50:56 -0700  
Reply-To: Woody Carter <[wcarter@DARKWING.UOREGON.EDU](mailto:wcarter@DARKWING.UOREGON.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Woody Carter <[wcarter@DARKWING.UOREGON.EDU](mailto:wcarter@DARKWING.UOREGON.EDU)>  
Subject: Bad news  
Comments: To: [patty@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU](mailto:patty@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU),  
Joel Bloom <[jbloom@darkwing.uoregon.edu](mailto:jbloom@darkwing.uoregon.edu)>,  
[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu), =?iso-8859-1?q?=22Bob\_Choquette=22?=  
<[choquett@uoregon.edu](mailto:choquett@uoregon.edu)>,  
[mcgeehan@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU](mailto:mcgeehan@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU), [sknap@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU](mailto:sknap@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU), Dan Burghart  
<[dburghar@darkwing.uoregon.edu](mailto:dburghar@darkwing.uoregon.edu)>,  
Juyeon Son <[json@darkwing.uoregon.edu](mailto:json@darkwing.uoregon.edu)>,  
Anthony Vincent Silvaggio <[tonys@darkwing.uoregon.edu](mailto:tonys@darkwing.uoregon.edu)>,  
[prapim@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU](mailto:prapim@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU)>, [moblo@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU](mailto:moblo@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU)>,  
[perren@uoregon.edu](mailto:perren@uoregon.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8bit

Flo has a rapidly spreading brain tumor and is having surgery Tuesday.  
The prognosis is not good. I'll let you know as things develop but realistically will not be reachable in the next few days.

Woody

Woody Carter, Director of Research  
University of Oregon Survey Research Lab

541 346-0934 (FAX 541 346-0388)

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

Date: Mon, 6 Sep 2004 17:11:20 -0500  
Reply-To: [alisu@email.com](mailto:alisu@email.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: =?iso-8859-1?Q?Alis=FA\_Schoua-Glusberg?= <[Alisu@EMAIL.COM](mailto:Alisu@EMAIL.COM)>  
Subject: On behalf of Woody Carter  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[200409062050.i86KovuY027839@darkwing.uoregon.edu](mailto:200409062050.i86KovuY027839@darkwing.uoregon.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

=20  
Dear Colleagues,=20

Woody Carter sends his apologies for sending to the list an email =  
message  
not meant for AAPORNET. As he puts it, the mistake is just further =  
example  
of his state of mind under his current family circumstances. =20

I am sure we all understand,

Alis=FA

\*\*\*\*\*

Alis=FA Schoua-Glusberg, Ph.D.  
General Partner  
Research Support Services  
906 Ridge Ave. Evanston, IL 60202  
847.971.9068 - fax: 847.556.6559  
[Alisu@email.com](mailto:Alisu@email.com)

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

Date: Mon, 6 Sep 2004 22:14:40 -0500  
Reply-To: Rob Santos <[rsantos@NUSTATS.COM](mailto:rsantos@NUSTATS.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Rob Santos <[rsantos@NUSTATS.COM](mailto:rsantos@NUSTATS.COM)>  
Subject: Re: On behalf of Woody Carter  
Comments: To: [alisu@EMAIL.COM](mailto:alisu@EMAIL.COM), =?ISO-8859-1?Q?Alis=FA\_Schoua-?=Glusberg  
<[Alisu@EMAIL.COM](mailto:Alisu@EMAIL.COM)>



Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <0I3N007BM4AJ1G@asu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

Woody is a long time, valued member of AAPOR & AAPORNET (and a great survey researcher, too). I hope all who know him (and maybe even those who don't) can take the time to offer our support & prayers to him & his family during this difficult period.

Rob

Quoting Alisú Schoua-Glusberg <Alisu@EMAIL.COM>:

>  
> Dear Colleagues,  
>  
> Woody Carter sends his apologies for sending to the list an email  
> message  
> not meant for AAPORNET. As he puts it, the mistake is just  
> further example  
> of his state of mind under his current family circumstances.

>  
> I am sure we all understand,

>  
> Alisú

>  
> \*\*\*\*\*

> Alisú Schoua-Glusberg, Ph.D.  
> General Partner  
> Research Support Services  
> 906 Ridge Ave. Evanston, IL 60202  
> 847.971.9068 - fax: 847.556.6559  
> Alisu@email.com

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

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

=====  
Date: Tue, 7 Sep 2004 09:14:16 -0400  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>

From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Subject: The RNC is frugging  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Recently my wife (a registered independent) received her second mailing from the Republican National Committee - the outside envelope was labeled "Republican Census Document Enclosed."

The cover letter (under the RNC masthead) notes that she is one of a "select group of Republicans who has been chosen to take part in the official CENSUS OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY."

After 15 questions including "Do you continue to support increasing the amount of security at airports, train stations and all government buildings including monuments and museums?" there is a request for contributions.

--  
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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Tue, 7 Sep 2004 10:33:24 -0400  
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>  
Subject: Re: The RNC is frugging  
Comments: To: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <0I3O00D7IA8R87@chimmx05.algx.net>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

If the return envelope comes with postage guaranteed wrap the envelope around a brick and mail it. That will get you off their mailing list.  
warren mitofsky

At 09:14 AM 9/7/2004, Leo Simonetta wrote:  
>Recently my wife (a registered independent) received her second mailing  
>from the Republican National Committee - the outside envelope was labeled  
>"Republican Census Document Enclosed."  
>  
>The cover letter (under the RNC masthead) notes that she is one of a  
>"select group of Republicans who has been chosen to take part in the  
>official CENSUS OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY."

>  
>After 15 questions including "Do you continue to support increasing the  
>amount of security at airports, train stations and all government buildings  
>including monuments and museums?" there is a request for contributions.

>  
>--  
>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](mailto: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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Tue, 7 Sep 2004 10:05:00 -0700  
Reply-To: John Oehlert <[joehlert@FRISOLUTIONS.COM](mailto:joehlert@FRISOLUTIONS.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: John Oehlert <[joehlert@FRISOLUTIONS.COM](mailto:joehlert@FRISOLUTIONS.COM)>  
Subject: Re: The RNC is frugging  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Great idea, Warren. As long as I can do the same thing with the requests I get from the Dem's and their surrogates. -- john

At 07:33 AM 9/7/2004, you wrote:

>If the return envelope comes with postage guaranteed wrap the envelope  
>around a brick and mail it. That will get you off their mailing list.  
>warren mitofsky

>  
>At 09:14 AM 9/7/2004, Leo Simonetta wrote:

>>Recently my wife (a registered independent) received her second mailing  
>>from the Republican National Committee - the outside envelope was labeled  
>>"Republican Census Document Enclosed."

>>  
>>The cover letter (under the RNC masthead) notes that she is one of a  
>>"select group of Republicans who has been chosen to take part in the  
>>official CENSUS OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY."

>>  
>>After 15 questions including "Do you continue to support increasing the  
>>amount of security at airports, train stations and all government buildings  
>>including monuments and museums?" there is a request for contributions.



MACRO), a full service research firm specializing in commercial and social survey research, seeks a Project Manager for its Manhattan office.

As a Project Manager you will manage research projects from inception to conclusion, as well as assist in proposal writing. You will assist with research design, survey data collection, data analysis, and report writing. Areas include health care and health insurance, banking, telecomm, mass transit.

The ideal candidate will possess 3-5 years of experience managing survey data collection projects (either Web, CATI, and/or mail), excellent analytic skills, and experience presenting research findings to clients. Bachelor's degree in relevant field required, advanced degree (MA/MS) preferred. Experience with Web-based surveys highly desired.

ORC MACRO offers opportunities for professional growth, a comprehensive benefits package including 401(k), profit sharing and tuition reimbursement and casual business dress. Send resume and salary requirements (preferably via email) to:

ORC MACRO  
Attn: HR  
116 John Street, Suite 800  
New York, NY 10038  
Robert.C.Gaffney@ORCMacro.com

Visit our web site at [www.ORCMacro.com](http://www.ORCMacro.com)

EOE/M/F/V/D

<<mailto:Thomas.P.Duffy.Jr@orcmacro.com>>Tom  
<<mailto:Thomas.P.Duffy.Jr@orcmacro.com>>Duffy  
<<http://www.macrint.com/>>ORC<<http://www.macrint.com/>> Macro  
116 John Street, Suite 800  
New York, NY 10038  
(212) 941-5555  
(212) 941-7031 fax  
[Thomas.P.Duffy.Jr@orcmacro.com](mailto:Thomas.P.Duffy.Jr@orcmacro.com)

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

=====

Date: Tue, 7 Sep 2004 13:36:19 -0700  
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <[lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM](mailto:lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leora Lawton <[lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM](mailto:lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM)>  
Subject: Re: The RNC is frugging  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
In-Reply-To: <[0I3O00D7IA8R87@chimmx05.algx.net](mailto:0I3O00D7IA8R87@chimmx05.algx.net)>  
MIME-version: 1.0

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

Frugging unfortunately seems to be multi-partisan.

Leora Lawton

On Tue, 7 Sep 2004, Leo Simonetta wrote:

> Date: Tue, 07 Sep 2004 09:14:16 -0400  
> From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: [AAPORNET] The RNC is frugging  
>  
> Recently my wife (a registered independent) received her second mailing  
> from the Republican National Committee - the outside envelope was labeled  
> "Republican Census Document Enclosed."  
>  
> The cover letter (under the RNC masthead) notes that she is one of a  
> "select group of Republicans who has been chosen to take part in the  
> official CENSUS OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY."  
>  
> After 15 questions including "Do you continue to support increasing the  
> amount of security at airports, train stations and all government buildings  
> including monuments and museums?" there is a request for contributions.  
>  
> --  
> 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](mailto: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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Tue, 7 Sep 2004 17:14:42 -0400  
Reply-To: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <[tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu](mailto:tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <[tmglp@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU](mailto:tmglp@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU)>  
Subject: Got data on Iraq support by education?  
Comments: To: AAPORnet List server <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
Comments: cc: "kingston, paul" <[pwk@virginia.edu](mailto:pwk@virginia.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit  
Content-disposition: inline

A colleague, Paul Kingston, is looking for recent data he could use in a Sociology lecture (tomorrow, Wednesday!) that shows the relationship between a person's education and their degree of support for the war in Iraq. My very quick check of a few web sites came up empty. Does anybody have a graph or table handy that shows this (or a similar) relationship? If so, please send it directly to Paul at [pwk@virginia.edu](mailto:pwk@virginia.edu) and he'll give you credit before over a hundred wide-eyed intro soc students at UVa.

TIA,  
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](mailto:TomG@virginia.edu)

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

-----  
Date: Tue, 7 Sep 2004 18:02:39 -0400  
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Got data on Iraq support by education?  
Comments: To: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <[tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu](mailto:tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[110195671.1094577282@DJMV3P31.csrser.cooper.virginia.edu](mailto:110195671.1094577282@DJMV3P31.csrser.cooper.virginia.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Thomas M. Guterbock wrote:

>A colleague, Paul Kingston, is looking for recent data he could use in a  
>Sociology lecture (tomorrow, Wednesday!) that shows the relationship  
>between a person's education and their degree of support for the war in  
>Iraq. My very quick check of a few web sites came up empty. Does anybody  
>have a graph or table handy that shows this (or a similar) relationship?  
>If so, please send it directly to Paul at [pwk@virginia.edu](mailto:pwk@virginia.edu) and he'll give  
>you credit before over a hundred wide-eyed intro soc students at UVa.

Hey, why not cc the list - I'm sure many of us would be interested.

Doug

-----

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

Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Wed, 8 Sep 2004 08:45:34 -0400  
Reply-To: "Terhanian, George" <[GTerhanian@HIEUROPE.COM](mailto:GTerhanian@HIEUROPE.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Terhanian, George" <[GTerhanian@HIEUROPE.COM](mailto:GTerhanian@HIEUROPE.COM)>  
Subject: Job Openings in the UK at HI Europe  
Comments: To: "[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)" <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Hello,

HI Europe, Harris Interactive's UK-based subsidiary, has more than 30 positions available in the UK for researchers, methodologists, and data processing staff at all levels. Please see description(s) and contact information below and feel free to forward this to any and all of your colleagues who might be interested in working for us.

Kind regards,

George

-----  
George H. Terhanian, Ph.D.  
President, HI Europe  
Watermans Park  
High Street, Brentford TW8 0BB  
United Kingdom  
+44 (0) 20 8263 5280 (work)  
+44 (0) 79 1916 7813 (mobile)  
+44 (0) 20 8263 5234 (fax)  
[www.hieurope.com](http://www.hieurope.com)

-----  
Harris Interactive & HI Europe

A full-service market research agency with a blue chip client list.

- \* Fast paced, high energy environment
- \* Worldwide leaders in internet research
- \* Offices in UK, France, USA and Japan.

I. Vacancies - Market Researchers at all levels, from Senior Research Assistants to Associate Directors.

Location: UK Maidenhead, Berkshire and Brentford, West London

Due to recent business success and ambitious plans for accelerated growth in its pan-European business, HI Europe is seeking to recruit researchers at



all levels to join its Full Service Research Division working in international markets across a broad range of industry sectors. We offer a mix of consumer and business-to-business research skills. Appointees would take full responsibility, appropriate to their experience, for the day-to-day management of a range of studies covering both ad hoc and continuous full service research.

The team is involved in a very broad range of research activities: opportunity analysis, new product development, market segmentation, usage and attitudes, customer satisfaction/retention, pricing, tracking, etc. These studies can incorporate our proprietary advanced research techniques, mainly predictive approaches to solving pricing, product development and segmentation problems. Studies are conducted using both traditional and Internet techniques. (Training in these techniques would be offered.)

#### Requirements:

- \* A strong interest in research as a discipline, and, for the more senior posts, a good track record of research experience, preferably in an agency environment.
- \* Enthusiasm and ambition.
- \* Good project management skills.
- \* An ability/willingness to take responsibility and work with a minimum of supervision.
- \* A high level of numeracy and accuracy, ideally including a knowledge of basic statistics.
- \* Strong verbal and written communication skills.
- \* Strong attention to detail and an ability to 'juggle' tasks/priorities effectively.
- \* A proactive approach to problem-solving.
- \* An ability to use research results powerfully and effectively in offering added value to clients and action-oriented solutions tailored to their specific needs.
- \* Strong IT skills.
- \* Fluency in another European language would be an asset, but not essential.
- \* A good degree (a 2.1 or higher), ideally in a related subject (business studies, marketing, maths/statistics, languages)

#### II. Vacancies: Data Processing staff at all levels

Location: UK Brentford, West London

Provide programming (spec writing) and technical services needed in support of client studies including survey data verification and processing, statistical programming, report generation and data analysis. Manage projects with respect to data analysis. Reports to DP Manager.

#### Requirements

- \* Degree or education in related field (Mathematics, Computer Science,

Information Systems, Applied Statistics). For mid and senior positions and at least 1-3 years of relevant work experience.

- \* Knowledge of market research software such as Quantum, Quanvert, CFMC Mentor, Survey Craft.
- \* Good knowledge of statistics and statistical terminology.
- \* Knowledge of the various tools, procedures and processes used to process research data (survey weighting, regression methodology, data merging etc).
- \* Proficient in Microsoft Word, Excel, and Access.
- \* Knowledge of a data analysis language such as SPSS or SAS with experience on both PC and mainframe platforms.
- \* Knowledge of programming languages such as Visual Basic, Perl, sed, awk, Unix shell scripting and platform experience a plus
- \* Quickly learn different programming languages, software packages, and communication styles.
- \* Ability to manage projects across multiple staff members. Ensure that all deadlines are met, efficiently manage resources; effective delegation of tasks.
- \* Attention to detail is critical.

#### Additional Information

Refer to the career section on our website - [www.hieurope.com](http://www.hieurope.com)

To apply please email us at [jobs@hieurope.com](mailto:jobs@hieurope.com)

For further information please contact our Recruitment Coordinator: Tanya Baker, email: [tbaker@hieurope.com](mailto:tbaker@hieurope.com)

HI Europe is an Equal Opportunities Employer.

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

Date: Wed, 8 Sep 2004 09:42:46 -0400  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Got data on Iraq support by education?  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[p05200f0dbd63e071b0a7@\[192.168.0.196\]](mailto:p05200f0dbd63e071b0a7@[192.168.0.196])>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

The only one I could find was this one from a Washington Post/ABC news poll.

On another subject, all in all, considering the costs to the United States versus the benefits to the United States, do you think the war with Iraq was worth fighting, or not?

Responses by Education Level

	High School or Less		
Some College	College Graduate	All	
Yes, worth fighting, STRONGLY		35%	39%
34%	36%		
Yes, worth fighting, SOMEWHAT		14%	10%
15%	13%		
No, not worth fighting, SOMEWHAT			12%
11%	8%	11%	
No, not worth fighting, STRONGLY			35%
37%	40%	37%	
DK/No opinion			4%
2%	2%	3%	

Source: A Washington Post/ABC News poll conducted by telephone July 22-25, 2004, among a random national sample of 1,202 adults.

--

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 Doug Henwood

> Sent: Tuesday, September 07, 2004 6:03 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: Got data on Iraq support by education?

>

> Thomas M. Guterbock wrote:

>

>>A colleague, Paul Kingston, is looking for recent data he

> could use in

>>a Sociology lecture (tomorrow, Wednesday!) that shows the

> relationship

>>between a person's education and their degree of support for

> the war in

>>Iraq. My very quick check of a few web sites came up empty. Does

>>anybody have a graph or table handy that shows this (or a

> similar) relationship?

>>If so, please send it directly to Paul at [pwk@virginia.edu](mailto:pwk@virginia.edu) and he'll

>>give you credit before over a hundred wide-eyed intro soc

> students at UVa.

>

> Hey, why not cc the list - I'm sure many of us would be interested.

>

> Doug

>

> -----

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

> Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

> set aapornet nomail  
> On your return send: set aapornet mail  
>

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

Date: Wed, 8 Sep 2004 10:33:58 -0400  
Reply-To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <[Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU](mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <[Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU](mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Got data on Iraq support by education?  
Comments: To: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Comments: cc: "pwk@virginia.edu" <[pwk@virginia.edu](mailto:pwk@virginia.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain

Sorry this didn't make it in time. IPPSR runs a quarterly survey -- the State of the State Survey -- of Michigan residents. The most recent survey ran from April to June 2004 and posed two questions on Iraq:  
"Now, thinking about the 2003 American invasion of Iraq, do you think it was justified or not justified?"

Justified  
k-High School - 47%  
Some college - College graduates - 58%  
Post-grad - 39%

"Do you think the potential benefits of the war in Iraq outweigh the costs that Americans are bearing?"

Benefits outweigh costs  
k-High School - 50%  
Some college - College graduates - 46%  
Post-grad - 34%

Information on the survey particulars is available at  
<http://www.ippsr.msu.edu/SOSS/SOSSdatacode.htm>

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: Doug Henwood [<mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM>]  
Sent: Tuesday, September 07, 2004 5:03 PM  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Subject: Re: Got data on Iraq support by education?

Thomas M. Guterbock wrote:

>A colleague, Paul Kingston, is looking for recent data he could use in a  
>Sociology lecture (tomorrow, Wednesday!) that shows the relationship  
>between a person's education and their degree of support for the war in  
>Iraq. My very quick check of a few web sites came up empty. Does anybody  
>have a graph or table handy that shows this (or a similar) relationship?  
>If so, please send it directly to Paul at [pwk@virginia.edu](mailto:pwk@virginia.edu) and he'll give  
>you credit before over a hundred wide-eyed intro soc students at UVa.

Hey, why not cc the list - I'm sure many of us would be interested.

Doug

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

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

---

Date: Wed, 8 Sep 2004 11:14:28 -0400  
Reply-To: dick halpern <[dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET](mailto:dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: dick halpern <[dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET](mailto:dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET)>  
Subject: 2004: It Is Not An 11 Point Race - by John Zogby  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: multipart/mixed; x-avg-checked=avg-ok-593032BB;  
boundary="Boundary\_(ID\_8DyeST9ylxHxcS+ky5bhTA)"

--Boundary\_(ID\_8DyeST9ylxHxcS+ky5bhTA)  
Content-type: text/plain; x-avg-checked=avg-ok-593032BB; charset=us-ascii;  
format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8bit

Interesting commentary just released by Zogby disputing the 11 point lead  
recently reported.....

<http://zogby.com/news/ReadNews859.html>

9/7/2004  
2004: It Is Not An 11 Point Race - by John Zogby

The Republican National Convention is over and score it a huge success for  
President George W. Bush. For one solid week he was on message and got  
Americans who watched to listen to the message he intends to carry in the  
fall campaign: leadership, decisiveness and success battling the war on  
terrorism. The convention actually followed another big week for Mr. Bush

and equally dismal one for his opponent, Democratic Senator John Kerry.

Now the first polls are out. I have Mr. Bush leading by 2 points in the simple head-to-head match up - 46% to 44%. Add in the other minor candidates and it becomes a 3 point advantage for the President - 46% to 43%. This is no small achievement. The President was behind 50% to 43% in my mid-August poll and he essentially turned the race around by jumping 3 points as Mr. Kerry lost 7 points. Impressive by any standards.

For the first time in my polling this year, Mr. Bush lined up his Republican ducks in a row by receiving 90% support of his own party, went ahead among Independents, and now leads by double-digits among key groups like investors. Also for the first time the President now leads among Catholics. Mr. Kerry is on the ropes.

Two new polls came out immediately after mine (as of this writing) by the nation's leading weekly news magazines. Both Time's 52% to 41% lead among likely voters and Newsweek's 54% to 43% lead among registered voters give the President a healthy 11 point lead. I have not yet been able to get the details of Time's methodology but I have checked out Newsweek's poll. Their sample of registered voters includes 38% Republican, 31% Democrat and 31% Independent voters. If we look at the three last Presidential elections, the spread was 34% Democrats, 34% Republicans and 33% Independents (in 1992 with Ross Perot in the race); 39% Democrats, 34% Republicans, and 27% Independents in 1996; and 39% Democrats, 35% Republicans and 26% Independents in 2000. While party identification can indeed change within the electorate, there is no evidence anywhere to suggest that Democrats will only represent 31% of the total vote this year. In fact, other competitors have gone in the opposite direction. The Los Angeles Times released a poll in June of this year with 38% Democrats and only 25% Republicans. And Gallup's party identification figures have been all over the place.

This is no small consideration. Given the fact that each candidate receives anywhere between eight in ten and nine in ten support from voters in his own party, any change in party identification trades point for point in the candidate's total support. My polls use a party weight of 39% Democrat, 35% Republican and 26% Independent. Thus in examining the Newsweek poll, add three points for Mr. Bush because of the percentage of Republicans in their poll, then add another 8% for Mr. Bush for the reduction in Democrats. It is not hard to see how we move from my two-point lead to their eleven-point lead for the President.

I will save the detailed methodological discussion for another time. But I will remind readers that my polling has come closest to the final results in both 1996 and 2000.

None of this takes away from the President's achievement. He got out of his party's convention everything he needed to launch his campaign in earnest in the closing two months. But my poll still reveals lurking shadows for him. He still has a net negative job performance rating, a negative re-elect (i.e. more voters think it is time for someone new than feel he deserves re-election) and a net negative wrong direction for the country.

The poll also suggests that Mr. Kerry is behind and has a lot of work to do to refocus the campaign on the issues that must work for him: the economy, health care, and the execution of the war in Iraq. We also see now that at least in the short run, the advertising campaign against the Senator about his military service in Vietnam has raised questions about his integrity and has caused his personal unfavorable numbers to jump.

But with all that said, it simply is not an 11 point race. It just isn't.

John Zogby is the President and CEO of Zogby International- an independent polling firm, and writes this column for the Financial Times where it first appeared..

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

<<http://www.zogby.com/features/features.dbm?ID=212>>Zogby Interactive 2004  
Presidential Election Tracking

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

--Boundary\_(ID\_8DyeST9ylxHxcS+ky5bhTA)  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-avg=cert;  
x-avg-checked=avg-ok-593032BB  
Content-disposition: inline

---  
Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.  
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).  
Version: 6.0.752 / Virus Database: 503 - Release Date: 9/3/2004

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

--Boundary\_(ID\_8DyeST9ylxHxcS+ky5bhTA)--

=====  
Date: Wed, 8 Sep 2004 12:36:22 -0400  
Reply-To: Lance Hoffman <[lhoffman@OPINIONACCESS.COM](mailto:lhoffman@OPINIONACCESS.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Lance Hoffman <[lhoffman@OPINIONACCESS.COM](mailto:lhoffman@OPINIONACCESS.COM)>  
Organization: Opinion Access Corp.  
Subject: Response rate question - sort of  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Hello, all. I hope everyone had a nice Labor Day weekend - too short, I'm sure. I have a request from a client, and in an effort to quantify the associated costs of satisfying their request, I thought I might pose

a question.

We currently run a large scale study for this client using telephone interviewing, with a set calling methodology consisting of the following:

- \* Each number is to be dialed a maximum of 10 times, scattered over different days/day parts
- \* Upon an initial refusal, a number will continue to be dialed until one of the following occurs:
  1. A second "hard refusal" is achieved
  2. We get a complete, or
  3. We reach max calls (10)

My client is now requesting what the price implications would be to raise the max call counter to 20. As we have limited experience in costing such an option, my question is this: When you increase dialings from 10 to 20, what percentage of the numbers between the 11th and 20th attempt get resolved (refusal, complete, etc.) before max attempts is hit? Any information regarding this would be useful to me, as I have an idea on how to price this increase in effort/decrease in production.

Thank you all in advance for any help you can offer me regarding this information. Please feel free to reply on the list or direct.

Best regards,

Lance Hoffman  
Manager, Business Development  
Opinion Access Corp. <<http://www.opinionaccess.com/>>  
P: 718.729.2622 x.157  
F: 718.729.2444  
C: 646.522.2012

---

This email is confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or organization to which it is addressed. Any opinions or advice presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Opinion Access Corp. DO NOT copy, modify, distribute or take any action in reliance on this email if you are not the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender and delete this email from your system. Although this email has been checked for viruses and other defects, no responsibility can be accepted for any loss or damage arising from its receipt or use.

---

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

---

Date: Wed, 8 Sep 2004 10:18:07 -0700  
Reply-To: Doug Strand <[dstrand@CSM.BERKELEY.EDU](mailto:dstrand@CSM.BERKELEY.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>



From: Doug Strand <dstrand@CSM.BERKELEY.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Got data on Iraq support by education?  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <C5E0665BB776D311868400805FF5603A0591B577@sscentex.ssc.msu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Hi, all,

This might also miss the sociologist's lecture, but for what it's worth, we have found almost no relationship between education and position on the war in Iraq. Only those who have a graduate school education stand out, showing higher opposition.

Public Agendas and Citizen Engagement Survey (PACES)  
February 18 - August 25, 2004 (rolling cross-section, US, national adults, monthly fresh samples), n = 867

Do you think the US SHOULD - or SHOULD NOT - have invaded Iraq?

	Should	Should Not	DK/Not
answered			
Less than HS grad	47	37	15
HS Grad	50	38	13
Some College	50	38	12
College Grad	49	39	12
Graduate School	36	56	8
All	47	41	12
n = 867			

If one removes those youth who may not yet have graduated from college or graduate school, and just looks at those age 27 and up, very little changes. The lowest educated becomes more evenly split on the war than the average for the sample as a whole, but there are only 42 cases in that lowest educated group, so the standard error there is large.

	Should	Should Not	DK/Not
answered			
Less than HS grad	40	40	19
HS Grad	49	37	14
Some College	52	38	10
College Grad	51	38	11
Graduate School	36	56	7
All	47	42	12
n = 663			

Best,  
Doug Strand

-----  
Douglas Strand, Ph.D.  
Project Director

Public Agendas and Citizen Engagement Survey (PACES)  
Survey Research Center  
UC Berkeley  
354 Barrows Hall  
Tel: 510-642-0508  
Fax: 510-642-9665

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

>From: Doug Henwood [mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM]

>Sent: Tuesday, September 07, 2004 5:03 PM

>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>Subject: Re: Got data on Iraq support by education?

>

>Thomas M. Guterbock wrote:

>

>>A colleague, Paul Kingston, is looking for recent data he could use in a  
>>Sociology lecture (tomorrow, Wednesday!) that shows the relationship  
>>between a person's education and their degree of support for the war in  
>>Iraq. My very quick check of a few web sites came up empty. Does anybody  
>>have a graph or table handy that shows this (or a similar) relationship?  
>>If so, please send it directly to Paul at pwk@virginia.edu and he'll give  
>>you credit before over a hundred wide-eyed intro soc students at UVa.

>

>Hey, why not cc the list - I'm sure many of us would be interested.

>

>Doug

>

>-----

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

>Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

>set aapornet nomail

>On your return send: set aapornet mail

>

>-----

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

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

>-----

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

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Wed, 8 Sep 2004 11:41:28 -0700

Reply-To: Marc Sapir <[marcsapir@COMCAST.NET](mailto:marcsapir@COMCAST.NET)>

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

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

Subject: Re: Got data on Iraq support by education?

Comments: To: Doug Strand <[dstrand@CSM.BERKELEY.EDU](mailto:dstrand@CSM.BERKELEY.EDU)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

In-Reply-To: <[5.2.1.1.2.20040908093952.02a3c3e8@csm.berkeley.edu](mailto:5.2.1.1.2.20040908093952.02a3c3e8@csm.berkeley.edu)>

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I think Doug Strand and the other poll data put up earlier on this

subject suggest that much education in the U.S. has deteriorated into a form of ritualism. It would seem that one has to have a PhD to be able to think critically. As most of you are aware a large majority of the public still thinks that Saddam worked with Al Qaeda. So why wouldn't those folks thing the war worth it? It was 39% in our last poll in May down from 45% in a previous poll. Even CNN's anchor lamented during the RNC convention that CNN is losing the Republican and conservative viewers to Fox, pointing out that such people seem to be uninterested in hearing information or viewpoints that differ from ones they hold strongly. (Not that I think CNN is particularly virtuous in presenting a nuanced and fair view of the world or the U.S, but Wolf and friends are right about that one). Strength of belief is becoming disconnected from, and a surreal surrogate for, facts, meaningful debate and analysis of same. The importation of biblical literalism into politics is but one of the common pathways to that end. This speaks to the importance of polls focusing on highly specific policy issues and trying to avoid questions based in the behavioral realm of emotional responsivity (of which the horserace polls are simply one example).

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

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Doug Strand  
Sent: Wednesday, September 08, 2004 9:18 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Got data on Iraq support by education?

Hi, all,

This might also miss the sociologist's lecture, but for what it's worth, we have found almost no relationship between education and position on the war in Iraq. Only those who have a graduate school education stand out, showing higher opposition.

Public Agendas and Citizen Engagement Survey (PACES)  
February 18 - August 25, 2004 (rolling cross-section, US, national adults, monthly fresh samples), n = 867

Do you think the US SHOULD - or SHOULD NOT - have invaded Iraq?

	Should	Should Not	DK/Not
answered			
Less than HS grad	47	37	15
HS Grad	50	38	13
Some College	50	38	12

College Grad	49	39	12
Graduate School	36	56	8
All	47	41	12
n = 867			

If one removes those youth who may not yet have graduated from college or graduate school, and just looks at those age 27 and up, very little changes.

The lowest educated becomes more evenly split on the war than the average for the sample as a whole, but there are only 42 cases in that lowest educated group, so the standard error there is large.

	Should	Should Not	DK/Not answered
Less than HS grad	40	40	19
HS Grad	49	37	14
Some College	52	38	10
College Grad	51	38	11
Graduate School	36	56	7
All	47	42	12
n = 663			

Best,  
Doug Strand

-----  
Douglas Strand, Ph.D.  
Project Director  
Public Agendas and Citizen Engagement Survey (PACES)  
Survey Research Center  
UC Berkeley  
354 Barrows Hall  
Tel: 510-642-0508  
Fax: 510-642-9665

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

>From: Doug Henwood [mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM]

>Sent: Tuesday, September 07, 2004 5:03 PM

>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>Subject: Re: Got data on Iraq support by education?

>

>Thomas M. Guterbock wrote:

>

>>A colleague, Paul Kingston, is looking for recent data he could use in a

>>Sociology lecture (tomorrow, Wednesday!) that shows the relationship

>>between a person's education and their degree of support for the war in

>>Iraq. My very quick check of a few web sites came up empty. Does anybody

> >have a graph or table handy that shows this (or a similar) relationship?  
> >If so, please send it directly to Paul at [pwk@virginia.edu](mailto:pwk@virginia.edu) and he'll give you credit before over a hundred wide-eyed intro soc students at UVa.  
> >Hey, why not cc the list - I'm sure many of us would be interested.  
> >Doug  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
> set aapornet nomail  
> On your return send: set aapornet mail  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
> [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

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

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

---

Date: Wed, 8 Sep 2004 13:53:07 -0700  
Reply-To: "Dr. Thomas Lamatsch" <[lamatsch@UNLV.NEVADA.EDU](mailto:lamatsch@UNLV.NEVADA.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Dr. Thomas Lamatsch" <[lamatsch@UNLV.NEVADA.EDU](mailto:lamatsch@UNLV.NEVADA.EDU)>  
Subject: copyright question  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <009b01c495c1\$fa184da0\$8301a8c0@LHOFFMAN>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Hi everybody:

I was approached by a client who is interested in contracting us to do an evaluation. The company they previously worked with used a 250 question instrument (to be administered in 15 min!!) and I recommended cutting down the questionnaire considerably. The original questionnaire copy states that "this questionnaire is copyrighted". Would it be a copyright violation if we take the questions we actually like and integrate them into our own instrument?

--tom

\*\*\*\*\*

Thomas Lamatsch, Ph.D.  
Director - Cannon Center for Survey Research  
Ast. Professor in Residence - Dept of Political Science  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
4505 Maryland Pkwy - Box 455008  
Las Vegas, NV 89154-5008  
phone: (702)895-0167  
fax (702)895-0165  
lamatsch@unlv.nevada.edu

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Lance Hoffman  
Sent: Wednesday, September 08, 2004 9:36 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Response rate question - sort of

Hello, all. I hope everyone had a nice Labor Day weekend - too short, I'm sure. I have a request from a client, and in an effort to quantify the associated costs of satisfying their request, I thought I might pose a question.

We currently run a large scale study for this client using telephone interviewing, with a set calling methodology consisting of the following:

- \* Each number is to be dialed a maximum of 10 times, scattered over different days/day parts
- \* Upon an initial refusal, a number will continue to be dialed until one of the following occurs:
  1. A second "hard refusal" is achieved
  2. We get a complete, or
  3. We reach max calls (10)

My client is now requesting what the price implications would be to raise the max call counter to 20. As we have limited experience in costing such an option, my question is this: When you increase dialings from 10 to 20, what percentage of the numbers between the 11th and 20th attempt get resolved (refusal, complete, etc.) before max attempts is hit? Any information regarding this would be useful to me, as I have an idea on how to price this increase in effort/decrease in production.

Thank you all in advance for any help you can offer me regarding this information. Please feel free to reply on the list or direct.

Best regards,

Lance Hoffman  
Manager, Business Development  
Opinion Access Corp. <<http://www.opinionaccess.com/>>  
P: 718.729.2622 x.157  
F: 718.729.2444  
C: 646.522.2012

This email is confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or organization to which it is addressed. Any opinions or advice presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Opinion Access Corp. DO NOT copy, modify, distribute or take any action in reliance on this email if you are not the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender and delete this email from your system. Although this email has been checked for viruses and other defects, no responsibility can be accepted for any loss or damage arising from its receipt or use.

---

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

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

---

---

Date: Wed, 8 Sep 2004 17:00:08 -0400  
Reply-To: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <[tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu](mailto:tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <[tmglp@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU](mailto:tmglp@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Got data on Iraq support by education? (fwd)  
Comments: To: AAPORnet List server <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
Comments: cc: [pwk@virginia.edu](mailto:pwk@virginia.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit  
Content-disposition: inline

First, let me pass on to the entire list the thanks of Paul Kingston, who heard directly from several of you with the latest poll numbers on Iraq-war support by education, from both national and state-wide polls. He is in awe of AAPORnet and has passed on that enthusiasm for what we do to the inquiring minds of his SOC 101 students here at UVa. He's thanked those who responded individually but I wanted to pass on our appreciation to the whole list.

Second, let me follow up on Doug Henwood's suggestion and share at least one result (with the permission of Susan Pinkus). The relevant result from the LA Times poll appears below. Based on the several results sent to Paul, it seems that there is relatively uniform support (or lack thereof) across categories of education, except for those with graduate degrees, who are significantly less supportive of the war. Of course, results vary with timing of the poll and wording of the question.

Thanks again!

Tom Guterbock

----- Forwarded Message -----

Date: Tuesday, September 07, 2004 3:23 PM -0700  
From: "Pinkus, Susan" <Susan.Pinkus@latimes.com>  
To: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmg1p@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU>  
Subject: RE: Got data on Iraq support by education?

LAT0505: National and Battleground States  
1352 respondents were interviewed 08/21/2004-08/24/2004

PREQ48.

Now turning to some questions about Iraq.

Q48.

All in all, do you think the situation in Iraq was worth going to war over, or not?

Q77. (QEDUC)

What is the highest grade of regular school or college that you finished and got credit for? (IF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE) After graduating from high school, did you complete some technical training like secretarial school, or art school, or trade school, or something like that? (IF R. FINISHED FOURTH YEAR OF HIGH SCHOOL OR COLLEGE, PROBE TO FIND OUT WHETHER A DIPLOMA OR DEGREE WAS RECEIVED. DO NOT CREDIT FOR THAT YEAR WITHOUT GRADUATION DOCUMENT)

CC77: Education of R.

N	554	384	404	10	1352
%	41	28	30	1	100

Q48: Sit in Iraq-WorthWar

N	%	HS/LESS	SOME COL	COLLEGE+	REFUSED	MARGINAL
618	46	WORTHWAR	48	49	39	xx 46
664	49	N/WORTH	46	45	58	xx 49
64	5	NOT SURE	6	6	2	xx 5
6	0	REFUSED	0	0	1	x 0

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

From: Thomas M. Guterbock [mailto:tmg1p@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU]  
Sent: Tuesday, September 07, 2004 2:15 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Got data on Iraq support by education?

A colleague, Paul Kingston, is looking for recent data he could use in a Sociology lecture (tomorrow, Wednesday!) that shows the relationship between a person's education and their degree of support for the war in Iraq. My very quick check of a few web sites came up empty. Does anybody have a graph or table handy that shows this (or a similar) relationship?



If so, please send it directly to Paul at [pwk@virginia.edu](mailto:pwk@virginia.edu) and he'll give you credit before over a hundred wide-eyed intro soc students at UVa.

TIA,  
Tom

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

Date: Thu, 9 Sep 2004 10:02:55 +0100  
Reply-To: "Moon, Nick" <[nmoon@NOPWORLD.COM](mailto:nmoon@NOPWORLD.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Moon, Nick" <[nmoon@NOPWORLD.COM](mailto:nmoon@NOPWORLD.COM)>  
Subject: problems facing the polls  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

about two weeks ago someone posted a very interesting piece about a risk of the polls underestimating Democrat support considerably because a number of long-held assumptions about turnout and voter behaviour may prove to be false this time round.

I intended to keep it, but seem to have deleted it by mistake. If the original poster, or anyone else who has kept it, could send it to me again off-list I would be very grateful

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

\*\*\*\*\*  
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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Thu, 9 Sep 2004 10:56:01 -0400

Reply-To: Melissa Marcello <[mmarcello@PURSUANTRESEARCH.COM](mailto:mmarcello@PURSUANTRESEARCH.COM)>

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

From: Melissa Marcello <[mmarcello@PURSUANTRESEARCH.COM](mailto:mmarcello@PURSUANTRESEARCH.COM)>

Subject: categorical occupation question

Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Hello,

I was wondering whether folks could recommend a categorical occupation question for a telephone survey we will be fielding shortly. We're not looking for a high level of specificity, but would like to have a sense for what respondents do for a living without asking it as an open end, going through elaborate coding, etc. Does anyone has a single occ question that you like?

Thanks,

Melissa

Melissa Marcello

Pursuant, Inc.

2141 P Street NW

Suite 105

Washington, DC 20037

p 202.887.0070

f 800.567.1723

c 202.352.7462

Visit our website at [www.pursuantresearch.com](http://www.pursuantresearch.com)

---

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

---

Date: Thu, 9 Sep 2004 11:25:23 -0400  
Reply-To: "Donelan, Karen" <[KDONELAN@PARTNERS.ORG](mailto:KDONELAN@PARTNERS.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Donelan, Karen" <[KDONELAN@PARTNERS.ORG](mailto:KDONELAN@PARTNERS.ORG)>  
Subject: Harris Interactive to merge with WirthlinWorldwide  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

<http://www.harrisinteractive.com/news/>

---

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

---

Date: Thu, 9 Sep 2004 08:58:29 -0700  
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <[lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM](mailto:lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leora Lawton <[lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM](mailto:lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM)>  
Subject: Re: categorical occupation question  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <003c01c4967d\$1fcd1970\$0701a8c0@Laptop>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

My question is this: what concept do you want to measure in your variable about occupation, and what do you think is the relationship between that concept and the concept you want to explain (the dependent variable). If you are looking at likelihood to be a person who uses online brokerages you might consider an occupational classification that includes a certain amount of 'economic and technological' sophistication. If you want to know how occupation relates to the likelihood of having health insurance, then you want to tweak your categories to issues of fulltime and part-time. etc.

Aside: I've found myself needing to review experimental methodology (Experimental and Quasi-experimental Designs, Shadish, Cook and Campbell,, 2002), and the early chapters deal with various forms of validity. While it's stuff I know, thinking about the dozens of forms of threat to validity is something someone designing questionnaires might do every now and then.

best,  
Leora

Dr. Leora Lawton, Principal  
TechSociety Research  
2342 Shattuck Avenue PMB 362, Berkeley, CA 94704  
(510) 548-6174; fax (510) 548-6175; cell (510) 928-7572  
www.techsociety.com

On Thu, 9 Sep 2004, Melissa Marcello wrote:

> Date: Thu, 09 Sep 2004 10:56:01 -0400  
> From: Melissa Marcello <mmarcello@PURSUANTRESEARCH.COM>  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: [AAPORNET] categorical occupation question

>  
> Hello,

>  
>  
> I was wondering whether folks could recommend a categorical occupation  
> question for a telephone survey we will be fielding shortly. We're not  
> looking for a high level of specificity, but would like to have a sense for  
> what respondents do for a living without asking it as an open end, going  
> through elaborate coding, etc. Does anyone has a single occ question that  
> you like?

>  
>  
> Thanks,

> Melissa

>  
>  
> Melissa Marcello

> Pursuant, Inc.

> 2141 P Street NW

> Suite 105

>

> Washington, DC 20037  
>  
> p 202.887.0070  
>  
> f 800.567.1723  
>  
> c 202.352.7462  
>  
>  
>  
> Visit our website at [www.pursuantresearch.com](http://www.pursuantresearch.com)  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
> set aapornet nomail  
> On your return send: set aapornet mail  
>

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

-----  
Date: Thu, 9 Sep 2004 12:28:40 -0400  
Reply-To: Carl M Ramirez <[RamirezC@GAO.GOV](mailto:RamirezC@GAO.GOV)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Carl M Ramirez <[RamirezC@GAO.GOV](mailto:RamirezC@GAO.GOV)>  
Subject: Eligibility rate in RR3 calculation?  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit  
Content-disposition: inline

My organization rarely does RDD general population phone surveys. When using AAPOR's RR3 response rate, is there any guidance or common industry practice for calculating e : the eligibility rate of unknown, noncontacted sample? The Standard Definition booklet says: "In estimating e, one must be guided by the best available scientific information on what share eligible cases make up among the unknown cases and one must not select a proportion in order to boost the response rate." I really want to (defensibly) boost the response rate.

Is there any frequently used approach? Such as using the proportion of contacts that turned out to be ineligible (business, no eligible household member, etc.). Or do many people take a conservative approach

and just assume e is always 100%? Let's say you make 10 calls to the number and try to reverse match it to an address and can't - is that enough evidence to declare a large proportion of such noncontacts as "ineligible?"

Any kind of feedback would be useful here, even if just to say "it varies, there's no established practice."

---

Carl Ramirez  
Sr. Design Methodologist  
Center for Design, Methods & Analysis  
U.S. Government Accountability Office  
Phone: (202) 512-3721  
Fax: (202) 512-3938  
Email: ramirezc@gao.gov

---

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

---

Date: Thu, 9 Sep 2004 13:26:17 -0400  
Reply-To: Diane Bowers <[dbowers@casro.org](mailto:dbowers@casro.org)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Diane Bowers <[dbowers@CASRO.ORG](mailto:dbowers@CASRO.ORG)>  
Organization: CASRO  
Subject: Research & Regulation  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

AAPORnetters: The following government & public affairs newsletter addresses "frugging"--we should be responding to fruggers, letting them know that the FTC via the TSR is enforcing this antifrugging statute. We will respond to the RNC issue and any Dems, too. But referring offenders to the [ftc.gov](http://ftc.gov) will be very disuasive. Also, please note the positive response AAPOR and CASRO received from the FTC regarding our joint comments (among 14,000 comments submitted) on CAN SPAM definitions: the FTC noted our comments in both the text and footnotes of the rulemaking report. Let me know if you have any questions. Thanks, Diane

---

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

---

Date: Thu, 9 Sep 2004 13:46:49 -0400  
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
Subject: all those polls  
Comments: To: aapornet <aapornet@asu.edu>  
In-Reply-To: <p06020401bd6643e69012@[68.190.92.218]>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

So many presidential polls, so many different stories. Is this typical?

--

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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Thu, 9 Sep 2004 15:35:14 -0400  
Reply-To: Diane Bowers <dbowers@casro.org>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Diane Bowers <dbowers@CASRO.ORG>  
Organization: CASRO  
Subject: Fw: Research & Regulation  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Sorry for the previous email--it didn't travel well. Hope the attached is better. Thanks, Diane

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

Date: Thu, 9 Sep 2004 15:48:18 -0400  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Harvard's Hausmann & MIT's Rigobon speak out about Venezuela's  
electoral fraud  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Harvard's Hausmann & MIT's Rigobon speak out about Venezuela's electoral  
fraud  
By Ricardo Hausmann & Roberto Rigobon

<http://www.vcrisis.com/index.php?content=letters/200409061610>

--  
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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail  
=====

Date: Thu, 9 Sep 2004 16:46:16 -0400  
Reply-To: Diane Bowers <[dbowers@casro.org](mailto:dbowers@casro.org)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Diane Bowers <[dbowers@CASRO.ORG](mailto:dbowers@CASRO.ORG)>  
Organization: CASRO  
Subject: Research & Regulation  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT



Sorry, everyone: Please scroll down on my previous email message and Research & Regulation is pasted in. Thanks, Diane

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

---

Date: Thu, 9 Sep 2004 17:25:45 -0400  
Reply-To: Diane Bowers <[dbowers@casro.org](mailto:dbowers@casro.org)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Diane Bowers <[dbowers@CASRO.ORG](mailto:dbowers@CASRO.ORG)>  
Organization: CASRO  
Subject: Fw: Research & Regulation  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Hi, guys--it's me again: if this time the newsletter Research & Regulation that should be just below this email (honestly) doesn't come through to you, I'm cancelling my internet and computer and going back to mimeograph. Diane

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

---

Date: Thu, 9 Sep 2004 17:30:50 -0400  
Reply-To: dick halpern <[dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET](mailto:dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: dick halpern <[dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET](mailto:dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET)>  
Subject: New evidence that Jimmy Carter got fooled in Venezuela.  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: multipart/mixed; x-avg-checked=avg-ok-21CA4FC7;  
boundary="Boundary\_(ID\_rYTqfoV4TDQeVFTbX32p8A)"

--Boundary\_(ID\_rYTqfoV4TDQeVFTbX32p8A)  
Content-type: text/plain; x-avg-checked=avg-ok-21CA4FC7; charset=us-ascii;  
format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8bit

Editorial from the Wall Street Journal.....and do remember that the US was less than happy with the election outcome in Venezuela.

Dick

## REVIEW & OUTLOOK

Conned in Caracas

New evidence that Jimmy Carter got fooled in Venezuela.

Wall Street Journal, Thursday, September 9, 2004 12:01 a.m. EDT

Both the Bush Administration and former President Jimmy Carter were quick to bless the results of last month's Venezuelan recall vote, but it now looks like they were had. A statistical analysis by a pair of economists suggests that the random-sample "audit" results that the Americans trusted weren't random at all.

This is no small matter. The imprimatur of Mr. Carter and his Carter Center election observers is being used by Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez to claim a mandate. The anti-American strongman has been steering his country toward dictatorship and is stirring up trouble throughout Latin America. If the recall election wasn't fair, why would Americans want to endorse it?

The new study was released this week by economists Ricardo Hausmann of Harvard and Roberto Rigobon of MIT. They zeroed in on a key problem with the August 18 vote audit that was run by the government's electoral council (CNE): In choosing which polling stations would be audited, the CNE refused to use the random number generator recommended by the Carter Center. Instead, the CNE insisted on its own program, run on its own computer. Mr. Carter's team acquiesced, and Messrs. Hausmann and Rigobon conclude that, in controlling this software, the government had the means to cheat.

"This result opens the possibility that the fraud was committed only in a subset of the 4,580 automated centers, say 3,000, and that the audit was successful because it directed the search to the 1,580 unaltered centers. That is why it was so important not to use the Carter Center number generator. If this was the case, Carter could never have figured it out."

Mr. Hausmann told us that he and Mr. Rigobon also "found very clear trails of fraud in the statistical record" and a probability of less than 1% that the anomalies observed could be pure chance. To put it another way, they think the chance is 99% that there was electoral fraud.

a014f5.jpg

The authors also suggest that the fraud was centralized. Voting machines were supposed to print tallies before communicating by Internet with the CNE center. But the CNE changed that rule, arranging to have totals sent to the center first and only later printing tally sheets. This increases the potential for fraud because the Smartmatic voting machines suddenly had two-way communication capacity that they weren't supposed to have. The

economists say this means the CNE center could have sent messages back to polling stations to alter the totals.

None of this would matter if the auditing process had been open to scrutiny by the Carter observers. But as the economists point out: "After an arduous negotiation, the Electoral Council allowed the OAS [Organization of American States] and the Carter Center to observe all aspects of the election process except for the central computer hub, a place where they also prohibited the presence of any witnesses from the opposition. At the time, this appeared to be an insignificant detail. Now it looks much more meaningful."

Yes, it does. It would seem that Colin Powell and the Carter Center have some explaining to do. The last thing either would want is for Latins to think that the U.S. is now apologizing for governments that steal elections. Back when he was President, Mr. Carter once famously noted that the Afghanistan invasion had finally caused him to see the truth about Leonid Brezhnev. A similar revelation would seem to be in order toward Mr. Chavez.

```
*****
*      ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED---      *
*  This post contains a forbidden message format  *
*  (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) *
*  This Mail List at USC.EDU only accepts PLAIN TEXT *
*  If your postings display this message your mail program *
*  is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting *
*****
```

```
--Boundary_(ID_/vNSEiYkGIF0QRm8iXUF3Q);--
--Boundary_(ID_/vNSEiYkGIF0QRm8iXUF3Q);--
--Boundary_(ID_/vNSEiYkGIF0QRm8iXUF3Q);--
```

---  
Incoming mail is certified Virus Free.  
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).  
Version: 6.0.752 / Virus Database: 503 - Release Date: 9/3/2004

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

```
--Boundary_(ID_rYTqfoV4TDQeVFTbX32p8A)
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-avg=cert;
x-avg-checked=avg-ok-21CA4FC7
Content-disposition: inline
```

---  
Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.  
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).  
Version: 6.0.752 / Virus Database: 503 - Release Date: 9/3/2004

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

--Boundary\_(ID\_rYTqfoV4TDQeVFTbX32p8A)--

=====  
Date: Thu, 9 Sep 2004 22:57:26 +0000  
Reply-To: [marcsapir@COMCAST.NET](mailto:marcsapir@COMCAST.NET)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Marc Sapir <[marcsapir@COMCAST.NET](mailto:marcsapir@COMCAST.NET)>  
Subject: Re: New evidence that Jimmy Carter got fooled in Venezuela.  
Comments: To: [dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>](mailto:dick_halpern@dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET), [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: multipart/mixed; boundary="Boundary\_(ID\_mQfd4b5cQfWKUNj1e7egbg)"

--Boundary\_(ID\_mQfd4b5cQfWKUNj1e7egbg)  
Content-type: text/plain  
Content-transfer-encoding: QUOTED-PRINTABLE

Re: the Wall Street Journal Editorial: Come now. I must have been asleep. I thought the U.S. government did everything in its power to not accept the election outcome. I guess the Wall Street Journal doesn't think that matters. Their lead in sentence is a subterfuge, and their closing sentence sounds like it was written by Dick Cheney: Colin Powell has some explaining to do? Perhaps that's a pre-emption in case Powell's skipping the Convention is preview to something more dramatic to come (a la Richard Clarke). This editorial is about at the level of the NY Post or the Washington Times, yet it is from THE WALL STREET JOURNAL. It states explicitly that based upon the conclusions of these two folks (who are they and what are their backgrounds besides saying they are Harvard and MIT?) the behavior of the Venezuelan government is likely to have reflected an attempt to cover up some machinations. It might be true (or not) but this is what we call innuendo. There is no evidence, but the conclusion of two people is to say, Dick, find the primary source and post that, not this garbage.

Marc Sapir

----- Original message -----

> Editorial from the Wall Street Journal.....and do remember that the US was less than happy with the election outcome in Venezuela.  
> Dick  
>

>=20  
> REVIEW & OUTLOOK=20  
>=20  
> Conned in Caracas=20  
> New evidence that Jimmy Carter got fooled in Venezuela.=20  
>=20  
> Wall Street Journal, Thursday, September 9, 2004 12:01 a.m. EDT=  
=20  
>=20  
> Both the Bush Administration and former President Jimmy Carter were=  
quick=20  
> to bless the results of last month's Venezuelan recall vote, but it=  
now=20  
> looks like they were had. A statistical analysis by a pair of econo=  
mists=20  
> suggests that the random-sample "audit" results that the Americans =  
trusted=20  
> weren't random at all.=20  
>=20  
> This is no small matter. The imprimatur of Mr. Carter and his Carte=  
r Center=20  
> election observers is being used by Venezuelan President Hugo Chave=  
z to=20  
> claim a mandate. The anti-American strongman has been steering his =  
country=20  
> toward dictatorship and is stirring up trouble throughout Latin Ame=  
rica. If=20  
> the recall election wasn't fair, why would Americans want to endors=  
e it?=20  
>=20  
> The new study was released this week by economists Ricardo Hausmann=  
of=20  
> Harvard and Roberto Rigobon of MIT. They zeroed in on a key problem=  
with=20  
> the August 18 vote audit that was run by the government's electoral=  
council=20  
> (CNE): In choosing which polling stations would be audited, the CNE=  
refused=20  
> to use the random number generator recommended by the Carter Center=  
. =20  
> Instead, the CNE insisted on its own program, run on its own comput=  
er. Mr.=20  
> Carter's team acquiesced, and Messrs. Hausmann and Rigobon conclude=  
that,=20  
> in controlling this software, the government had the means to cheat=  
. =20  
>=20  
> "This result opens the possibility that the fraud was committed onl=  
y in a=20  
> subset of the 4,580 automated centers, say 3,000, and that the audi=  
t was=20  
> successful because it directed the search to the 1,580 unaltered ce=  
nters.=20  
> That is why it was so important not to use the Carter Center number=

=20  
> generator. If this was the case, Carter could never have figured it=  
out."=20  
>=20  
> Mr. Hausmann told us that he and Mr. Rigoban also "found very clear=  
trails=20  
> of fraud in the statistical record" and a probability of less than =  
1% that=20  
> the anomalies observed could be pure chance. To put it another way,=  
they=20  
> think the chance is 99% that there was electoral fraud.=20  
>=20  
> a014f5.jpg=20  
>=20  
>=20  
> The authors also suggest that the fraud was centralized. Voting mac=  
hines=20  
> were supposed to print tallies before communicating by Internet wit=  
h the=20  
> CNE center. But the CNE changed that rule, arranging to have totals=  
sent to=20  
> the center first and only later printing tally sheets. This increas=  
es the=20  
> potential for fraud because the Smartmatic voting machines suddenly=  
had=20  
> two-way communication capacity that they weren't supposed to have. =  
The=20  
> economists say this means the CNE center could have sent messages b=  
ack to=20  
> polling stations to alter the totals.=20  
>=20  
> None of this would matter if the auditing process had been open to =  
scrutiny=20  
> by the Carter observers. But as the economists point out: "After an=  
arduous=20  
> negotiation, the Electoral Council allowed the OAS [Organization of=  
=20  
> American States] and the Carter Center to observe all aspects of th=  
e=20  
> election process except for the central computer hub, a place where=  
they=20  
> also prohibited the presence of any witnesses from the opposition. =  
At the=20  
> time, this appeared to be an insignificant detail. Now it looks muc=  
h more=20  
> meaningful."=20  
>=20  
> Yes, it does. It would seem that Colin Powell and the Carter Center=  
have=20  
> some explaining to do. The last thing either would want is for Lati=  
ns to=20  
> think that the U.S. is now apologizing for governments that steal=  
=20  
> elections. Back when he was President, Mr. Carter once famously not=

ed that=20  
> the Afghanistan invasion had finally caused him to see the truth ab=  
out=20  
> Leonid Brezhnev. A similar revelation would seem to be in order tow=  
ard Mr.=20  
> Chavez.=20  
>=20  
>=20  
>=20  
>=20  
>=20  
> \* \* \* \* \* =20  
> \* ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED--- \* =20  
> \* This post contains a forbidden message format \* =20  
> \* (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) \* =20  
> \* This Mail List at USC.EDU only accepts PLAIN TEXT \* =20  
> \* If your postings display this message your mail program \* =20  
> \* is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting \* =20  
> \* \* \* \* \* =20  
>=20  
> --Boundary\_(ID\_/vNSEiYkGIF0QRm8iXUF3Q)";--=20  
> --Boundary\_(ID\_/vNSEiYkGIF0QRm8iXUF3Q)";--=20  
> --Boundary\_(ID\_/vNSEiYkGIF0QRm8iXUF3Q)";--=20  
>=20  
>=20  
>=20  
> ---=20  
> Incoming mail is certified Virus Free.=20  
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).=20  
> Version: 6.0.752 / Virus Database: 503 - Release Date: 9/3/2004=  
=20  
>=20  
> -----=20  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>=20  
> Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:=20  
> set aapornet nomail=20  
> On your return send: set aapornet mail=20

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

--Boundary\_(ID\_mQfd4b5cQfWKUNj1e7egbg)  
Content-type: multipart/mixed; boundary="Boundary\_(ID\_bbccXwUAY6Os6QU3E7z9yA)"

Content-type: text/plain; x-avg-checked=avg-ok-21CA4FC7; x-avg=cert;  
charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT  
Content-disposition: inline

---

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.  
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).  
Version: 6.0.752 / Virus Database: 503 - Release Date: 9/3/2004

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

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

--Boundary\_(ID\_mQfd4b5cQfWKUNj1e7egbg)--

=====  
Date: Thu, 9 Sep 2004 21:15:11 -0400  
Reply-To: [JoyceR@cfmc.com](mailto:JoyceR@cfmc.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Joyce Rachelson <[jrachels@CONCENTRIC.NET](mailto:jrachels@CONCENTRIC.NET)>  
Subject: Re: Fw: Research & Regulation  
Comments: To: Diane Bowers <[dbowers@casro.org](mailto:dbowers@casro.org)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[038901c496b3\\$91999390\\$6401a8c0@DIANE](mailto:038901c496b3$91999390$6401a8c0@DIANE)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Hi Diane,

I'm pretty sure that AAPORnet does not allow attachments. That's why your information is not showing up.

You'll have to cut and paste the info.

Joyce

Diane Bowers wrote:

> Hi, guys--it's me again: if this time the newsletter Research & Regulation that should be just below this email (honestly) doesn't come through to you, I'm cancelling my internet and computer and going back to mimeograph. Diane

>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>



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

--  
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](mailto:JoyceR@CfMC.com)  
<http://www.CfMC.com>

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

=====  
Date: Fri, 10 Sep 2004 09:40:55 +0100  
Reply-To: "Moon, Nick" <[nmoon@NOPWORLD.COM](mailto:nmoon@NOPWORLD.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Moon, Nick" <[nmoon@NOPWORLD.COM](mailto:nmoon@NOPWORLD.COM)>  
Subject: Re: New evidence that Jimmy Carter got fooled in Venezuela.  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

> Veneuelan government is likely to have reflected an attempt  
> to cover up some machinations. It might be true (or not) but  
> this is what we call inuendo. There is no evidence, but the  
> conclusion of two people is  
> to say, Dick, find the primary source and post that, not this garbage.  
>

quite right too. Dick, what on earth were you thinking of? Finding an article in a very reputable newspaper on a topic that has been discussed a lot on this list, and then just posting it to the list on the grounds that it might add to the debate, without conducting your own in-depth investigation of all the primary sources to see if the paper was entirely accurate? Shame on you. Next time you read something about the Venezuelan election in the papers, can you at least fly to Venezuela and interview both government and opposition statements first

\*\*\*\*\*  
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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Fri, 10 Sep 2004 05:54:05 -0400  
Reply-To: Diane Bowers <[dbowers@casro.org](mailto:dbowers@casro.org)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Diane Bowers <[dbowers@CASRO.ORG](mailto:dbowers@CASRO.ORG)>  
Organization: CASRO  
Subject: Research & Regulation Last Call  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Hi, everyone. Research & Regulation will be accessible later today on our website - [www.casro.org](http://www.casro.org). No more sturm und drang. Diane

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

=====  
Date: Fri, 10 Sep 2004 09:29:43 -0400

Reply-To: "Uglow, David" <duglow@RTI.ORG>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Uglow, David" <duglow@RTI.ORG>  
Subject: Re: CATI versus ASCASI  
Comments: To: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I've talked to some folks at RTI , and I was told that the (currently limited) empirical evidence indicates that one should expect the T-ACASI vs. CATI comparison to yield increased reporting of behaviors that respondents find sensitive when T-ACASI is used. It appears that removal of the human interviewer has an effect analogous to that which occurs in face-to-face surveys when Video- or Audio-CASI (or PAPI SAQs) are substituted for interviewer questioning. T-ACASI does not, however, introduce the literacy problems that can subvert PAPI and Video-CASI measurements for some respondents (see Al-Tayyib below), but there are higher interviewer breakoff rates when T-CASI is substituted for human interviewers. While many of these breakoffs can be recovered (see Link's AAPOR presentation a few years back) , strategies for their recovery must be planned for in advance. =20

RTI researchers in collaboration with UMASS conducted the NSBME (National STD and Behavior Measurement Experiment) which randomly assigned probability samples of USA and Baltimore residents to be interviewed by either human telephone interviewers or T-ACASI. Some NSBME findings were presented at the 2002 APHA convention. The Villarroel report below presents illustrative results. Reprints can be obtained by e-mailing: MEASUREMENT@RTI.ORG.

#### REFERENCES:

Same-Gender Sex In the USA: Impact of T-ACASI on Prevalence Estimates (pre-publication draft). M.A. Villarroel, C.F. Turner, E.E. Eggleston, A.A Al-Tayyib, S.M. Rogers, A.M. Roman, P.C. Cooley, H. Gordek. Technical Papers on Health and Behavior Measurement, no. 60, 2004.

Effect of Low Medical Literacy on Health Survey Measurements. By A.A. Al-Tayyib, S.M. Rogers, J.N. Gribble, M. Villarroel, C.F. Turner (American Journal of Public Health., 92(9): 378-480.)=20  
=20

Automating telephone surveys: Using T-ACASI to obtain data on sensitive topics. By P.C. Cooley, H.G. Miller, J.N. Gribble, C.F. Turner. (Published in Computers and Human Behavior 16:1-11,2000.)  
=20

The impact of T-ACASI interviewing on reported drug use among men who have sex with men. By J.N. Gribble, H.G. Miller, J.A. Catania, L. Pollack, and C.F. Turner. (Published in Substance Use and Misuse 35 (6&7): 63-84,2000.)=20  
=20

Automated Self-interviewing and the Survey Measurement of Sensitive Behaviors. By C.F. Turner, B.H. Forsyth, J. O'Reilly, P.C. Cooley, T.K. Smith, S.M. Rogers, and H.G. Miller. (Published in Computer-Assisted

Survey Information Collection. Edited by M. Couper, R. Baker, J. Bethlehem, C. Clark, J. Martin, W. Nicholls, J. O' Reilly, ISBN 0-471-17848-9, New York: Wiley and Sons, Inc.)

David Uglow  
Research Computing Division  
RTI International  
PO Box 12194  
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709  
(919) 541-7123 voice  
(919) 541-6178 fax  
www.rti.org=20

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta  
Sent: Wednesday, September 01, 2004 5:44 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: CATI versus ASCASI

A former colleague of mine (now at the CDC) is considering a study using CATI and ACASI. She has some concerns about whether data collected in these two manners is suitable to be combined.

I referred her to Couper, Singer & Tourangeau (2003) but I was wondering if there were any articles that might shed some light on differences in sensitive data collected using these two methods.

--

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](mailto: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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text: set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Fri, 10 Sep 2004 09:55:14 -0400  
Reply-To: dick halpern <[dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET](mailto:dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: dick halpern <[dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET](mailto:dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET)>  
Subject: Re: New evidence that Jimmy Carter got fooled in Venezuela.  
Comments: To: "Moon, Nick" <[nmoon@NOPWORLD.COM](mailto:nmoon@NOPWORLD.COM)>  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu

In-Reply-To: <369904DA6CB7D611818D0002B3656320071B2655@lud-exch-nt02.nop.nopworld.com>

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: multipart/mixed; x-avg-checked=avg-ok-3CC727AC;  
boundary="Boundary\_(ID\_vi/ftuuOkwaGYrNvZj15kw)"

--Boundary\_(ID\_vi/ftuuOkwaGYrNvZj15kw)

Content-type: text/plain; x-avg-checked=avg-ok-3CC727AC; charset=us-ascii;  
format=flowed

Content-transfer-encoding: 8bit

Nick,

It's very simple.

Although this issue has been discussed at length on this site, it behoves us as professionals, to pay attention to articles relating to our field which appear in a very reputable newspaper....a newspaper which is read by highly influential opinion leaders. Their views about the validity and accuracy of opinion and attitude research/polling, etc. are heavily influenced by what they read in publications such as the Wall St. Journal, NY Times, etc. We need to pay attention, whether or not we agree with the content of a particular article or feel that further investigation is warranted. The purpose of my posting was not to debate the validity of the article's claims, but simply to let others know that this sort of thing is being discussed and may be a matter of some concern at some pretty high levels.

Dick

At 04:40 AM 9/10/2004, you wrote:

>> Veneuelan government is likely to have reflected an attempt  
>> to cover up some machinations. It might be true (or not) but  
>> this is what we call inuendo. There is no evidence, but the  
>> conclusion of two people is  
>> to say, Dick, find the primary source and post that, not this garbage.  
>>

>quite right too. Dick, what on earth were you thinking of? Finding an  
>article in a very reputable newspaper on a topic that has been discussed a  
>lot on this list, and then just posting it to the list on the grounds that  
>it might add to the debate, without conducting your own in-depth  
>investigation of all the primary sources to see if the paper was entirely  
>accurate? Shame on you. Next time you read something about the Venezuelan  
>election in the papers, can you at least fly to Venezuela and interview both  
>government and opposition statements first

>

>

>\*\*\*\*\*

>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](mailto: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: 6.0.752 / Virus Database: 503 - Release Date: 9/3/2004

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

--Boundary\_(ID\_vi/ftuuOkwaGYrNvZj15kw)  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-avg=cert;  
x-avg-checked=avg-ok-3CC727AC  
Content-disposition: inline

---  
Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.  
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).  
Version: 6.0.752 / Virus Database: 503 - Release Date: 9/3/2004

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

--Boundary\_(ID\_vi/ftuuOkwaGYrNvZj15kw)--

---

Date: Fri, 10 Sep 2004 10:54:50 -0400  
Reply-To: Nancy Belden <nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Nancy Belden <nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM>  
Subject: Venezuela  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Comments: cc: "Frankovic, Kathleen" <KAF@cbsnews.com>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Dear AAPOR Members:

Many of you have expressed concern with the questions arising out of the exit poll conducted by Penn Schoen and Berland in Venezuela last month as well as the election and counting of votes, and there are on going discussions on this list serve about continuing news about this. I have had numerous conversations with many of you and President Carter has also contacted AAPOR. I want to assure you that we have not dropped the issue. The AAPOR Council and I share your concerns, and we will keep you apprised of our efforts to address the issue and those of WAPOR, our international sister organization.

Sincerely,

Nancy Belden

President

American Association for Public Opinion Research

cc: Kathy Frankovic, President, WAPOR

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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Fri, 10 Sep 2004 10:06:59 -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: <MAIN\_SERVERFDTAL6gk00000319@MAIN\_SERVER.pdc.brspoll.com>

MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=Windows-1252  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I would like to suggest that AAPOR evaluate developing a rapid response team for issues such as this, and that this team be in-place prior to November 2nd, 2004.

---

Steven Hertzberg  
Votewatch Corporation  
2269 Chestnut Street, 611  
San Francisco, California 94123

<http://www.votewatch.us>  
Your Eye on Elections

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)] On Behalf Of Nancy Belden  
Sent: Friday, September 10, 2004 7:55 AM  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Subject: Venezuela

Dear AAPOR Members:

Many of you have expressed concern with the questions arising out of the exit poll conducted by Penn Schoen and Berland in Venezuela last month as well as the election and counting of votes, and there are on going discussions on this list serve about continuing news about this. I have had numerous conversations with many of you and President Carter has also contacted AAPOR. I want to assure you that we have not dropped the issue. The AAPOR Council and I share your concerns, and we will keep you apprised of our efforts to address the issue and those of WAPOR, our international sister organization.

Sincerely,

Nancy Belden

President

American Association for Public Opinion Research

cc: Kathy Frankovic, President, WAPOR

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](mailto: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: 6.0.754 / Virus Database: 504 - Release Date: 9/6/2004

---

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.  
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).  
Version: 6.0.754 / Virus Database: 504 - Release Date: 9/6/2004

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

---

Date: Fri, 10 Sep 2004 16:16:47 -0400  
Reply-To: Eric Plutzer <[exp12@PSU.EDU](mailto:exp12@PSU.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Eric Plutzer <[exp12@PSU.EDU](mailto:exp12@PSU.EDU)>  
Subject: Harvard's Hausmann & MIT's Rigobon speak out about Venezuela's  
electoral fraud  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
In-Reply-To: <[200409100510.BAA121804@f05n16.cac.psu.edu](mailto:200409100510.BAA121804@f05n16.cac.psu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

There is a huge flaw in the Hausmann and Rigobon model. It *assumes* that recall signatures and potential bias in the Schoen/Penn exit poll are completed uncorrelated.

But since the exit polls were conducted by Sumate volunteers and the signatures were collected by Sumate volunteers, the assumption of independent errors is a heroic one. One could never publish in a refereed journal with an assumption so unlikely.

In fact, it seems far more likely that any bias in the exit poll would occur in precisely the same precincts where the percentage of signature signers exceeded the percentage of the public supporting the recall.

There may or may not have been fraud. And if so, the fraud may or may not have been large enough to change the outcome of the election.

But Hausmann and Rigobon's model can't be used as evidence one way or another as it is as consistent with overzealous Sumate volunteers as it is with fraud. Again, without detailed information on the fieldwork practices it's impossible to have enough faith in the exit poll to use it as evidence one way or another.

Eric

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

Date: Sat, 11 Sep 2004 13:56:25 -0400  
Reply-To: Mark Schulman <[M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM](mailto:M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mark Schulman <[M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM](mailto:M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM)>  
Subject: Weighting Election Polls  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable  
Content-disposition: inline

Since we released last week's Republican Convention Time Magazine election =  
poll, with the Bush bounce, we're gotten lots in inquiries=20  
about why our poll and some of the other media polls differ from other =  
polls, particularly Zogby, which found little bounce. (I have not actually =  
seen the Zogby poll, but have gotten second-hand reports.) I need to point =  
out that even the media polls differed a bit on the size of the bounce.=20

One likely reason for the disparity with some polls is that most of the =  
media polls, including ours, weight by Census data. I believe that Zogby =  
and some others weight on party id. I just wrote a response to Professor =  
Alan Reifman of Texas Tech, who has created a web site on the weighting =  
issue. His email is below mine. However, I thought it would be useful to =  
open this issue to AAPOR members. I welcome your thoughts. Here are my =  
email comments to Dr. Reifman:

-----  
Weighting by party ID can result in serious distortion of the horserace =  
numbers. Here's=20  
why:=20

1. As an observer of party identification tallies day after day on our =  
election surveys, it's clear that we're not measuring a constant factor. =  
It varies day by day, week by week.=20
2. Why does it vary? Most polls place the party ID question near the end =  
of the=20  
questionnaire, so that it does not interact or contaminate the horserace =  
measure and=20  
any other head-to-head candidate comparisons. David Moore has an excellent =  
discussion of this on the Gallup website. For election pollsters, the =  
horserace always takes priority,since that's the topline number we report. =  
As a result, respondents may tend to bring their party ID in line with =  
their partisan choice, particularly after having gone through an extensive =  
battery of election items. It's simply "cognitive consistency." Hence, a =  
Bush surge, for example, might elevate the number of voters later in the =

survey identifying themselves as Republicans.=20

3. Since party ID is a "variable" and not an enduring constant, as is age =  
or gender, it=20  
varies!=20

4. Voting behavior literature from the 1950s and 1960s (Campbell, =  
Converse, Miller and=20  
Stokes, *The American Voter*, for example), posited that party ID is =  
something of a constant that anchors partisan choice. Party was seen as =  
something of a constant independent variable. It's likely that party ID =  
was, in fact, a more enduring "constant" in the 1950's. But, that was =  
then, and this is now. Voters are just not as tied to party as in the =  
past. Let's get over this likely out-of-date notion that party ID is a =  
constant that anchors the vote. The causal arrows here are unclear, that =  
is, what influences what. The academic voting behavior literature has long =  
since abandoned the view of party ID as the key independent variable.

5. Hence, weighting by party ID, (and it's party ID, not party registration=  
) , can seriously=20  
distort the horserace data. Weighting by party ID would damp down the Bush =  
surge over the past few weeks. Yes, examining last week's Republican =  
convention poll, there may have been some "at home" selection bias when we =  
interview during party convention periods. However, not all that many =  
folks watched the convention. The networks provide little convention =  
coverage.=20

Finally, my choice, and the choice of most the major media polls, is to =  
weight by factors=20  
that we know are real, such as age, gender, region, education, number of =  
adults in=20  
household, number of voice phone lines, etc. While you can argue about the =  
reliability=20  
of Census data, I'll place my bets with the Census rather than party =  
ID.=20

I really do believe that we need to resolve this weighting issue. Getting =  
a little edgy now, I believe that this discussion will put to rest=20  
party ID weighting.=20

I look forward to further comment. Dr. Reifman's email is below.

Mark Schulman=20  
Schulman, Ronca & Bucucvalas, Inc.=20  
m.schulman@srbi.com=20

-----  
Dr. Reifman's email:

As part of my teaching of research methodology (which includes survey =  
sampling), I=20  
have created a web component on the sample-weighting controversy in =  
presidential=20  
pre-election polls. I have found from past experience that linking =  
concepts from class to=20

current events appears to work well with students. My website would also =  
be of interest=20  
to political/polling "junkies." Please take a look at it (by clicking =  
directly on the address=20  
below) and consider linking it to your own websites (if you have one). =  
Thanks!=20

<http://www.hs.ttu.edu/hdfs3390/weighting.htm>=20

Alan Reifman, Ph. D., Associate Professor=20  
Dept of Human Dev't and Family Studies=20  
College of Human Sciences=20  
Texas Tech University=20  
Lubbock, TX 79409-1162=20  
(806) 742-3000=20  
<http://www.hs.ttu.edu/hdfs/Faculty/reifman.htm>=20

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

Date: Mon, 13 Sep 2004 09:12:04 -0400  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Someone went to the AAPOR web page on push polls . . .  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Don't be pushed around  
[http://seattlepi.nwsourc.com/opinion/190285\\_pushpolled.html](http://seattlepi.nwsourc.com/opinion/190285_pushpolled.html)

#### SEATTLE POST-INTELLIGENCER EDITORIAL BOARD

As if we needed more evidence that this is one of the more smarmy recent political campaigns, "push" polls are popping up around the state. Posing as legitimate opinion research, these scams are designed not to measure voter opinion but to manipulate it.

Reports of such unethical practices surfaced recently in the disparate locales of Bainbridge Island and the Palouse, where The Spokesman-Review's Jim Camden wrote of pollster phone calls apparently designed to undercut the campaigns of Democrats Christine Gregoire, for governor, and Patty Murray, for re-election to the U.S. Senate.

They're called "push" polls because, after starting out with questions seemingly designed to solicit legitimate information, the caller begins asking what-if questions of a voter who seems to be undecided or leaning toward the targeted candidate. "Would you change your vote if you knew that the candidate voted to raise your taxes is a liar ... a felon ... a child molester?"

OK, we exaggerate, but not by much. The ersatz pollsters try to plant the seeds of doubt -- or dismay -- in the minds of those they're "surveying." It's a potentially effective tool in swaying uninformed voters. As such, it's subversive to representative democracy.

According to the Web site of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, this is a telemarketing technique in which "the intent is to disseminate campaign propaganda and under the guise of conducting a legitimate public opinion poll." Usually, the association says, poll answers aren't even tabulated. The value is in the leading questions they ask, not the answers you give.

The AAPOR asks that you fight back if you get such a call. Ask who's doing the interviews and where they're located. Ask who's sponsoring the poll, how many people are being called and how the information will be used. Report such calls by e-mailing AAPOR-infor@goAMP.com.

We would also suggest that you report the call to the campaign or party headquarters of the targeted candidate and call the poll sponsors to complain. Let them know that nobody likes to be pushed around.

C1996-2004 Seattle Post-Intelligencer

--

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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Mon, 13 Sep 2004 11:59:27 -0400  
Reply-To: [pd@kerr-downs.com](mailto:pd@kerr-downs.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Phillip Downs <[pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM](mailto:pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM)>  
Subject: Push polls  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I hate any activity that can adversely impact the image of our profession as much as the next person. Just wondering - has there been any credible research that shows that push polls have (not might) affected voting patterns?

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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Mon, 13 Sep 2004 13:10:21 -0400  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Ahhh, the joys of political polling . . .  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Republicans complain about Star Tribune polls  
BRIAN BAKST  
Associated Press

ST. PAUL - The state Republican Party repeated its long-standing complaint Friday that polls by the Star Tribune of Minneapolis are inaccurate, and asked that the paper's pollster be fired.

Party Chairman Ron Eibensteiner wasn't basing his accusations on any current or soon-to-be published poll in the presidential race. Rather, he attacked the newspaper's polling methodology and highlighted past elections where Election Day results varied widely from the paper's final polls.

"We're alerting the folks of Minnesota that because of their flawed methodology they are going to come out with a flawed poll," he said.

Eibensteiner's main criticism is that the Star Tribune polls tend to rely on Democratic voters more heavily than Republicans despite the fact Republicans lay claim to more statewide offices.

The Star Tribune stood by its practices and poll director Rob Daves. In a written statement, Editor Anders Gyllenhaal said that the political party complaints about polls are "routine" at the height of a campaign and that similar claims in the past have been found meritless.

"We do think a personal attack on our polling director is shameful and misdirected," he said.

Gyllenhaal's statement didn't address the complaint about party preference of people included in polls and a spokesman said he didn't plan to comment beyond it. The statement said the paper is open and forthcoming about its methodology and has "stringent checks and balances to ensure accuracy."

Polls are snapshots in time and not intended to be predictors of election

outcomes, said Dr. Lee M. Miringoff of Marist College in New York state, president of the National Council on Public Polls.

"The public isn't waiting around to hear what a poll is saying to jump on board. Candidates win these things on their own," Miringoff said. "The political community should worry more about what their candidates are doing rather than how the polls say their candidates are doing."

--

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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Mon, 13 Sep 2004 11:10:02 -0700  
Reply-To: John Nienstedt <[john@CERC.NET](mailto:john@CERC.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: John Nienstedt <[john@CERC.NET](mailto:john@CERC.NET)>  
Organization: CERC  
Subject: Re: Someone went to the AAPOR web page on push polls . . .  
Comments: To: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[0I3Z00F2KE57U5@chimmx03.algx.net](mailto:0I3Z00F2KE57U5@chimmx03.algx.net)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

One big problem we've had and we're going to continue to have with this is that the name of the campaign technique is push "polling." As all AAPORites know, it's not polling or research at all, but the name perpetuates the blurring between campaign research designed to test messages and campaign advocacy disguised as research. Let's come up with a better name and start disseminating it to the media. How about "disguised campaign (or attack) calls?"

John E. Nienstedt, Sr.  
[john@cerc.net](mailto:john@cerc.net)  
Get the edge at [www.cerc.net](http://www.cerc.net)

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

From: AAPORNET [[mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta  
Sent: Monday, September 13, 2004 6:12 AM  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Subject: Someone went to the AAPOR web page on push polls . . .

Don't be pushed around

[http://seattlepi.nwsourc.com/opinion/190285\\_pushpolled.html](http://seattlepi.nwsourc.com/opinion/190285_pushpolled.html)

## SEATTLE POST-INTELLIGENCER EDITORIAL BOARD

As if we needed more evidence that this is one of the more smarmy recent political campaigns, "push" polls are popping up around the state.

Posing

as legitimate opinion research, these scams are designed not to measure voter opinion but to manipulate it.

Reports of such unethical practices surfaced recently in the disparate locales of Bainbridge Island and the Palouse, where The Spokesman-Review's

Jim Camden wrote of pollster phone calls apparently designed to undercut the campaigns of Democrats Christine Gregoire, for governor, and Patty Murray, for re-election to the U.S. Senate.

They're called "push" polls because, after starting out with questions seemingly designed to solicit legitimate information, the caller begins asking what-if questions of a voter who seems to be undecided or leaning toward the targeted candidate. "Would you change your vote if you knew that

the candidate voted to raise your taxes is a liar ... a felon ... a child molester?"

OK, we exaggerate, but not by much. The ersatz pollsters try to plant the seeds of doubt -- or dismay -- in the minds of those they're "surveying."

It's a potentially effective tool in swaying uninformed voters. As such, it's subversive to representative democracy.

According to the Web site of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, this is a telemarketing technique in which "the intent is to disseminate campaign propaganda and under the guise of conducting a legitimate public opinion poll." Usually, the association says, poll answers aren't even tabulated. The value is in the leading questions they ask, not the answers you give.

The AAPOR asks that you fight back if you get such a call. Ask who's doing the interviews and where they're located. Ask who's sponsoring the poll, how many people are being called and how the information will be used. Report such calls by e-mailing [AAPOR-infor@goAMP.com](mailto:AAPOR-infor@goAMP.com).

We would also suggest that you report the call to the campaign or party headquarters of the targeted candidate and call the poll sponsors to complain. Let them know that nobody likes to be pushed around.

C1996-2004 Seattle Post-Intelligencer



--

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](mailto: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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Mon, 13 Sep 2004 11:42:19 -0700  
Reply-To: Richard Rands <[rrands@CFMC.COM](mailto:rrands@CFMC.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Richard Rands <[rrands@CFMC.COM](mailto:rrands@CFMC.COM)>  
Subject: In case you missed this...  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

In case you missed Oliphant's cartoon last week, check it out at:

<http://www.ucomics.com/patoliphant/2004/09/08/>

Richard Rands

---

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

---

Date: Mon, 13 Sep 2004 16:07:34 -0400  
Reply-To: "Safir, Adam" <[ASafir@UI.URBAN.ORG](mailto:ASafir@UI.URBAN.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Safir, Adam" <[ASafir@UI.URBAN.ORG](mailto:ASafir@UI.URBAN.ORG)>  
Subject: DC/AAPOR Student Paper Competition  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu), "[SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU](mailto:SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU)"  
<[SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU](mailto:SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU)>, "[asro@virginia.edu](mailto:asro@virginia.edu)" <[asro@virginia.edu](mailto:asro@virginia.edu)>,  
"[smsnet@listserver.itd.umich.edu](mailto:smsnet@listserver.itd.umich.edu)" <[smsnet@listserver.itd.umich.edu](mailto:smsnet@listserver.itd.umich.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

The Washington-Baltimore Chapter of the American Association for Public  
Opinion Research (DC/AAPOR) invites entries to its inaugural Student Paper

Competition. The competition is intended to recognize excellence in scholarly research by area students, and to encourage active student participation in DC/AAPOR.

## CRITERIA

DC/AAPOR welcomes papers in any field related to the study of public opinion, broadly defined, including research on (a) theoretical issues in the formation and change of public opinion, (b) the theory and methods of survey or market research, or (c) the use of statistical techniques in the analysis of survey data. Papers should be approximately 15 to 25 pages in length. The winning paper will be selected by a review committee composed of survey and public opinion researchers from the membership of DC/AAPOR, including researchers drawn from the academic, government, and commercial sectors.

## ELIGIBILITY

The competition is open to all current graduate and undergraduate students, and to those who have received their degree within the last calendar year. Faculty co-authors are acceptable, with the stipulation that an eligible student must be first author. Eligibility is limited to students attending or graduated from an accredited college or university in Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, or Washington, DC, or to students whose primary residence is in one of those areas. Previous membership in DC/AAPOR is not required, but non-members must become members in order to be eligible (the student membership fee is \$6). Submitted papers may not have been published or presented elsewhere.

## AWARD

The author(s) of the winning paper will be awarded the choice of full lodging expenses paid at AAPOR's 60th Annual Conference (May 12-15 2005, Miami Beach), or a cash prize of \$300. For multiple student authors on a winning paper, the award will be divided among the eligible authors (excluding faculty co-authors). The authors of the winning paper and of any papers selected as Honorable Mention may also have the opportunity to present their work at a special DC/AAPOR seminar.

## PAPER SUBMISSION

To be considered for the award, please send an electronic copy of your paper to Adam Safir at [studentpaper@dc-aapor.org](mailto:studentpaper@dc-aapor.org) by December 17, 2004. Include your name, academic affiliation, mailing address, telephone number, and e-mail address. You will receive confirmation that your paper has been received. The winning paper will be announced on January 28, 2005.

Contact Adam Safir at [studentpaper@dc-aapor.org](mailto:studentpaper@dc-aapor.org) with any questions about criteria or eligibility.

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

Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Mon, 13 Sep 2004 14:15:47 -0700  
Reply-To: Bob Choquette <choquett@UOREGON.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Bob Choquette <choquett@UOREGON.EDU>  
Organization: Bob Choquette  
Subject: Anyone using WinCATI 4.2?  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Comments: cc: perren@uoregon.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

If you are using Sawtooth WinCATI 4.2, could you please contact me directly off-list?

Thanks!

Bob Choquette  
Director of Administration  
University of Oregon Survey Research Laboratory

---

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

---

Date: Mon, 13 Sep 2004 14:44:37 -0700  
Reply-To: Rebecca Levin <RebeccaL@KFF.ORG>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Rebecca Levin <RebeccaL@KFF.ORG>  
Subject: 2004 PAPOR Conference-- Registration Info  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

To AAPOR Members who are in the Pacific Region or to anyone who wants to =  
spend a few days in San Francisco:

The annual meeting of the Pacific Chapter of the American Association =  
for Public Opinion Research is coming up and will be held in San =  
Francisco at the Hyatt at Fisherman's Wharf. The conference will take =  
place on December 2nd & 3rd, 2004 and will include:

- \* Plenary Speaker Bob Groves discussing survey non-response. Bob is the =  
Director of the University of Michigan Survey Research Center and a past =  
AAPOR president.=20
- \* Sessions on a wide range of topics including politics and the =  
election, the Do Not Call List, and interviewing unique populations. =20
- \* A short course on the visual aspects of survey design taught by Don =

Dillman. Don is a professor and Director of the Social and Economic =  
Sciences Research Center at Washington State University.=20

We had a great crowd last year and we are looking forward to seeing =  
everyone again. Thanks to our board and members this years program is =  
shaping up to be incredibly interesting, with some returning presenters =  
as well as a lot of new faces.=20

I don't think attachments can be sent out on AAPORNET so for more =  
information on the conference and a registration form, please visit =  
www.papor.org. Also, pass this e-mail on to anyone you think might be =  
interested.=20

I hope to see you in December!

Rebecca Levin

Kaiser Family Foundation  
2400 Sand Hill Road  
Menlo Park, CA 94025  
Tel: (650) 854-9400  
email: RebeccaL@kff.org

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

=====  
Date: Tue, 14 Sep 2004 17:11:12 -0400  
Reply-To: "Christopher B. Mann" <[christopher.mann@YALE.EDU](mailto:christopher.mann@YALE.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Christopher B. Mann" <[christopher.mann@YALE.EDU](mailto:christopher.mann@YALE.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Weighting Election Polls  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
In-Reply-To: <[0I3W003Y6TS1G9@asu.edu](mailto:0I3W003Y6TS1G9@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8bit

I want to weigh in (no pun intended) on the issue of weighting polls  
because I think that there is a better alternative to weighting to  
either party ID or census data. Mark Shulman has laid out the case  
against party ID, so I won't pile on.

However, weighting to Census data also has an inherent flaw: the  
electorate does not look like the population. To resolve this problem,  
many polling organization have used VNS exit poll data as their  
weighting baseline. This certainly makes sense. However, the recent  
demise of VNS and the data problems of the last two elections from the  
exit polls raise questions about using this approach now. Not to  
mention it means weighting to a baseline that is itself subject to  
sampling error and other methodological issues.

Fortunately, there is an alternative that captures specifically the electorate and does so without minimal, if any, sampling error or response problems because it is calculated from the entire universe of actual voters. Whether or not they choose to take advantage of the considerable cost savings available in using registration based sampling, pollsters should consider using the past turnout data available on voter files to develop weighting baselines from past elections. These registration files provide a number of demographic characteristics useful for weighting: age, gender, various geographic areas (counties, cities, telephone exchanges, zip codes), and (in some states) other characteristics. If you use a registration based sample, you can further use party registration (which is significantly more stable than party ID) and length of registration.

Quoting Automatic digest processor <LISTSERV@lists.asu.edu>:

> There is one message totalling 118 lines in this issue.  
>  
> Topics of the day:  
>  
> 1. Weighting Election Polls  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
> [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>  
> -----  
>  
> Date: Sat, 11 Sep 2004 13:56:25 -0400  
> From: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>  
> Subject: Weighting Election Polls  
>  
> Since we released last week's Republican Convention Time Magazine  
> election =  
> poll, with the Bush bounce, we're gotten lots in inquiries=20  
> about why our poll and some of the other media polls differ from  
> other =  
> polls, particularly Zogby, which found little bounce. (I have not  
> actually =  
> seen the Zogby poll, but have gotten second-hand reports.) I need to  
> point =  
> out that even the media polls differed a bit on the size of the  
> bounce.=20  
>  
> One likely reason for the disparity with some polls is that most of  
> the =  
> media polls, including ours, weight by Census data. I believe that  
> Zogby =  
> and some others weight on party id. I just wrote a response to  
> Professor =  
> Alan Reifman of Texas Tech, who has created a web site on the  
> weighting =

> issue. His email is below mine. However, I thought it would be useful  
> to =  
> open this issue to AAPOR members. I welcome your thoughts. Here are  
> my =  
> email comments to Dr. Reifman:  
> -----  
> Weighting by party ID can result in serious distortion of the  
> horserace =  
> numbers. Here's=20  
> why:=20  
>  
> 1. As an observer of party identification tallies day after day on  
> our =  
> election surveys, it's clear that we're not measuring a constant  
> factor. =  
> It varies day by day, week by week.=20  
>  
> 2. Why does it vary? Most polls place the party ID question near the  
> end =  
> of the=20  
> questionnaire, so that it does not interact or contaminate the  
> horserace =  
> measure and=20  
> any other head-to-head candidate comparisons. David Moore has an  
> excellent =  
> discussion of this on the Gallup website. For election pollsters, the  
> =  
> horserace always takes priority,since that's the topline number we  
> report. =  
> As a result, respondents may tend to bring their party ID in line  
> with =  
> their partisan choice, particularly after having gone through an  
> extensive =  
> battery of election items. It's simply "cognitive consistency."  
> Hence, a =  
> Bush surge, for example, might elevate the number of voters later in  
> the =  
> survey identifying themselves as Republicans.=20  
>  
> 3. Since party ID is a "variable" and not an enduring constant, as is  
> age =  
> or gender, it=20  
> varies!=20  
>  
> 4. Voting behavior literature from the 1950s and 1960s (Campbell, =  
> Converse, Miller and=20  
> Stokes, The American Voter, for example), posited that party ID is  
> =  
> something of a constant that anchors partisan choice. Party was seen  
> as =  
> something of a constant independent variable. It's likely that party  
> ID =  
> was, in fact, a more enduring "constant" in the 1950's. But, that was  
> =

> then, and this is now. Voters are just not as tied to party as in the  
> =  
> past. Let's get over this likely out-of-date notion that party ID is  
> a =  
> constant that anchors the vote. The causal arrows here are unclear,  
> that =  
> is, what influences what. The academic voting behavior literature has  
> long =  
> since abandoned the view of party ID as the key independent  
> variable.  
>  
> 5. Hence, weighting by party ID, (and it's party ID, not party  
> registration=  
> ), can seriously=20  
> distort the horserace data. Weighting by party ID would damp down the  
> Bush =  
> surge over the past few weeks. Yes, examining last week's Republican  
> =  
> convention poll, there may have been some "at home" selection bias  
> when we =  
> interview during party convention periods. However, not all that many  
> =  
> folks watched the convention. The networks provide little convention  
> =  
> coverage.=20  
>  
> Finally, my choice, and the choice of most the major media polls, is  
> to =  
> weight by factors=20  
> that we know are real, such as age, gender, region, education, number  
> of =  
> adults in=20  
> household, number of voice phone lines, etc. While you can argue  
> about the =  
> reliability=20  
> of Census data, I'll place my bets with the Census rather than party  
> =  
> ID.=20  
>  
> I really do believe that we need to resolve this weighting issue.  
> Getting =  
> a little edgy now, I believe that this discussion will put to  
> rest=20  
> party ID weighting.=20  
>  
> I look forward to further comment. Dr. Reifman's email is below.  
>  
> Mark Schulman=20  
> Schulman, Ronca & Bucucvalas, Inc.=20  
> m.schulman@srbi.com=20  
> -----  
> Dr. Reifman's email:  
>  
> As part of my teaching of research methodology (which includes survey

> =  
> sampling), I=20  
> have created a web component on the sample-weighting controversy in  
> =  
> presidential=20  
> pre-election polls. I have found from past experience that linking  
> =  
> concepts from class to=20  
> current events appears to work well with students. My website would  
> also =  
> be of interest=20  
> to political/polling "junkies." Please take a look at it (by clicking  
> =  
> directly on the address=20  
> below) and consider linking it to your own websites (if you have  
> one). =  
> Thanks!=20  
>  
> <http://www.hs.ttu.edu/hdfs3390/weighting.htm>=20  
>  
> Alan Reifman, Ph. D., Associate Professor=20  
> Dept of Human Dev't and Family Studies=20  
> College of Human Sciences=20  
> Texas Tech University=20  
> Lubbock, TX 79409-1162=20  
> (806) 742-3000=20  
> <http://www.hs.ttu.edu/hdfs/Faculty/reifman.htm>=20  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
> [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>  
> -----  
>  
> End of AAPORNET Digest - 10 Sep 2004 to 11 Sep 2004 (#2004-191)  
> \*\*\*\*\*  
>

--  
Christopher B. Mann  
Yale University  
Department of Political Science  
[christopher.mann@yale.edu](mailto:christopher.mann@yale.edu)  
(203) 668-3430

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

Date: Tue, 14 Sep 2004 17:46:57 -0500  
Reply-To: Rob Daves <[daves@STARTRIBUNE.COM](mailto:daves@STARTRIBUNE.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>



From: Rob Daves <daves@STARTRIBUNE.COM>  
Subject: Re: Weighting Election Polls  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu, christopher.mann@YALE.EDU  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=Windows-874  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable  
Content-disposition: inline

There are states such as Minnesota that don't record party ID, so there are no population parameters on which to weight sample statistics. The state doesn't record it because you can't register as a Democrat, Republican, Green, unaffiliated, or whatever.

Moreover, Minnesota is one of a handful of state in which registration books don't close: There's Election Day registration, and often Election Day registration accounts for more than one in six voters. Of course some of these may be just changing precincts, but still that's a lot of movement at the 11th hour.

What this means for public opinion researchers in these states is that there is a great deal of uncertainty about the nature of the electorate until illuminated by exit polls.

Registration lists in these states or at least in Minnesota do have their uses. We can go back after the election, verify whether respondents in the final polls before the election voted, reconcile their actions with what they told us in the survey, and use those comparisons to fine tune likely voter models.

Rob Daves, director  
Strategic & News Research  
The Minnesota Poll  
Star Tribune  
Minneapolis MN

>>> Christopher B. Mann <christopher.mann@YALE.EDU> 09/14/04 = 04:11PM

>>>>

I want to weigh in (no pun intended) on the issue of weighting polls because I think that there is a better alternative to weighting to either party ID or census data. Mark Shulman has laid out the case against party ID, so I won't pile on.

However, weighting to Census data also has an inherent flaw: the electorate does not look like the population. To resolve this problem, many polling organization have used VNS exit poll data as their weighting baseline. This certainly makes sense. However, the recent demise of VNS and the data problems of the last two elections from the exit polls raise questions about using this approach now. Not to mention it means weighting to a baseline that is itself subject to sampling error and other methodological issues.

Fortunately, there is an alternative that captures specifically the electorate and does so without minimal, if any, sampling error or response problems because it is calculated from the entire universe of actual voters. Whether or not they choose to take advantage of the considerable cost savings available in using registration based sampling, pollsters should consider using the past turnout data available on voter files to develop weighting baselines from past elections. These registration files provide a number of demographic characteristics useful for weighting: age, gender, various geographic areas (counties, cities, telephone exchanges, zip codes), and (in some states) other characteristics. If you use a registration based sample, you can further use party registration (which is significantly more stable than party ID) and length of registration.

Quoting Automatic digest processor <LISTSERV=40lists.asu.edu>:

> There is one message totalling 118 lines in this issue.

>

> Topics of the day:

>

> 1. Weighting Election Polls

>

> -----

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

> Problems?-don=27t reply to this message, write to:

> [aapornet-request=40asu.edu=20](mailto:aapornet-request=40asu.edu=20)

>

>

> -----

>

> Date: Sat, 11 Sep 2004 13:56:25 -0400

> From: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN=40SRBI.COM>

> Subject: Weighting Election Polls

>

> Since we released last week=27s Republican Convention Time Magazine

> election =3D

> poll, with the Bush bounce, we=27re gotten lots in inquiries=3D20

> about why our poll and some of the other media polls differ from

> other =3D

> polls, particularly Zogby, which found little bounce. (I have not

> actually =3D

> seen the Zogby poll, but have gotten second-hand reports.) I need to

> point =3D

> out that even the media polls differed a bit on the size of the

> bounce.=3D20

>

> One likely reason for the d

isparity with some polls is that most of

> the =3D

> media polls, including ours, weight by Census data. I believe that

> Zogby =3D

> and some others weight on party id. I just wrote a response to

> Professor =3D  
> Alan Reifman of Texas Tech, who has created a web site on the  
> weighting =3D  
> issue. His email is below mine. However, I thought it would be  
useful  
> to =3D  
> open this issue to AAPOR members. I welcome your thoughts. Here are  
> my =3D  
> email comments to Dr. Reifman:  
> -----  
> Weighting by party ID can result in serious distortion of the  
> horserace =3D  
> numbers. Here=27s=3D20  
> why:=3D20  
>  
> 1. As an observer of party identification tallies day after day on  
> our =3D  
> election surveys, it=27s clear that we=27re not measuring a constant  
> factor. =3D  
> It varies day by day, week by week.=3D20  
>  
> 2. Why does it vary? Most polls place the party ID question near the  
> end =3D  
> of the=3D20  
> questionnaire, so that it does not interact or contaminate the  
> horserace =3D  
> measure and=3D20  
> any other head-to-head candidate comparisons. David Moore has an  
> excellent =3D  
> discussion of this on the Gallup website. For election pollsters,  
the  
> =3D  
> horserace always takes priority,since that=27s the topline number we  
> report. =3D  
> As a result, respondents may tend to bring their party ID in line  
> with =3D  
> their partisan choice, particularly after having gone through an  
> extensive =3D  
> battery of election items. It=27s simply =22cognitive consistency.=22  
> Hence, a =3D  
> Bush surge, for example, might elevate the number of voters later in  
> the =3D  
> survey identifying themselves as Republicans.=3D20  
>  
> 3. Since party ID is a =22variable=22 and not an enduring constant, as  
is  
> age =3D  
> or gender, it=3D20  
> varies=21=3D20  
>  
> 4. Voting behavior literature from the 1950s and 1960s (Campbell, =3D  
> Converse, Miller and=3D20  
> Stokes, The American Voter, for example), posited that party ID is  
> =3D

> something of a constant that anchors partisan choice. Party was seen  
> as =3D  
> something of a constant independent variable. It=27s likely that party  
> ID =3D  
> was, in fact, a more enduring =22constant=22 in the 1950=27s. But, that  
was  
> =3D  
> then, and this is now. Voters are just not as tied to party as in  
the  
> =3D  
> past. Let=27s get over this likely out-of-date notion that party ID is  
> a =3D  
> constant that anchors the vote. The causal arrows here are unclear,  
> that =3D  
> is, what influences what. The academic voting behavior literature  
has  
> long =3D  
> since abandoned the view of party ID as the key independent  
> variable.  
>  
> 5. Hence, weighting by party ID, (and it=27s party ID, not party  
> registration=3D  
> ), can seriously=3D20  
> distort the horserace data. Weighting by party ID would damp down  
the  
> Bush =3D  
> surge over the past few weeks. Yes, examining last week=27s Republican  
> =3D  
> convention poll, there may have been some =22at home=22 selection bias  
> when we =3D  
> interview during party convention periods. However, not all that  
many  
> =3D  
> folks watched the convention. The networks provide little convention  
> =3D  
> coverage.=3D20  
>  
> Finally, my choice, and the choice of most the major media polls, is  
> to =3D  
> weight by factors=3D20  
> that we know are real, such as age, gender, region, education,  
number  
> of =3D  
> adults in=3D20  
> household, number of voice phone lines, etc. While you can argue  
> about the =3D  
> reliability=3D20  
> of Census data, I=27ll place my bets with the Census rather than party  
> =3D  
> ID.=3D20  
>  
> I really do believe that we need to resolve this weighting issue.  
> Getting =3D  
> a little edgy now, I believe that this discussion will put to

> rest=3D20  
> party ID weighting.=3D20  
>  
> I look forward to further comment. Dr. Reifman=27s email is below.  
>  
> Mark Schulman=3D20  
> Schulman, Ronca & Bucucvalas, Inc.=3D20  
> m.schulman=40srbi.com=3D20=20  
> -----  
> Dr. Reifman=27s email:  
>  
> As part of my teaching of research methodology (which includes  
survey  
> =3D  
> sampling), I=3D20  
> have created a web component on the sample-weighting controversy in  
> =3D  
> presidential=3D20  
  
> pre-election polls. I have found from past experience that linking  
> =3D  
> concepts from class to=3D20  
> current events appears to work well with students. My website would  
> also =3D  
> be of interest=3D20  
> to political/polling =22junkies.=22 Please take a look at it (by  
clicking  
> =3D  
> directly on the address=3D20  
> below) and consider linking it to your own websites (if you have  
> one). =3D  
> Thanks=21=3D20  
>  
> <http://www.hs.ttu.edu/hdfs3390/weighting.htm>=3D20=20  
>  
> Alan Reifman, Ph. D., Associate Professor=3D20  
> Dept of Human Dev=27t and Family Studies=3D20  
> College of Human Sciences=3D20  
> Texas Tech University=3D20  
> Lubbock, TX 79409-1162=3D20  
> (806) 742-3000=3D20  
> <http://www.hs.ttu.edu/hdfs/Faculty/reifman.htm>=3D20=20  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>=20  
> Problems?-don=27t reply to this message, write to:  
> [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)=20  
>  
> -----  
>  
> End of AAPORNET Digest - 10 Sep 2004 to 11 Sep 2004 (=232004-191)  
> \*\*\*\*\*  
>

--

Christopher B. Mann  
Yale University  
Department of Political Science  
christopher.mann=40yale.edu=20  
(203) 668-3430

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>=20  
Problems?-don=27t reply to this message, write to:  
aapornet-request=40asu.edu

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

=====  
Date: Tue, 14 Sep 2004 20:21:12 -0400  
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <[mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Warren Mitofsky <[mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Weighting Election Polls  
Comments: To: "Christopher B. Mann" <[christopher.mann@YALE.EDU](mailto:christopher.mann@YALE.EDU)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[1095196272.41475e7052ed9@www.mail.yale.edu](mailto:1095196272.41475e7052ed9@www.mail.yale.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

One can weight to Census characteristics if one weights all respondents age 18 or older to these independent estimates. That's for weighting. Then the tabulations can be limited to registered voters or likely voters or any other subgroup of the sample, which will carry the weights they received when the whole sample was weighted. Weighting to such poorly measured characteristics such as party ID, or registration may introduce more error in the poll than it reduces.

warren mitofsky

At 05:11 PM 9/14/2004, Christopher B. Mann wrote:

>I want to weigh in (no pun intended) on the issue of weighting polls  
>because I think that there is a better alternative to weighting to  
>either party ID or census data. Mark Shulman has laid out the case  
>against party ID, so I won't pile on.

>

>However, weighting to Census data also has an inherent flaw: the  
>electorate does not look like the population. To resolve this problem,  
>many polling organization have used VNS exit poll data as their  
>weighting baseline. This certainly makes sense. However, the recent  
>demise of VNS and the data problems of the last two elections from the  
>exit polls raise questions about using this approach now. Not to  
>mention it means weighting to a baseline that is itself subject to  
>sampling error and other methodological issues.

>

>Fortunately, there is an alternative that captures specifically the  
>electorate and does so without minimal, if any, sampling error or

>response problems because it is calculated from the entire universe of  
>actual voters. Whether or not they choose to take advantage of the  
>considerable cost savings available in using registration based  
>sampling, pollsters should consider using the past turnout data  
>available on voter files to develop weighting baselines from past  
>elections. These registration files provide a number of demographic  
>characteristics useful for weighting: age, gender, various geographic  
>areas (counties, cities, telephone exchanges, zip codes), and (in some  
>states) other characteristics. If you use a registration based sample,  
>you can further use party registration (which is significantly more  
>stable than party ID) and length of registration.  
>  
>Quoting Automatic digest processor <LISTSERV@lists.asu.edu>:  
>  
>> There is one message totalling 118 lines in this issue.  
>>  
>> Topics of the day:  
>>  
>> 1. Weighting Election Polls  
>>  
>> -----  
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
>> [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>>  
>> -----  
>>  
>> Date: Sat, 11 Sep 2004 13:56:25 -0400  
>> From: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>  
>> Subject: Weighting Election Polls  
>>  
>> Since we released last week's Republican Convention Time Magazine  
>> election =  
>> poll, with the Bush bounce, we're gotten lots in inquiries=20  
>> about why our poll and some of the other media polls differ from  
>> other =  
>> polls, particularly Zogby, which found little bounce. (I have not  
>> actually =  
>> seen the Zogby poll, but have gotten second-hand reports.) I need to  
>> point =  
>> out that even the media polls differed a bit on the size of the  
>> bounce.=20  
>>  
>> One likely reason for the disparity with some polls is that most of  
>> the =  
>> media polls, including ours, weight by Census data. I believe that  
>> Zogby =  
>> and some others weight on party id. I just wrote a response to  
>> Professor =  
>> Alan Reifman of Texas Tech, who has created a web site on the  
>> weighting =  
>> issue. His email is below mine. However, I thought it would be useful  
>> to =  
>> open this issue to AAPOR members. I welcome your thoughts. Here are

>> my =  
>> email comments to Dr. Reifman:  
>> -----  
>> Weighting by party ID can result in serious distortion of the  
>> horserace =  
>> numbers. Here's=20  
>> why:=20  
>>  
>> 1. As an observer of party identification tallies day after day on  
>> our =  
>> election surveys, it's clear that we're not measuring a constant  
>> factor. =  
>> It varies day by day, week by week.=20  
>>  
>> 2. Why does it vary? Most polls place the party ID question near the  
>> end =  
>> of the=20  
>> questionnaire, so that it does not interact or contaminate the  
>> horserace =  
>> measure and=20  
>> any other head-to-head candidate comparisons. David Moore has an  
>> excellent =  
>> discussion of this on the Gallup website. For election pollsters, the  
>> =  
>> horserace always takes priority,since that's the topline number we  
>> report. =  
>> As a result, respondents may tend to bring their party ID in line  
>> with =  
>> their partisan choice, particularly after having gone through an  
>> extensive =  
>> battery of election items. It's simply "cognitive consistency."  
>> Hence, a =  
>> Bush surge, for example, might elevate the number of voters later in  
>> the =  
>> survey identifying themselves as Republicans.=20  
>>  
>> 3. Since party ID is a "variable" and not an enduring constant, as is  
>> age =  
>> or gender, it=20  
>> varies!=20  
>>  
>> 4. Voting behavior literature from the 1950s and 1960s (Campbell, =  
>> Converse, Miller and=20  
>> Stokes, The American Voter, for example), posited that party ID is  
>> =  
>> something of a constant that anchors partisan choice. Party was seen  
>> as =  
>> something of a constant independent variable. It's likely that party  
>> ID =  
>> was, in fact, a more enduring "constant" in the 1950's. But, that was  
>> =  
>> then, and this is now. Voters are just not as tied to party as in the  
>> =  
>> past. Let's get over this likely out-of-date notion that party ID is



>> a =  
>> constant that anchors the vote. The causal arrows here are unclear,  
>> that =  
>> is, what influences what. The academic voting behavior literature has  
>> long =  
>> since abandoned the view of party ID as the key independent  
>> variable.  
>>  
>> 5. Hence, weighting by party ID, (and it's party ID, not party  
>> registration=  
>> ), can seriously=20  
>> distort the horserace data. Weighting by party ID would damp down the  
>> Bush =  
>> surge over the past few weeks. Yes, examining last week's Republican  
>> =  
>> convention poll, there may have been some "at home" selection bias  
>> when we =  
>> interview during party convention periods. However, not all that many  
>> =  
>> folks watched the convention. The networks provide little convention  
>> =  
>> coverage.=20  
>>  
>> Finally, my choice, and the choice of most the major media polls, is  
>> to =  
>> weight by factors=20  
>> that we know are real, such as age, gender, region, education, number  
>> of =  
>> adults in=20  
>> household, number of voice phone lines, etc. While you can argue  
>> about the =  
>> reliability=20  
>> of Census data, I'll place my bets with the Census rather than party  
>> =  
>> ID.=20  
>>  
>> I really do believe that we need to resolve this weighting issue.  
>> Getting =  
>> a little edgy now, I believe that this discussion will put to  
>> rest=20  
>> party ID weighting.=20  
>>  
>> I look forward to further comment. Dr. Reifman's email is below.  
>>  
>> Mark Schulman=20  
>> Schulman, Ronca & Bucucvalas, Inc.=20  
>> m.schulman@srbi.com=20  
>> -----  
>> Dr. Reifman's email:  
>>  
>> As part of my teaching of research methodology (which includes survey  
>> =  
>> sampling), I=20  
>> have created a web component on the sample-weighting controversy in

>> =  
>> presidential=20  
>> pre-election polls. I have found from past experience that linking  
>> =  
>> concepts from class to=20  
>> current events appears to work well with students. My website would  
>> also =  
>> be of interest=20  
>> to political/polling "junkies." Please take a look at it (by clicking  
>> =  
>> directly on the address=20  
>> below) and consider linking it to your own websites (if you have  
>> one). =  
>> Thanks!=20  
>>  
>> <http://www.hs.ttu.edu/hdfs3390/weighting.htm>=20  
>>  
>> Alan Reifman, Ph. D., Associate Professor=20  
>> Dept of Human Dev't and Family Studies=20  
>> College of Human Sciences=20  
>> Texas Tech University=20  
>> Lubbock, TX 79409-1162=20  
>> (806) 742-3000=20  
>> <http://www.hs.ttu.edu/hdfs/Faculty/reifman.htm>=20  
>>  
>> -----  
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
>> [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>>  
>> -----  
>>  
>> End of AAPORNET Digest - 10 Sep 2004 to 11 Sep 2004 (#2004-191)  
>> \*\*\*\*\*  
>>  
>  
>  
>--  
>Christopher B. Mann  
>Yale University  
>Department of Political Science  
>[christopher.mann@yale.edu](mailto:christopher.mann@yale.edu)  
>(203) 668-3430  
>  
>-----  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

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>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Tue, 14 Sep 2004 20:28:56 -0400  
Reply-To: Howard Schuman <[hschuman@UMICH.EDU](mailto:hschuman@UMICH.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Howard Schuman <[hschuman@UMICH.EDU](mailto:hschuman@UMICH.EDU)>  
Subject: Weighting Election Polls  
Comments: To: aapor <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=windows-1252; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The message (below) to aapornet by Mark Schulman suggests that much of the difference between his Time Magazine poll and a poll by Zogby has to do with the latter's weighting of candidate preference by Party Identification (PI). Mark further states that PI should not be treated as "an enduring constant" like age, gender, and other demographic factors. Instead it is a variable likely to be influenced by earlier questions on candidate preference, and he cites an interesting supportive piece by David Moore that raises the possibility of order effects when candidate preference is obtained early in an interview and PI much later.

Such order effects certainly seem possible, but since I've seldom used PI in my own work, I asked Philip Converse for his thoughts on PI measures. Although he did not comment directly on the issue of weighting current polls, his words suggested that before we focus entirely on order effects we should find out how PI is being measured and used in the several polls. In Mark's message it seems to be viewed as a dichotomy, but the classic (and I think sensible) way to measure it is with a scale, specifically a 7-point continuum from Strong Republican to Strong Democrat (or vice versa). Thus when Mark says that PI "varies day by day, week by week," does he really mean that there are more than a tiny number of people who move from one end of the scale to the other? Or does this involve people who lean slightly in one direction and then slightly in the other? And is he capturing such shifts with panel data, as would be best, or at least with large enough samples to be sure that variations in marginals are not readily accounted for by chance or other poll differences?

More generally, before assuming that weighting influenced by order effects accounts for large differences like those between the Zogby and Time polls, we should find out how PI itself was measured, coded, and employed in each poll.

Howard

[from Mark Schulman:

Since we released last week's Republican Convention Time Magazine election poll, with the Bush bounce, we're gotten lots in inquiries about why our poll and some of the other media polls differ from other polls, particularly Zogby, which found little bounce. (I have not actually seen the Zogby poll, but have gotten second-hand reports.) I need to point out that even the media polls differed a bit on the size of the bounce.

One likely reason for the disparity with some polls is that most of the media polls, including ours, weight by Census data. I believe that Zogby and some others weight on party id. I just wrote a response to Professor Alan Reifman of Texas Tech, who has created a web site on the weighting issue. His email is below mine. However, I thought it would be useful to open this issue to AAPOR members. I welcome your thoughts. Here are my email comments to Dr. Reifman:

-----

Weighting by party ID can result in serious distortion of the horserace numbers. Here's why:

1. As an observer of party identification tallies day after day on our election surveys, it's clear that we're not measuring a constant factor. It varies day by day, week by week.
2. Why does it vary? Most polls place the party ID question near the end of the questionnaire, so that it does not interact or contaminate the horserace measure and any other head-to-head candidate comparisons. David Moore has an excellent discussion of this on the Gallup website. For election pollsters, the horserace always takes priority, since that's the topline number we report. As a result, respondents may tend to bring their party ID in line with their partisan choice, particularly after having gone through an extensive battery of election items. It's simply "cognitive consistency." Hence, a Bush surge, for example, might elevate the number of voters later in the survey identifying themselves as Republicans.
3. Since party ID is a "variable" and not an enduring constant, as is age or gender, it varies!
4. Voting behavior literature from the 1950s and 1960s (Campbell, Converse, Miller and Stokes, *The American Voter*, for example), posited that party ID is something of a constant that anchors partisan choice. Party was seen as something of a constant independent variable. It's likely that party ID was, in fact, a more enduring "constant" in the 1950's. But, that was then, and this is now. Voters are just not as tied to party as in the past. Let's get over this likely out-of-date notion that party ID is a constant that anchors the vote. The causal arrows here are unclear, that is, what influences what. The academic voting behavior literature has long since abandoned the view of party ID as the key independent variable.
5. Hence, weighting by party ID, (and it's party ID, not party registration),

can seriously distort the horserace data. Weighting by party ID would damp down the Bush surge over the past few weeks. Yes, examining last week's Republican convention poll, there may have been some "at home" selection bias when we interview during party convention periods. However, not all that many folks watched the convention. The networks provide little convention coverage.

Finally, my choice, and the choice of most the major media polls, is to weight by factors that we know are real, such as age, gender, region, education, number of adults in household, number of voice phone lines, etc. While you can argue about the reliability of Census data, I'll place my bets with the Census rather than party ID.

I really do believe that we need to resolve this weighting issue. Getting a little edgy now, I believe that this discussion will put to rest party ID weighting.

I look forward to further comment.

Mark Schulman  
Schulman, Ronca & Bucucvalas, Inc.  
m.schulman@srbi.com

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

Date: Wed, 15 Sep 2004 06:44:42 -0400  
Reply-To: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>  
Subject: Re: Weighting Election Polls  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu, hschuman@UMICH.EDU  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable  
Content-disposition: inline

Howard, as always, you've raised some excellent points. I doubly appreciate that you went to one of the wellsprings of modern voting behavior, Dr. Converse. Just a few points:

1. I was deliberately "provocative" because this PI weighting issue has not been properly reviewed, yet it can have a profound impact on our estimates. I was also hoping to catch the attention of researchers like yourself who might delve deeper into the "consistency" issue. We probably could use experimental designs to provide this insight. As you noted, overall levels of party ID do not account for individual level shifts. Only a panel design could tease this out.
2. When bounces occur, we generally capture marginal aggregate changes in party ID levels, such as from 33% to 37% or so, in the party of the

candidate receiving the bounce. (I'm on the road in Europe right now and = don't have access to my data. I don't have precise numbers on hand.) = Therefore, we're not talking about huge changes, just changes at the = margins. Unfolding the party ID scale would likely shed light on possible = switches from, let's say, independent to Republican.

2. We have thus far measured party ID in our surveys using a trichotomy, = Democrat, Republican, Independent...or something else. I may unfold that = to capture leaners.

I look forward to everyone's comments. As I mentioned, I can't fully = participate for the next few days because I'm abroad. =20

Best wishes,  
Mark

<<< Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU> 9/14 8:28p >>>

The message (below) to aapornet by Mark Schulman suggests that much of the difference between his Time Magazine poll and a poll by Zogby has to do with the latter's weighting of candidate preference by Party Identification (PI). Mark further states that PI should not be treated as "an enduring constant" like age, gender, and other demographic factors. Instead it is a variable likely to be influenced by earlier questions on candidate preference, and he cites an interesting supportive piece by David Moore that raises the possibility of order effects when candidate preference is obtained early in an interview and PI much later.

Such order effects certainly seem possible, but since I've seldom used PI in my own work, I asked Philip Converse for his thoughts on PI measures. Although he did not comment directly on the issue of weighting current polls, his words suggested that before we focus entirely on order effects we should find out how PI is being measured and used in the several polls. In Mark's message it seems to be viewed as a dichotomy, but the classic (and I think sensible) way to measure it is with a scale, specifically a 7-point continuum from Strong Republican to Strong Democrat (or vice versa). Thus when Mark says that PI "varies day by day, week by week," does he really mean that there are more than a tiny number of people who move from one end of the scale to the other? Or does this involve people who lean slightly in one direction and then slightly in the other? And is he capturing such shifts with panel data, as would be best, or at least with large enough samples to be sure that variations in marginals are not readily accounted for by chance or other poll differences?

More generally, before assuming that weighting influenced by order effects accounts for large differences like those between the Zogby and Time polls, we should find out how PI itself was measured, coded, and employed in each poll.

Howard

[from Mark Schulman:

Since we released last week's Republican Convention Time Magazine election = poll, with the Bush bounce, we're gotten lots in inquiries about why our poll and some of the other media polls differ from other = polls, particularly Zogby, which found little bounce. (I have not actually = seen the Zogby poll, but have gotten second-hand reports.) I need to point = out that even the media polls differed a bit on the size of the bounce.

One likely reason for the disparity with some polls is that most of the = media polls, including ours, weight by Census data. I believe that Zogby = and some others weight on party id. I just wrote a response to Professor = Alan Reifman of Texas Tech, who has created a web site on the weighting = issue. His email is below mine. However, I thought it would be useful to = open this issue to AAPOR members. I welcome your thoughts. Here are my = email comments to Dr. Reifman:

-----  
Weighting by party ID can result in serious distortion of the horserace = numbers. Here's why:

1. As an observer of party identification tallies day after day on our = election surveys, it's clear that we're not measuring a constant factor. = It varies day by day, week by week.
2. Why does it vary? Most polls place the party ID question near the end = of the questionnaire, so that it does not interact or contaminate the horserace = measure and any other head-to-head candidate comparisons. David Moore has an excellent = discussion of this on the Gallup website. For election pollsters, the = horserace always takes priority, since that's the topline number we report. = As a result, respondents may tend to bring their party ID in line with = their partisan choice, particularly after having gone through an extensive = battery of election items. It's simply "cognitive consistency." Hence, a = Bush surge, for example, might elevate the number of voters later in the = survey identifying themselves as Republicans.
3. Since party ID is a "variable" and not an enduring constant, as is age = or gender, it varies!
4. Voting behavior literature from the 1950s and 1960s (Campbell, = Converse, Miller and Stokes, The American Voter, for example), posited that party ID is = something of a constant that anchors partisan choice. Party was seen as = something of a constant independent variable. It's likely that party ID = was, in fact, a more enduring "constant" in the 1950's. But, that was = then, and this is now. Voters are just not as tied to party as in the = past. Let's get over this likely out-of-date notion that party ID is a = constant that anchors the vote. The causal arrows here are unclear, that = is, what influences what. The academic voting behavior literature has long = since abandoned the view of party ID as the key independent variable.
5. Hence, weighting by party ID, (and it's party ID, not party registration=

), can seriously distort the horserace data. Weighting by party ID would damp down the Bush = surge over the past few weeks. Yes, examining last week's Republican = convention poll, there may have been some "at home" selection bias when we = interview during party convention periods. However, not all that many = folks watched the convention. The networks provide little convention = coverage.

Finally, my choice, and the choice of most the major media polls, is to = weight by factors that we know are real, such as age, gender, region, education, number of = adults in household, number of voice phone lines, etc. While you can argue about the = reliability of Census data, I'll place my bets with the Census rather than party ID.

I really do believe that we need to resolve this weighting issue. Getting = a little edgy now, I believe that this discussion will put to rest party ID weighting.

I look forward to further comment.

Mark Schulman  
Schulman, Ronca & Bucucvalas, Inc.  
m.schulman@srbi.com

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

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

=====  
Date: Wed, 15 Sep 2004 06:55:12 -0400  
Reply-To: Mark Schulman <[M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM](mailto:M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mark Schulman <[M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM](mailto:M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Weighting Election Polls  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu), [mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable  
Content-disposition: inline

Just to clarify, the Time Poll collects demographics on the entire sample, = not just registered voters. The weighting is at the adult population = level. Thanks for raising this issue.

Mark

<<< Warren Mitofsky <[mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM)> 9/14 8:21p >>>



One can weight to Census characteristics if one weights all respondents = age 18 or older to these independent estimates. That's for weighting. Then the tabulations can be limited to registered voters or likely voters or any other subgroup of the sample, which will carry the weights they received when the whole sample was weighted. Weighting to such poorly measured characteristics such as party ID, or registration may introduce more error in the poll than it reduces.  
warren mitofsky

At 05:11 PM 9/14/2004, Christopher B. Mann wrote:

>I want to weigh in (no pun intended) on the issue of weighting polls  
>because I think that there is a better alternative to weighting to  
>either party ID or census data. Mark Shulman has laid out the case  
>against party ID, so I won't pile on.

>  
>However, weighting to Census data also has an inherent flaw: the  
>electorate does not look like the population. To resolve this problem,  
>many polling organization have used VNS exit poll data as their  
>weighting baseline. This certainly makes sense. However, the recent  
>demise of VNS and the data problems of the last two elections from the  
>exit polls raise questions about using this approach now. Not to  
>mention it means weighting to a baseline that is itself subject to  
>sampling error and other methodological issues.

>  
>Fortunately, there is an alternative that captures specifically the  
>electorate and does so without minimal, if any, sampling error or  
>response problems because it is calculated from the entire universe of  
>actual voters. Whether or not they choose to take advantage of the  
>considerable cost savings available in using registration based  
>sampling, pollsters should consider using the past turnout data  
>available on voter files to develop weighting baselines from past  
>elections. These registration files provide a number of demographic  
>characteristics useful for weighting: age, gender, various geographic  
>areas (counties, cities, telephone exchanges, zip codes), and (in some  
>states) other characteristics. If you use a registration based sample,  
>you can further use party registration (which is significantly more  
>stable than party ID) and length of registration.

>  
>Quoting Automatic digest processor <LISTSERV@lists.asu.edu>:

>  
>> There is one message totalling 118 lines in this issue.

>>  
>> Topics of the day:

>>  
>> 1. Weighting Election Polls

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

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

>>  
>> -----  
>>

>> Date: Sat, 11 Sep 2004 13:56:25 -0400  
>> From: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>  
>> Subject: Weighting Election Polls  
>>  
>> Since we released last week's Republican Convention Time Magazine  
>> election =3D  
>> poll, with the Bush bounce, we're gotten lots in inquiries=3D20  
>> about why our poll and some of the other media polls differ from  
>> other =3D  
>> polls, particularly Zogby, which found little bounce. (I have not  
>> actually =3D  
>> seen the Zogby poll, but have gotten second-hand reports.) I need to  
>> point =3D  
>> out that even the media polls differed a bit on the size of the  
>> bounce.=3D20  
>>  
>> One likely reason for the disparity with some polls is that most of  
>> the =3D  
>> media polls, including ours, weight by Census data. I believe that  
>> Zogby =3D  
>> and some others weight on party id. I just wrote a response to  
>> Professor =3D  
>> Alan Reifman of Texas Tech, who has created a web site on the  
>> weighting =3D  
>> issue. His email is below mine. However, I thought it would be useful  
>> to =3D  
>> open this issue to AAPOR members. I welcome your thoughts. Here are  
>> my =3D  
>> email comments to Dr. Reifman:  
>> -----  
>> Weighting by party ID can result in serious distortion of the  
>> horserace =3D  
>> numbers. Here's=3D20  
>> why:=3D20  
>>  
>> 1. As an observer of party identification tallies day after day on  
>> our =3D  
>> election surveys, it's clear that we're not measuring a constant  
>> factor. =3D  
>> It varies day by day, week by week.=3D20  
>>  
>> 2. Why does it vary? Most polls place the party ID question near the  
>> end =3D  
>> of the=3D20  
>> questionnaire, so that it does not interact or contaminate the  
>> horserace =3D  
>> measure and=3D20  
>> any other head-to-head candidate comparisons. David Moore has an  
>> excellent =3D  
>> discussion of this on the Gallup website. For election pollsters, the  
>> =3D  
>> horserace always takes priority,since that's the topline number we  
>> report. =3D  
>> As a result, respondents may tend to bring their party ID in line

>> with their partisan choice, particularly after having gone through an extensive battery of election items. It's simply "cognitive consistency." Hence, a Bush surge, for example, might elevate the number of voters later in the survey identifying themselves as Republicans.

>> 3. Since party ID is a "variable" and not an enduring constant, as is age or gender, it varies.

>> 4. Voting behavior literature from the 1950s and 1960s (Campbell, Converse, Miller and Stokes, The American Voter, for example), posited that party ID is something of a constant that anchors partisan choice. Party was seen as something of a constant independent variable. It's likely that party ID was, in fact, a more enduring "constant" in the 1950's. But, that was then, and this is now. Voters are just not as tied to party as in the past. Let's get over this likely out-of-date notion that party ID is a constant that anchors the vote. The causal arrows here are unclear, that is, what influences what. The academic voting behavior literature has since abandoned the view of party ID as the key independent variable.

>> 5. Hence, weighting by party ID, (and it's party ID, not party registration), can seriously distort the horserace data. Weighting by party ID would damp down the Bush surge over the past few weeks. Yes, examining last week's Republican convention poll, there may have been some "at home" selection bias when we interview during party convention periods. However, not all that many folks watched the convention. The networks provide little convention coverage.

>> Finally, my choice, and the choice of most the major media polls, is to weight by factors that we know are real, such as age, gender, region, education, number

>> of=3D  
>> adults in=3D20  
>> household, number of voice phone lines, etc. While you can argue  
>> about the =3D  
>> reliability=3D20  
>> of Census data, I'll place my bets with the Census rather than party  
>> =3D  
>> ID.=3D20  
>>  
>> I really do believe that we need to resolve this weighting issue.  
>> Getting =3D  
>> a little edgy now, I believe that this discussion will put to  
>> rest=3D20  
>> party ID weighting.=3D20  
>>  
>> I look forward to further comment. Dr. Reifman's email is below.  
>>  
>> Mark Schulman=3D20  
>> Schulman, Ronca & Bucucvalas, Inc.=3D20  
>> m.schulman@srbi.com=3D20  
>> -----  
>> Dr. Reifman's email:  
>>  
>> As part of my teaching of research methodology (which includes survey  
>> =3D  
>> sampling), I=3D20  
>> have created a web component on the sample-weighting controversy in  
>> =3D  
>> presidential=3D20  
>> pre-election polls. I have found from past experience that linking  
>> =3D  
>> concepts from class to=3D20  
>> current events appears to work well with students. My website would  
>> also =3D  
>> be of interest=3D20  
>> to political/polling "junkies." Please take a look at it (by clicking  
>> =3D  
>> directly on the address=3D20  
>> below) and consider linking it to your own websites (if you have  
>> one). =3D  
>> Thanks!=3D20  
>>  
>> <http://www.hs.ttu.edu/hdfs3390/weighting.htm>=3D20  
>>  
>> Alan Reifman, Ph. D., Associate Professor=3D20  
>> Dept of Human Dev't and Family Studies=3D20  
>> College of Human Sciences=3D20  
>> Texas Tech University=3D20  
>> Lubbock, TX 79409-1162=3D20  
>> (806) 742-3000=3D20  
>> <http://www.hs.ttu.edu/hdfs/Faculty/reifman.htm>=3D20  
>>  
>> -----  
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

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

>> aapornet-request@asu.edu

>>

>> -----

>>

>> End of AAPORNET Digest - 10 Sep 2004 to 11 Sep 2004 (#2004-191)

>> \*\*\*\*\*

>>

>

>

>--

>Christopher B. Mann

>Yale University

>Department of Political Science

>christopher.mann@yale.edu

>(203) 668-3430

>

>-----

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

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

MITOFSKY INTERNATIONAL

1776 Broadway, Suite 1708

New York, NY 10019

212 980-3031

212 980-3107 Fax

[www.mitofskyinternational.com](http://www.mitofskyinternational.com)

[mitofsky@mindspring.com](mailto:mitofsky@mindspring.com)

-----  
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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Wed, 15 Sep 2004 09:32:58 -0400

Reply-To: "Traugott, Michael" <[mtrau@UMICH.EDU](mailto:mtrau@UMICH.EDU)>

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

From: "Traugott, Michael" <[mtrau@UMICH.EDU](mailto:mtrau@UMICH.EDU)>

Subject: Re: Weighting Election Polls

Comments: To: "Schuman, Howard" <[hschuman@umich.edu](mailto:hschuman@umich.edu)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Here is a standard citation on the variability of party ID within a campaign and by firm:

Why the Democrat-Republican Partisanship Gap Varies From Poll to Poll  
Stephen Borrelli; Brad Lockerbie; Richard G. Niemi  
The Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 51, No. 1. (Spring, 1987), pp.  
115-119.

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

Date: Wed, 15 Sep 2004 09:37:29 -0400  
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Weighting Election Polls  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[s147e4de.042@srbi.com](mailto:s147e4de.042@srbi.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

I hear that Curtis Gans said on C-SPAN the other night that turnout was likely to be quite high, 58-60%. What do people think of that, and what would the likely voter polls look like if turnout were that high?

--

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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail  
=====

Date: Wed, 15 Sep 2004 10:54:07 -0400  
Reply-To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jan Werner <[jwerner@JWDP.COM](mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM)>  
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing  
Subject: Re: Weighting Election Polls  
Comments: To: Howard Schuman <[hschuman@UMICH.EDU](mailto:hschuman@UMICH.EDU)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[41478CC8.9060300@umich.edu](mailto:41478CC8.9060300@umich.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The expression "Party Identification" (PI) conceals a multitude of different measurements. Consider the following two questions:

- Do you consider yourself a Democrat, a Republican or an Independent?
- Are you currently registered to vote as a Democrat, a Republican or an Independent?

In political polling, answers to the first might well be expected to correlate with the dependent variable, whereas the second is a demographic which should in theory (although perhaps not in fact) be independent.

One might expect the answers to these two questions to be similar, but that may not always be the case. For example, in Massachusetts, many people who consider themselves Republicans register as Democrats or Independents in order to vote in primaries, which usually involve only Democrats. In other places, party registration may not even exist.

The answer to a PI question in a given poll may not always have much value in and of itself, yet by monitoring trends over a series of polls the same question may provide a useful yardstick for measuring one source of potential non-response bias.

I don't think that one can condemn weighting on PI out of hand. Yes, it is tricky and can be a source of instability if abused, but that does not mean that it always has to be. As usual, God (or the devil) is in the details.

Jan Werner

---

Howard Schuman wrote:

- > The message (below) to aapornet by Mark Schulman suggests that much of
- > the difference between his Time Magazine poll and a poll by Zogby has to
- > do with the latter's weighting of candidate preference by Party
- > Identification (PI). Mark further states that PI should not be treated
- > as "an enduring constant" like age, gender, and other demographic
- > factors. Instead it is a variable likely to be influenced by earlier
- > questions on candidate preference, and he cites an interesting
- > supportive piece by David Moore that raises the possibility of order
- > effects when candidate preference is obtained early in an interview and
- > PI much later.
- >
- > Such order effects certainly seem possible, but since I've seldom used
- > PI in my own work, I asked Philip Converse for his thoughts on PI
- > measures. Although he did not comment directly on the issue of weighting
- > current polls, his words suggested that before we focus entirely on
- > order effects we should find out how PI is being measured and used in
- > the several polls. In Mark's message it seems to be viewed as a
- > dichotomy, but the classic (and I think sensible) way to measure it is

> with a scale, specifically a 7-point continuum from Strong Republican to  
> Strong Democrat (or vice versa). Thus when Mark says that PI "varies day  
> by day, week by week," does he really mean that there are more than a  
> tiny number of people who move from one end of the scale to the other?  
> Or does this involve people who lean slightly in one direction and then  
> slightly in the other? And is he capturing such shifts with panel data,  
> as would be best, or at least with large enough samples to be sure that  
> variations in marginals are not readily accounted for by chance or other  
> poll differences?

>  
> More generally, before assuming that weighting influenced by order  
> effects accounts for large differences like those between the Zogby and  
> Time polls, we should find out how PI itself was measured, coded, and  
> employed in each poll.

>  
> Howard

>  
>  
> [from Mark Schulman:

>  
> Since we released last week's Republican Convention Time Magazine  
> election poll, with the Bush bounce, we've gotten lots in inquiries  
> about why our poll and some of the other media polls differ from other  
> polls, particularly Zogby, which found little bounce. (I have not  
> actually seen the Zogby poll, but have gotten second-hand reports.) I  
> need to point out that even the media polls differed a bit on the size  
> of the bounce.

>  
> One likely reason for the disparity with some polls is that most of the  
> media polls, including ours, weight by Census data. I believe that Zogby  
> and some others weight on party id. I just wrote a response to Professor  
> Alan Reifman of Texas Tech, who has created a web site on the weighting  
> issue. His email is below mine. However, I thought it would be useful to  
> open this issue to AAPOR members. I welcome your thoughts. Here are my  
> email comments to Dr. Reifman:

> -----

> Weighting by party ID can result in serious distortion of the horserace  
> numbers. Here's  
> why:

>  
> 1. As an observer of party identification tallies day after day on our  
> election surveys, it's clear that we're not measuring a constant factor.  
> It varies day by day, week by week.

>  
> 2. Why does it vary? Most polls place the party ID question near the end  
> of the  
> questionnaire, so that it does not interact or contaminate the horserace  
> measure and  
> any other head-to-head candidate comparisons. David Moore has an  
> excellent discussion of this on the Gallup website. For election  
> pollsters, the horserace always takes priority, since that's the topline  
> number we report. As a result, respondents may tend to bring their party  
> ID in line with their partisan choice, particularly after having gone  
> through an extensive battery of election items. It's simply "cognitive



> consistency." Hence, a Bush surge, for example, might elevate the number  
> of voters later in the survey identifying themselves as Republicans.  
>  
> 3. Since party ID is a "variable" and not an enduring constant, as is  
> age or gender, it  
> varies!  
>  
> 4. Voting behavior literature from the 1950s and 1960s (Campbell,  
> Converse, Miller and  
> Stokes, The American Voter, for example), posited that party ID is  
> something of a constant that anchors partisan choice. Party was seen as  
> something of a constant independent variable. It's likely that party ID  
> was, in fact, a more enduring "constant" in the 1950's. But, that was  
> then, and this is now. Voters are just not as tied to party as in the  
> past. Let's get over this likely out-of-date notion that party ID is a  
> constant that anchors the vote. The causal arrows here are unclear, that  
> is, what influences what. The academic voting behavior literature has  
> long since abandoned the view of party ID as the key independent variable.  
>  
> 5. Hence, weighting by party ID, (and it's party ID, not party  
> registration), can seriously  
> distort the horserace data. Weighting by party ID would damp down the  
> Bush surge over the past few weeks. Yes, examining last week's  
> Republican convention poll, there may have been some "at home" selection  
> bias when we interview during party convention periods. However, not all  
> that many folks watched the convention. The networks provide little  
> convention coverage.  
>  
> Finally, my choice, and the choice of most the major media polls, is to  
> weight by factors  
> that we know are real, such as age, gender, region, education, number of  
> adults in  
> household, number of voice phone lines, etc. While you can argue about  
> the reliability  
> of Census data, I'll place my bets with the Census rather than party ID.  
>  
> I really do believe that we need to resolve this weighting issue.  
> Getting a little edgy now, I believe that this discussion will put to rest  
> party ID weighting.  
>  
> I look forward to further comment.  
>  
> Mark Schulman  
> Schulman, Ronca & Bucucvalas, Inc.  
> m.schulman@srbi.com  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>  
>

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Wed, 15 Sep 2004 12:07:17 -0400  
Reply-To: Cliff Zukin <zukin@RCI.RUTGERS.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Cliff Zukin <zukin@RCI.RUTGERS.EDU>  
Subject: Election Polling Concerns  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
In-Reply-To: <0I4200KQPDS1NX@asu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Adding a couple of points to the discussion:

First with regard to weighting...It is important to remember that =  
anything  
is a guess. Unlike weighting a general population survey on known  
characteristics of age, education or race, weighting a pre-election poll =  
to  
parameters that won't be known until after the election (who turned =  
out?) is  
going to be a bit more art than science. In New Jersey we find that  
weighting based on party id would be disastrous. Our panel surveys =  
finds  
that party--an attitude, even if the Michigan school calls it an =  
enduring  
predisposition--is not a fixed attribute. We would also have great  
difficulty with party registration from a listed sample as Christopher =  
Mann  
suggests. We have far more registered "undeclareds" than Democrats and  
Republicans, when we estimate from our survey data that the true number =  
of  
pure independents to be about 12 percent. And, should we old VNS data =  
for  
estimates (which we have), what do we do when they vary from one  
presidential year to the next? So, weighting is an important source of  
potential variation from poll to poll.

Second, with regard to likely voter models...We have to use them, but as =  
the  
Pew Research Center's study has indicated, there is no magic bullet =  
question  
that discriminates perfectly. Most indices are combinations of =  
self-report,  
past voting behavior and engagement (interest, following the campaign). =  
But  
while this allows each poll to speak about those who are highest on the  
scale, it is also an important source of variation from poll to poll for =  
two  
reasons. First, I suspect each polling organization uses slightly =  
different

components. Second, each must have some cutoff line for expected = turnout, a figure that will not be known until the actual election. For example, turnout was 82% of registered voters in NJ in the '92 election, and 70 percent in the '00 election. So what is our best estimate for '04? And will other organizations polling in NJ make the same sets of decisions?

Finally, with regard to our sampling frames... I'd be very worried about using a listed based frame in NJ, given that we have about 35% or so = with unlisted numbers. That's a lot of missed coverage. And those who are unlisted tend to be younger, urban, etc.--a greater proportion of Kerrey voters than in the listed population. =20

AND, to add a new sampling frame concern, that we are ALL missing...an = AAPOR paper presented in May by Clyde Tucker & colleagues estimated that the = cell phone only population in the U.S. is about 7 percent, and growing. They = are also younger, and accordingly less likely to vote. But what if 4 % of = them vote and they are divided 3-1 for the Democratic candidates? =20

Best to all.  
Cliff =20

Cliff Zukin  
Professor of Public Policy  
Rutgers University  
Vice President and President-elect  
American Association for Public Opinion Research  
zukin@rci.rutgers.edu 732 932 9384 x 247  
=20

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

Date: Wed, 15 Sep 2004 16:30:13 -0400  
Reply-To: Kate Stewart <katestewart@brspoll.com>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Kate Stewart <katestewart@BRSPOLL.COM>  
Organization: Belden, Russonello & Stewart  
Subject: evaluation studies  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I'm trying to track down some articles on methods of evaluating the = impact of communications -- tv ads, print ads, etc.

Any advice would be greatly welcomed.

Thanks.

Kate Stewart  
Belden Russonello & Stewart  
1320 19th Street, Suite 700  
WDC 20036  
(w) 202-822-6090  
(h) 301-270-8090=

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

---

Date: Wed, 15 Sep 2004 16:37:14 -0500  
Reply-To: Kathlene Larson <[katelar@IASTATE.EDU](mailto:katelar@IASTATE.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Kathlene Larson <[katelar@IASTATE.EDU](mailto:katelar@IASTATE.EDU)>  
Subject: informed consent in mailed surveys  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

Can anyone provide references on the likely impact on mailed survey response rate of a two page, informed consent document that must be signed by the respondent and included with the return questionnaire? The template for this document is located at <http://www.compliance.iastate.edu/irbForms.aspx> (page down to Informed Consent Document Template.)

I am director of an Extension-supported community survey unit. We use Dillman's (3-phase) mailing process to collect data from community residents. In the past week, the Compliance Officer in our Office of Research Compliance (ORC) has insisted that we include the following statement in the cover letter that accompanies the first questionnaire mailing (phone numbers and email addresses purposely omitted for this posting).

If you have any questions about the rights of research subjects or research-related injury, please contact the Human Subjects Research Office, address, (515) 294-xxxx or email address or the Research Compliance Officer, Office of Research Compliance, address, (515) 294-xxxx; email address.

In particular, we object to this statement because we already list the name of the director of the center sponsoring the survey and her telephone number. In addition, we strongly object to the use of the terms "compliance" and "research-related injury."

Further, they are asking us to include the informed consent document mentioned above, which basically repeats all of the information in the cover

letter.

ORC is citing Federal Code of Regulations (46 CFR Part A, especially §46.101 b (5) and §46.116) as their justification, especially indicating that the project is not exempt although in the past they determined that all of our projects were exempt.

This is the first year for this annual survey. Results are being used by our state public health department and the university's center for family policy to assess need and track impacts of public policy changes. To quote our Compliance Officer, "questions such as marital status are sensitive" and likely to cause harm to respondents since we use a number on the front of the questionnaire to track mail returns for the third mailing, a replacement questionnaire to non-respondents.

Your comments are appreciated. We meet with their representatives next Monday. All of our social science colleagues here are watching what happens with this case since it will impact many, many future social science survey projects.

Kathlene Larson  
CD-DIAL Research Director  
Iowa State University  
403A East Hall  
Ames, IA 50011-1070  
PH: (515) 294-3452  
FAX: (515) 294-0592  
katelar@iastate.edu  
Web: <http://www.extension.iastate.edu/cd-dial/>

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

=====

Date: Wed, 15 Sep 2004 17:19:08 -0500  
Reply-To: Mary.Losch@uni.edu  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mary Losch <mary.losch@UNI.EDU>  
Subject: Re: informed consent in mailed surveys  
Comments: To: Kathlene Larson <katelar@IASTATE.edu>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <PKEJLBAEEEIJKKMDLPEIIEBMCPAA.katelar@iastate.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: Quoted-printable

Kathlene,  
A couple of quick suggestions. Have you directed the Compliance Officer to  
o  
the information on the AAPOR website regarding protections of human  
research participants in survey research? If not, I would review that and  
start there. Consent is routinely incorporated into survey cover letters =

and documentation of consent (i.e., the signatures) can be waived in minimal risk studies and in some higher risk studies where the signature is the only identifying information. To ensure confidentiality, the signed consent is typically required to be sent back separately from the questionnaire which imposes a significant cost burden. This should be relevant for the cost/benefit discussion. There is little benefit of the signature in cases where the study is minimal risk and there is significant cost.

The contact information is a required element of consent but the exact wording should be open to negotiation. The "Compliance" part may be more difficult to modify -- as it is the title -- than the "research-related injury" portion. The argument should be made that this type of language is unnecessarily inflammatory and may upset and confuse respondents rather than reassure them.

Good luck. Mary Losch

On 15 Sep 2004 at 16:37, Kathlene Larson wrote:

- > Can anyone provide references on the likely impact on mailed survey response rate of a two page, informed consent document that must be signed by the respondent and included with the return questionnaire? The template for this document is located at <http://www.compliance.iastate.edu/irbForms.aspx> (page down to Informed Consent Document Template.)
- >
- > I am director of an Extension-supported community survey unit. We use Dillman's (3-phase) mailing process to collect data from community residents. In the past week, the Compliance Officer in our Office of Research Compliance (ORC) has insisted that we include the following statement in the cover letter that accompanies the first questionnaire mailing (phone numbers and email addresses purposely omitted for this posting).
- >
- > If you have any questions about the rights of research subjects or research-related injury, please contact the Human Subjects Research Office, address, (515) 294-xxxx or email address or the Research Compliance Officer, Office of Research Compliance, address, (515) 294-xxxx; email address.
- >
- > In particular, we object to this statement because we already list the name of the director of the center sponsoring the survey and her telephone number. In addition, we strongly object to the use of the terms "compliance" and "research-related injury."
- >

> Further, they are asking us to include the informed consent document  
> mentioned above, which basically repeats all of the information in the c=  
over  
> letter.  
>  
> ORC is citing Federal Code of Regulations (46 CFR Part A, especially  
> =A746.101 b (5) and =A746.116) as their justification, especially indica=  
ting  
> that the project is not exempt although in the past they determined that=  
all  
> of our projects were exempt.  
>  
> This is the first year for this annual survey. Results are being used b=  
y  
> our state public health department and the university's center for famil=  
y  
> policy to assess need and track impacts of public policy changes. To qu=  
ote  
> our Compliance Officer, "questions such as marital status are sensitive"=  
and  
> likely to cause harm to respondents since we use a number on the front o=  
f  
> the questionnaire to track mail returns for the third mailing, a replace=  
ment  
> questionnaire to non-respondents.  
> Your comments are appreciated. We meet with their representatives next  
> Monday. All of our social science colleagues here are watching what hap=  
pens  
> with this case since it will impact many, many future social science sur=  
vey  
> projects.

>  
> Kathlene Larson  
> CD-DIAL Research Director  
> Iowa State University  
> 403A East Hall  
> Ames, IA 50011-1070  
> PH: (515) 294-3452  
> FAX: (515) 294-0592  
> katelar@iastate.edu  
> Web: <http://www.extension.iastate.edu/cd-dial/>

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

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

On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Wed, 15 Sep 2004 18:45:39 -0400  
Reply-To: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>  
Subject: Re: informed consent in mailed surveys  
Comments: To: Kathlene Larson <katelar@IASTATE.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Even if you find research saying the response rate will be degraded with =  
the inclusion of the release, I doubt it will influence the review =  
board.

Personally, I would challenge the notion of "human subjects." "Subject," =  
as you surely know, originated in psychology research where participants =  
were in fact exposed to various experimental manipulations (lied to, =  
frightened, whatever). And of course in medical research subjects are =  
injected with substances, given pills (or told they're receiving pills =  
but they're nothing) etc. Your respondents are not on your premises, and =  
they are not subjected to any physical or psychological manipulation. =  
Once they return the signed form, you have no further contact with them, =  
so what's to indemnify? Post-survey completion trauma? (Assumes you're =  
not building a panel or recontacting them.) It's just "bracket creep" =  
(make that "authority creep") by which anyone could argue that a simple =  
request for information should be subsumed under regulations that =  
arguably make sense for true subjects. What risks are there? Paper cuts? =  
Allergies to envelope glue? It's ridiculous. Good luck.

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

----- Original Message -----=20  
From: Kathlene Larson=20  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu=20  
Sent: Wednesday, September 15, 2004 5:37 PM  
Subject: informed consent in mailed surveys

Can anyone provide references on the likely impact on mailed survey =  
response  
rate of a two page, informed consent document that must be signed by the  
respondent and included with the return questionnaire? The template for  
this document is located at =  
<http://www.compliance.iastate.edu/irbForms.aspx>  
(page down to Informed Consent Document Template.)

I am director of an Extension-supported community survey unit. We use  
Dillman's (3-phase) mailing process to collect data from community  
residents. In the past week, the Compliance Officer in our Office of



Research Compliance (ORC) has insisted that we include the following statement in the cover letter that accompanies the first questionnaire mailing (phone numbers and email addresses purposely omitted for this posting).

If you have any questions about the rights of research subjects or research-related injury, please contact the Human Subjects Research Office, address, (515) 294-xxxx or email address or the Research Compliance Officer, Office of Research Compliance, address, (515) 294-xxxx; email address.

In particular, we object to this statement because we already list the name of the director of the center sponsoring the survey and her telephone number. In addition, we strongly object to the use of the terms "compliance" and "research-related injury."

Further, they are asking us to include the informed consent document mentioned above, which basically repeats all of the information in the cover letter.

ORC is citing Federal Code of Regulations (46 CFR Part A, especially =A746.101 b (5) and =A746.116) as their justification, especially = indicating that the project is not exempt although in the past they determined that = all of our projects were exempt.

This is the first year for this annual survey. Results are being used = by our state public health department and the university's center for = family policy to assess need and track impacts of public policy changes. To = quote our Compliance Officer, "questions such as marital status are sensitive" = and likely to cause harm to respondents since we use a number on the front = of the questionnaire to track mail returns for the third mailing, a = replacement questionnaire to non-respondents. Your comments are appreciated. We meet with their representatives next Monday. All of our social science colleagues here are watching what = happens with this case since it will impact many, many future social science = survey projects.

Kathlene Larson  
CD-DIAL Research Director  
Iowa State University  
403A East Hall

Ames, IA 50011-1070  
PH: (515) 294-3452  
FAX: (515) 294-0592  
katelar@iastate.edu  
Web: <http://www.extension.iastate.edu/cd-dial/>

---

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

---

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

---

Date: Wed, 15 Sep 2004 23:17:14 -0400  
Reply-To: [Ande271@AOL.COM](mailto:Ande271@AOL.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jeanne Anderson <[Ande271@AOL.COM](mailto:Ande271@AOL.COM)>  
Subject: Re: informed consent in mailed surveys  
Comments: To: [katelar@IASTATE.EDU](mailto:katelar@IASTATE.EDU), [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

If there is time, you might try to obtain authorization to do a pretest to see what the effect would be. Two suggestions:

1. A focus group discussion in which the group members are given a brief introduction to the survey and instrument (using the wording you prefer and a request for consent) and also the consent form as dictated to you. See what they say, what they ask, etc.

- . Draw two small random samples (manipulating to make them "match" on a few criteria if necessary), and send one the version you prefer (including a request for consent) and the other one your introduction to the survey and the consent form as dictated to you.

I'm banking on the fact that the results of the focus group discussion, even with only one group, would be convincing, and the differences in response rate between the two samples would be too obvious to require a statistical test of significance of the difference.

Perhaps if your colleagues are all interested in the results they could pool their resources and time and figure out how to maximize the gain from such a study (or studies). The survey in question need not be a real one, and at least in the focus group design you could introduce two or even three studies and accompanying intro and consent.

Either design as I've described them could be improved on.

Jeanne L. Anderson  
(formerly) Principal  
Jeanne Anderson Research

---

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

---

Date: Thu, 16 Sep 2004 08:18:03 -0400  
Reply-To: Donald Green <[donald.green@YALE.EDU](mailto:donald.green@YALE.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Donald Green <[donald.green@YALE.EDU](mailto:donald.green@YALE.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: evaluation studies  
Comments: To: Kate Stewart <[katestewart@BRSPOLL.COM](mailto:katestewart@BRSPOLL.COM)>  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <[00ac01c49b62\\$cd422a0\\$7d68a644@brspoll.com](mailto:00ac01c49b62$cd422a0$7d68a644@brspoll.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Lynn Vavreck (UCLA) and I recently presented a paper at APSA that used randomized experimentation to test the impact of PSAs designed to increase voter turnout. The paradigm involved the random assignment of 169 cable systems in four states (KY, LA, NJ, and VA), comprising more than 3 million voters. Because cable systems are often small, one can target relatively focused geographic areas at not much cost. The entire experiment, including the production and distribution of the ads, was \$70,000. The use of random assignment borrows the strength of lab experiments while the field setting and measurement of real-world outcomes augments the study's external validity. My reading of comparable literatures on smoking ads and the like suggests that social scientists tend to rely on much weaker, observational designs.

dg

---

Donald Green  
Director, Institution for Social and Policy Studies  
&  
A. Whitney Griswold Professor of Political Science  
Yale University  
77 Prospect St.  
New Haven, CT 06520-8209

---

email address: [donald.green@yale.edu](mailto:donald.green@yale.edu)  
Web: [research.yale.edu/vote](http://research.yale.edu/vote)  
Fax 203-432-3296  
Voice 203-432-3237

On Wed, 15 Sep 2004, Kate Stewart wrote:

> I'm trying to track down some articles on methods of evaluating the impact of communications -- tv ads, print ads, etc.

>  
> Any advice would be greatly welcomed.

>  
> Thanks.

>  
> Kate Stewart  
> Belden Russonello & Stewart  
> 1320 19th Street, Suite 700  
> WDC 20036  
> (w) 202-822-6090  
> (h) 301-270-8090

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

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

---

Date: Thu, 16 Sep 2004 11:02:02 -0400  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Someone doesn't understand what a push poll is  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

<http://wvgazette.com/section/News/2004091550>

Wells files complaint over alleged push poll

By The Associated Press

Someone is targeting Democratic candidate Erik Wells with what may be an illegal "push poll" as he challenges West Virginia's sole Republican in Congress.

The telephone survey asks voters if they might change their minds about Wells if they knew about what the poll characterizes as his stance on Iraq and on President Bush's tax policies, about his lawsuit against a former employer and about out-of-state groups allegedly aiding his campaign.

SNIP

Push polls are designed to advocate a candidate's defeat or victory deceptively, and are illegal under state law.

"The questions are phrased so they get certain results. They use those questions to get the poll numbers they want," said Cindy Smith, team leader for elections at the Secretary of State's Office.

Wells filed a complaint with Smith's office Wednesday asking it to investigate the polling.

Venture Data, a Utah-based telemarketing firm, is conducting the survey out of its Spokane, Wash., office. A Venture operator phoning West Virginia voters for the poll late Tuesday did not know who had hired the firm. Jeff Call, a Venture Data official, did not respond to requests for comment Wednesday.

Capito complained about a push poll that allegedly targeted her during her 2002 re-election bid.

"This campaign should be about the issues important to West Virginia, not about personal attacks," Hamm said Wednesday.

The National Republican Congressional Committee has aided Capito's past campaigns. It declined to comment on any polling.

SNIP

--

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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

-----  
Date: Thu, 16 Sep 2004 11:37:13 -0400

Reply-To: Jim Bason <[jbason@ARCHES.UGA.EDU](mailto:jbason@ARCHES.UGA.EDU)>

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

From: Jim Bason <[jbason@ARCHES.UGA.EDU](mailto:jbason@ARCHES.UGA.EDU)>

Subject: Re: Someone doesn't understand what a push poll is

Comments: To: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I received a telephone call from someone from Venure Data on Monday evening of this week regarding the Presidential election, the U.S Senate race in Georgia and a State Senate race in Georgia. Although the questions I was asked were not a push poll, I did ask the interview for information (who is

calling, who sponsored the survey, etc.). The interviewer could not answer my questions so I asked to speak to a Supervisor who also could not tell me who sponsored the survey.

I then asked for the corporate office number, and tried to reach Mr. Call but was unsuccessful. I asked the people I spoke with if they were aware of AAPOR and CASRO, and they were not. I then asked if they knew that our Best Practices requires identifying the sponsor of a survey, the methodology used, and the purpose.

By the way, I was phoned from Washington State and Venture Data's home office is in Utah.

Jim Bason

James J. Bason, Ph.D.  
Director and Associate Research Scientist  
Survey Research Center  
Office of Research Services  
jbason@uga.edu  
McWhorter Hall  
University of Georgia  
Athens, Georgia 30606  
706-542-9082

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

From: "Leo Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
To: <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
Sent: Thursday, September 16, 2004 11:02 AM  
Subject: Someone doesn't understand what a push poll is

> <http://wvgazette.com/section/News/2004091550>  
>  
> Wells files complaint over alleged push poll  
>  
> By The Associated Press  
>  
> Someone is targeting Democratic candidate Erik Wells with what may be an  
> illegal "push poll" as he challenges West Virginia's sole Republican in  
> Congress.  
>  
> The telephone survey asks voters if they might change their minds about  
> Wells if they knew about what the poll characterizes as his stance on Iraq  
> and on President Bush's tax policies, about his lawsuit against a former  
> employer and about out-of-state groups allegedly aiding his campaign.  
>  
> SNIP  
>  
> Push polls are designed to advocate a candidate's defeat or victory  
> deceptively, and are illegal under state law.

>  
> "The questions are phrased so they get certain results. They use those  
> questions to get the poll numbers they want," said Cindy Smith, team  
> leader for elections at the Secretary of State's Office.  
>  
> Wells filed a complaint with Smith's office Wednesday asking it to  
> investigate the polling.  
>  
> Venture Data, a Utah-based telemarketing firm, is conducting the survey  
out  
> of its Spokane, Wash., office. A Venture operator phoning West Virginia  
> voters for the poll late Tuesday did not know who had hired the firm. Jeff  
> Call, a Venture Data official, did not respond to requests for comment  
> Wednesday.  
>  
> Capito complained about a push poll that allegedly targeted her during her  
> 2002 re-election bid.  
>  
> "This campaign should be about the issues important to West Virginia, not  
> about personal attacks," Hamm said Wednesday.  
>  
> The National Republican Congressional Committee has aided Capito's past  
> campaigns. It declined to comment on any polling.

> SNIP

> --

> 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](mailto: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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Thu, 16 Sep 2004 11:47:21 -0400  
Reply-To: Jane Dockery <[jane.dockery@WRIGHT.EDU](mailto:jane.dockery@WRIGHT.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jane Dockery <[jane.dockery@WRIGHT.EDU](mailto:jane.dockery@WRIGHT.EDU)>  
Organization: Wright State University  
Subject: AIDS questionnaire  
Comments: To: "AAPORNET@asu.edu" <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

We are working with a regional organization to assess African Americans' attitudes and behaviors regarding AIDS prevention and awareness. We are interested in any survey instruments that have been used to probe this topic at the local, state, or national level. Please reply to david.jones@wright.edu

Thank you, Jane

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

=====  
Date: Thu, 16 Sep 2004 12:01:26 -0400  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Making call on sham of political polling  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

John Zogby says: "I don't use telephones anymore because there is no easy way to use them," "The people who are using telephone surveys are in denial," Zogby was saying. "It is similar to the '30s, when they first started polling by telephones and there were people who laughed at that and said you couldn't trust them because not everybody had a home phone. Now they try not to mention cell phones. They don't look or listen. They go ahead with a method that is old and wrong."

Making call on sham of political polling  
Jimmy Breslin  
Newsday  
<http://www.nynewsday.com/news/local/newyork/columnists/ny-nybres163973220sep16,0,6250241,print.column?coll=ny-ny-columnists>

September 16, 2004

Anybody who believes these national political polls are giving you facts is a gullible fool.

Any editors of newspapers or television news shows who use poll results as a story are beyond gullible. On behalf of the public they profess to serve, they are indolent salesmen of falsehoods.

This is because these political polls are done by telephone. Land-line telephones, as your house phone is called.



The telephone polls do not include cellular phones. There are almost 169 million cell phones being used in America today - 168,900,019 as of Sept. 15, according to the cell phone institute in Washington.

There is no way to poll cell phone users, so it isn't done.

Not one cell phone user has received a call on their cell phone asking them how they plan to vote as of today.

Out of 168 million, anything can happen. Midway through election night, these stern-faced network announcers suddenly will be frozen white and they have to give a result:

SNIP

If you want a poll on the Kerry-Bush race, sit down and make up your own. It is just as good as the monstrous frauds presented on television and the newspaper first pages.

Copyright C 2004, Newsday, Inc.

--

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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Thu, 16 Sep 2004 12:01:44 -0500  
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Organization: Market Shares Corporation  
Subject: Re: Making call on sham of political polling  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[0I4500F065ZKRV@chimmx04.algx.net](mailto:0I4500F065ZKRV@chimmx04.algx.net)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Does anyone have the current incidence figure for people who rely exclusively on cell phones?

Nick

Leo Simonetta wrote:

>John Zogby says: "I don't use telephones anymore because there is no easy  
>way to use them," "The people who are using telephone surveys are in  
>denial," Zogby was saying. "It is similar to the '30s, when they first  
>started polling by telephones and there were people who laughed at that and  
>said you couldn't trust them because not everybody had a home phone. Now  
>they try not to mention cell phones. They don't look or listen. They go  
>ahead with a method that is old and wrong."

>  
>  
>Making call on sham of political polling

>Jimmy Breslin

>Newsday

><http://www.nynewsday.com/news/local/newyork/columnists/ny-nybres163973220se>  
>p16,0,6250241,print.column?coll=ny-ny-columnists

>  
>September 16, 2004

>  
>Anybody who believes these national political polls are giving you facts is  
>a gullible fool.

>  
>Any editors of newspapers or television news shows who use poll results as  
>a story are beyond gullible. On behalf of the public they profess to serve,  
>they are indolent salesmen of falsehoods.

>  
>This is because these political polls are done by telephone. Land-line  
>telephones, as your house phone is called.

>  
>The telephone polls do not include cellular phones. There are almost 169  
>million cell phones being used in America today - 168,900,019 as of Sept.  
>15, according to the cell phone institute in Washington.

>  
>There is no way to poll cell phone users, so it isn't done.

>  
>Not one cell phone user has received a call on their cell phone asking them  
>how they plan to vote as of today.

>  
>Out of 168 million, anything can happen. Midway through election night,  
>these stern-faced network announcers suddenly will be frozen white and they  
>have to give a result:

>  
>SNIP

>  
>If you want a poll on the Kerry-Bush race, sit down and make up your own.  
>It is just as good as the monstrous frauds presented on television and the  
>newspaper first pages.

>  
>Copyright C 2004, Newsday, Inc.

>  
>--  
>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](mailto: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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Thu, 16 Sep 2004 14:02:52 -0400

Reply-To: [JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM](mailto:JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM)

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

From: "J. Ann Selzer" <[JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM](mailto:JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM)>

Subject: Re: Making call on sham of political polling

Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I actually had a call from someone who did receive a presidential poll call on his cell phone, because that was the number he included with his voter registration information. JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.

Selzer & Company, Inc.

Des Moines, Iowa 50312

515.271.5700

visit our website: [www.SelzerCo.com](http://www.SelzerCo.com)

E-mail address for purposes of this list: [JAnnSelzer@aol.com](mailto:JAnnSelzer@aol.com); otherwise, contact [JASelzer@SelzerCo.com](mailto:JASelzer@SelzerCo.com).

-----

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

Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Thu, 16 Sep 2004 11:44:50 -0700

Reply-To: John Nienstedt <[john@CERC.NET](mailto:john@CERC.NET)>

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

From: John Nienstedt <[john@CERC.NET](mailto:john@CERC.NET)>

Organization: CERC

Subject: Re: Making call on sham of political polling

Comments: To: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

In-Reply-To: <4149C6F8.8080409@marketsharescorp.com>

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I heard less than 7% at the Phoenix conference. Additionally, research presented in St. Petersburg (maybe a bit dated) clearly showed the group of cell-only individuals are disproportionately younger, lower income, members of ethnic minorities and renters. The inference is that they are much less likely to vote than those who have a land-line and therefore these are the types of folks who would self-select themselves out of an election poll anyway.

AAPOR should address this issue (open letter to Newsday readers, lump of coal to John Zogby, etc.) before the idea that cell phones have ruined political polling becomes an urban legend.

John E. Nienstedt, Sr.

john@cerc.net

Get the edge at [www.cerc.net](http://www.cerc.net)

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Nick Panagakis

Sent: Thursday, September 16, 2004 10:02 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: Making call on sham of political polling

Does anyone have the current incidence figure for people who rely exclusively on cell phones?

Nick

Leo Simonetta wrote:

>John Zogby says: "I don't use telephones anymore because there is no  
>easy  
>way to use them," "The people who are using telephone surveys are in  
>denial," Zogby was saying. "It is similar to the '30s, when they first  
>started polling by telephones and there were people who laughed at that  
>and  
>said you couldn't trust them because not everybody had a home phone.  
Now  
>they try not to mention cell phones. They don't look or listen. They go  
>ahead with a method that is old and wrong."

>

>

>Making call on sham of political polling

>Jimmy Breslin

>Newsday

><http://www.nynewsday.com/news/local/newyork/columnists/ny-nybres1639732>

20se

>p16,0,6250241,print.column?coll=ny-ny-columnists

>  
>September 16, 2004  
>  
>Anybody who believes these national political polls are giving you  
facts is  
>a gullible fool.  
>  
>Any editors of newspapers or television news shows who use poll results  
as  
>a story are beyond gullible. On behalf of the public they profess to  
serve,  
>they are indolent salesmen of falsehoods.  
>  
>This is because these political polls are done by telephone. Land-line  
>telephones, as your house phone is called.  
>  
>The telephone polls do not include cellular phones. There are almost  
169  
>million cell phones being used in America today - 168,900,019 as of  
Sept.  
>15, according to the cell phone institute in Washington.  
>  
>There is no way to poll cell phone users, so it isn't done.  
>  
>Not one cell phone user has received a call on their cell phone asking  
them  
>how they plan to vote as of today.  
>  
>Out of 168 million, anything can happen. Midway through election night,  
>these stern-faced network announcers suddenly will be frozen white and  
they  
>have to give a result:  
>  
>SNIP  
>  
>If you want a poll on the Kerry-Bush race, sit down and make up your  
own.  
>It is just as good as the monstrous frauds presented on television and  
the  
>newspaper first pages.  
>  
>Copyright C 2004, Newsday, Inc.  
>  
>--  
>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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Thu, 16 Sep 2004 15:57:27 -0400

Reply-To: Nancy Belden <[nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM](mailto:nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM)>

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

From: Nancy Belden <[nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM](mailto:nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM)>

Subject: A Meeting Place

Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Help! Does anyone in Washington, DC who is sitting at a desk right now, have a copy of A Meeting Place on hand? If so please email me ASAP. I will explain! 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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Thu, 16 Sep 2004 17:01:47 -0400

Reply-To: "Christopher B. Mann" <[christopher.mann@YALE.EDU](mailto:christopher.mann@YALE.EDU)>

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

From: "Christopher B. Mann" <[christopher.mann@YALE.EDU](mailto:christopher.mann@YALE.EDU)>

Subject: Re: Weighting Election Polls

Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

In-Reply-To: <[0I4400EA28G07Q@asu.edu](mailto:0I4400EA28G07Q@asu.edu)>

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

I would like to clarify a couple of points about using past voter turnout from registration data for weighting because I think that several people have dismissed it without properly understanding the nature of the data.

First, the registration data is from the lists held by the public agency supervising elections (e.g. county clerks) and contains the entire universe of registered voters. Thus calculations of past turnout are based on the entire universe, not a sample. There are imperfections in this registration data, but they are very minimal recordkeeping mistakes and are not variation from sampling. Thus, it seems that any other weights - even the very good estimates from the Census sampling or the estimates from VNS - are more likely to introduce variation than using registration based data. Just to reiterate, I am NOT referring to self-reported registration or any other self-reported information.

Second, using past turnout from registration data as weights allows one to eliminate the bias that may result from using screens for registered voters or likely voters. In my research in the 2002 cycle, adding vote screens to the past voting history weights did not appear to result in a significant improvement in forecast accuracy. Thus, for a sample of the whole population that is weighted to the Census and then by likely voters, two sources of bias can be eliminated: sampling issues from the Census and problems with the screen.

Third, weighting to past turnout from registration data is an entirely separate question from using registration based samples. Objections to using the sample because of unlisted phone numbers are not a good reason to ignore other potential uses for registration data that don't involve phone numbers.

Fourth, election day registration is a problem for all types of samples. However, using past turnout data from registration lists can provide useful weights for this data. Since date of registration on the registration lists will allow us to build a profile of those who have registered on past election days, we can calculate a set of weights for the age, gender, geography, etc that can be used to weight the sub-sample that is not registered when contacted. This subsample can in turn be weighted into the whole sample including registered voters according to the past proportions of election day registrants and previously registered voters.

Finally, I concede the variation in turnout from election to election is something of a problem for weighting to past turnout from registration data, as it was for using exit poll data for weighting. However, I believe that the past (a single election or averaging several past elections) introduces less bias than relying on the Census which we know doesn't look like the voting population, vote screens which have their own variation and significant element of researcher judgment, or self-reported and unstable items such as party ID.

--

Christopher B. Mann  
Yale University  
Department of Political Science  
christopher.mann@yale.edu  
(203) 668-3430

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

---

Date: Thu, 16 Sep 2004 17:25:44 -0400  
Reply-To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jan Werner <[jwerner@JWDP.COM](mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM)>  
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing  
Subject: Re: Making call on sham of political polling  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[0I4500F065ZKRV@chimmx04.algx.net](mailto:0I4500F065ZKRV@chimmx04.algx.net)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

One might surmise from the Zogby web site that his political polling is being done online this year (Zogby Interactive), although it does not say so explicitly.

On the other hand, the FAQ posted on the Zogby site clearly states that he uses RDD telephone interviewing (<http://www.zogby.com/about/faq.cfm>).

Perhaps someone more familiar with the Zogby operation could elucidate.

Jan Werner

---

Leo Simonetta wrote:

> John Zogby says: "I don't use telephones anymore because there is no easy  
> way to use them," "The people who are using telephone surveys are in  
> denial," Zogby was saying. "It is similar to the '30s, when they first  
> started polling by telephones and there were people who laughed at that and  
> said you couldn't trust them because not everybody had a home phone. Now  
> they try not to mention cell phones. They don't look or listen. They go  
> ahead with a method that is old and wrong."  
>

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



On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Thu, 16 Sep 2004 18:14:18 -0400  
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>  
Subject: Re: Weighting Election Polls  
Comments: To: "Christopher B. Mann" <christopher.mann@YALE.EDU>  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <1095368507.4149ff3bd612a@www.mail.yale.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

While the posting below makes a lot of good points I believe it minimizes one very significant problem. It says:

"There are imperfections in this registration data, but they are very minimal recordkeeping mistakes..."

The mistakes in registration lists are frequently very large. They include a population that includes those who have moved, died or otherwise become ineligible to vote. The magnitude of obsolete voter registration varies from state to state and within states, from county to count. There is no consistent deletion of obsolete registrants. If the character of the registered population does not change then I suppose the problem due to obsolete records is minimal. If there is change in the character of the voting population one could have trouble with the approach listed below.  
warren mitofsky

At 05:01 PM 9/16/2004, Christopher B. Mann wrote:

>I would like to clarify a couple of points about using past voter  
>turnout from registration data for weighting because I think that  
>several people have dismissed it without properly understanding the  
>nature of the data.

>  
>First, the registration data is from the lists held by the public agency  
>supervising elections (e.g. county clerks) and contains the entire  
>universe of registered voters. Thus calculations of past turnout are  
>based on the entire universe, not a sample. There are imperfections in  
>this registration data, but they are very minimal recordkeeping mistakes  
>and are not variation from sampling. Thus, it seems that any other  
>weights - even the very good estimates from the Census sampling or the  
>estimates from VNS - are more likely to introduce variation than using  
>registration based data. Just to reiterate, I am NOT referring to  
>self-reported registration or any other self-reported information.

>  
>Second, using past turnout from registration data as weights allows one  
>to eliminate the bias that may result from using screens for registered  
>voters or likely voters. In my research in the 2002 cycle, adding vote  
>screens to the past voting history weights did not appear to result in a  
>significant improvement in forecast accuracy. Thus, for a sample of the  
>whole population that is weighted to the Census and then by likely

>voters, two sources of bias can be eliminated: sampling issues from the  
>Census and problems with the screen.  
>  
>Third, weighting to past turnout from registration data is an entirely  
>separate question from using registration based samples. Objections to  
>using the sample because of unlisted phone numbers are not a good reason  
>to ignore other potential uses for registration data that don't involve  
>phone numbers.  
>  
>Fourth, election day registration is a problem for all types of samples.  
> However, using past turnout data from registration lists can provide  
>useful weights for this data. Since date of registration on the  
>registration lists will allow us to build a profile of those who have  
>registered on past election days, we can calculate a set of weights for  
>the age, gender, geography, etc that can be used to weight the  
>sub-sample that is not registered when contacted. This subsample can in  
>turn be weighted into the whole sample including registered voters  
>according to the past proportions of election day registrants and  
>previously registered voters.  
>  
>Finally, I concede the variation in turnout from election to election is  
>something of a problem for weighting to past turnout from registration  
>data, as it was for using exit poll data for weighting. However, I  
>believe that the past (a single election or averaging several past  
>elections) introduces less bias than relying on the Census which we know  
>doesn't look like the voting population, vote screens which have their  
>own variation and significant element of researcher judgment, or  
>self-reported and unstable items such as party ID.

>  
>  
>  
>--  
>Christopher B. Mann  
>Yale University  
>Department of Political Science  
>christopher.mann@yale.edu  
>(203) 668-3430

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

MITOFSKY INTERNATIONAL  
1776 Broadway, Suite 1708  
New York, NY 10019

212 980-3031  
212 980-3107 Fax

[www.mitofskyinternational.com](http://www.mitofskyinternational.com)  
[mitofsky@mindspring.com](mailto:mitofsky@mindspring.com)

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

Date: Thu, 16 Sep 2004 18:33:35 -0400  
Reply-To: Joe Lenski <[jlenski@EDISONRESEARCH.COM](mailto:jlenski@EDISONRESEARCH.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Joe Lenski <[jlenski@EDISONRESEARCH.COM](mailto:jlenski@EDISONRESEARCH.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Making call on sham of political polling  
Comments: To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com), [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I know that Zogby's surveys are being conducted online because I am on =  
his e-mail list.

If you are wondering why his numbers for Nader are so high in New Jersey =  
I am the one contributing to that.

Joe Lenski  
edison media research

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>]On Behalf Of Jan Werner  
Sent: Thursday, September 16, 2004 5:26 PM  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Subject: Re: Making call on sham of political polling

One might surmise from the Zogby web site that his political polling is  
being done online this year (Zogby Interactive), although it does not  
say so explicitly.

On the other hand, the FAQ posted on the Zogby site clearly states that  
he uses RDD telephone interviewing (<http://www.zogby.com/about/faq.cfm>).

Perhaps someone more familiar with the Zogby operation could elucidate.

Jan Werner

-----  
Leo Simonetta wrote:

> John Zogby says: "I don't use telephones anymore because there is no =  
easy  
> way to use them," "The people who are using telephone surveys are in  
> denial," Zogby was saying. "It is similar to the '30s, when they first  
> started polling by telephones and there were people who laughed at =  
that and  
> said you couldn't trust them because not everybody had a home phone. =

Now

> they try not to mention cell phones. They don't look or listen. They =  
go  
> ahead with a method that is old and wrong."  
>

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

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

---

Date: Thu, 16 Sep 2004 21:43:22 -0400  
Reply-To: [DMMerkle@AOL.COM](mailto:DMMerkle@AOL.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Daniel M. Merkle" <[DMMerkle@AOL.COM](mailto:DMMerkle@AOL.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Making call on sham of political polling  
Comments: To: [jlenski@EDISONRESEARCH.COM](mailto:jlenski@EDISONRESEARCH.COM), [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Zogby does have an online panel, but the most recent Zogby pre-election poll (and others) on his website (conducted Sept. 8-9) was done by telephone:

"Zogby International conducted telephone interviews of 1018 likely voters chosen at random nationwide. All calls were made from Zogby International headquarters in Utica, N.Y., from Wednesday, September 8 through Thursday, September 9, 2004. The margin of error is +/-3.1 percentage points. Slight weights were added to region, party, age, race, religion and gender to more accurately reflect the voting population. Margins of error are higher in sub-groups."

In a message dated 9/16/2004 6:52:18 PM Eastern Standard Time, [jlenski@EDISONRESEARCH.COM](mailto:jlenski@EDISONRESEARCH.COM) writes:

I know that Zogby's surveys are being conducted online because I am on his e-mail list.

If you are wondering why his numbers for Nader are so high in New Jersey I am the one contributing to that.

Joe Lenski  
edison media research

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

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 05:50:23 -0700  
Reply-To: Steven Pennell <[spennell@UMICH.EDU](mailto:spennell@UMICH.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Steven Pennell <[spennell@UMICH.EDU](mailto:spennell@UMICH.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: informed consent in mailed surveys  
Comments: To: Kathlene Larson <[katelar@IASTATE.EDU](mailto:katelar@IASTATE.EDU)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

A few comments regarding your email inquiry ( others may have already addressed some of the items).

Research which maintains a link between survey data and participants' identities generally does not qualify for an exemption. When a survey is not anonymous, IRBs have an obligation to assess the extent to which participant risk is minimized (in survey research the major risk is the potential for breaches in confidentiality) as well as the researcher's plan for protecting confidentiality. When data are collected anonymously concerns about breaches in confidentiality may be resolved and IRBs are apt to provide an exemption from on-going review under =A746.101b(2).

=A746.116a(1-8) outlines the required elements of informed consent, one of which is to provide information to participants about who to contact with questions about their rights as volunteers in research (as opposed to questions about the research which are appropriately directed to the investigator). Most IRBs identify themselves as the entity to contact when participants have questions about their rights. Some IRBs allow their contact information to be presented in smaller font as an endnote on the cover letter; although, people may not call often when the telephone number is not toll-free. I agree that the wording is provocative. Since your research doesn't appear to have any expected risks it should be unnecessary to mention research-related injuries in the statement. Your IRB should be able to identify for you what risks they are referring to.

Your IRB should expect the number of inquiries they receive, but can't answer and have to forward to the investigator, to increase, so it becomes a burden for the IRB if the distinction between questions about the research and questions about participant rights is not clear, even when a few extra calls are generated.

One alternative which makes this distinction clearer could be:

"Specific questions about this study, including what this research is about and your role in the research should be directed to INVESTIGATOR at

the number noted above. Should you have general questions about the rights of participants in research, however, please contact IRB INFORMATION....."

=A746.117c(2) provides a waiver of the requirement for signed consent when "the research presents no more than minimal risk of harm to subjects and involves no procedures for which written consent is normally required outside of the research context." Many IRBs provide this waiver for mail, telephone, and internet surveys. IRBs have the dual obligation to protect research participants and promote the research interests of society. Requiring signed consent in situations which leads to lower response rates increases the likelihood of bias and is at cross purposes with this obligation.

Clearly, your response rate will be lower if signed consent is required. You might want to look at some of the school-based research, for example, that demonstrates lower response rates and sample bias when signed parental consent is required for students to participate.

Regards,

Steve Pennell  
Survey Director  
Survey Research Center  
University of Michigan

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

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 08:43:05 -0500  
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Organization: Market Shares Corporation  
Subject: Re: Weighting Election Polls  
Comments: To: "aapornet@asu.edu" <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
In-Reply-To: <[1095368507.4149ff3bd612a@www.mail.yale.edu](mailto:1095368507.4149ff3bd612a@www.mail.yale.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=windows-1252; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

A comment on a couple of points below from someone who is not an opponent of RBS sampling.

Registered Voter List Quality  
There are probably variations in the quality of registration data from state to state. But the quality of state registration should be generally suspect. The FEC collects registration data from the states which do raise questions about this.  
<http://www.fec.gov/pages/2000turnout/reg&to00.htm>

Nationally, in 2000 the FEC showed 5 million fewer votes than reported

by Census Voting and Registration survey which the Census does not dispute.

On the other hand, the FEC also showed almost 27 million more registered voters than reported in the Census survey, 156,421,311 vs. 129,549,000. Needless to say, purging non-voters, duplicate registrations of voters who moved or for other reasons appears to be less than current. SOS offices in Alaska and Montana in particular seem to be somewhat behind in their work - their registered voter counts are 110% and 105% of VAP estimates in 2000.

#### Party Registration

We don't do many polls in states with party registration. In 2000, we did a poll in New Jersey. According to party registration data at the time which is still available on-line, 57% of voters were registered as independents.

In our poll, which did not even offer "independent" as an answer choice, only 31% called themselves independents. Cliff Zukin could probably add to this.

Nick

Christopher B. Mann wrote:

>I would like to clarify a couple of points about using past voter  
>turnout from registration data for weighting because I think that  
>several people have dismissed it without properly understanding the  
>nature of the data.

>

>First, the registration data is from the lists held by the public agency  
>supervising elections (e.g. county clerks) and contains the entire  
>universe of registered voters. Thus calculations of past turnout are  
>based on the entire universe, not a sample. There are imperfections in  
>this registration data, but they are very minimal recordkeeping mistakes  
>and are not variation from sampling. Thus, it seems that any other  
>weights - even the very good estimates from the Census sampling or the  
>estimates from VNS - are more likely to introduce variation than using  
>registration based data. Just to reiterate, I am NOT referring to  
>self-reported registration or any other self-reported information.

>

>Second, using past turnout from registration data as weights allows one  
>to eliminate the bias that may result from using screens for registered  
>voters or likely voters. In my research in the 2002 cycle, adding vote  
>screens to the past voting history weights did not appear to result in a  
>significant improvement in forecast accuracy. Thus, for a sample of the  
>whole population that is weighted to the Census and then by likely  
>voters, two sources of bias can be eliminated: sampling issues from the  
>Census and problems with the screen.

>

>Third, weighting to past turnout from registration data is an entirely  
>separate question from using registration based samples. Objections to  
>using the sample because of unlisted phone numbers are not a good reason  
>to ignore other potential uses for registration data that don't involve  
>phone numbers.

>  
>Fourth, election day registration is a problem for all types of samples.  
> However, using past turnout data from registration lists can provide  
>useful weights for this data. Since date of registration on the  
>registration lists will allow us to build a profile of those who have  
>registered on past election days, we can calculate a set of weights for  
>the age, gender, geography, etc that can be used to weight the  
>sub-sample that is not registered when contacted. This subsample can in  
>turn be weighted into the whole sample including registered voters  
>according to the past proportions of election day registrants and  
>previously registered voters.

>  
>Finally, I concede the variation in turnout from election to election is  
>something of a problem for weighting to past turnout from registration  
>data, as it was for using exit poll data for weighting. However, I  
>believe that the past (a single election or averaging several past  
>elections) introduces less bias than relying on the Census which we know  
>doesn't look like the voting population, vote screens which have their  
>own variation and significant element of researcher judgment, or  
>self-reported and unstable items such as party ID.

>  
>  
>  
>--

>Christopher B. Mann  
>Yale University  
>Department of Political Science  
>christopher.mann@yale.edu  
>(203) 668-3430

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

>  
>  
>  
>

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

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 10:11:42 -0400  
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>  
Subject: Pew vs Gallup  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Pew has the pres race "dead even" - and Gallup now has Bush 13 points



ahead. What is going on?

--

Doug Henwood  
Producer, Behind the News  
Thursdays, 5-6 PM, WBAI, New York 99.5 FM  
38 Greene St - 4th fl  
New York NY 10013-2505 USA  
+1-212-219-0010 voice +1-212-219-0098 fax  
email: <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>  
web: <http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Radio.html>

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

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 10:28:57 -0400  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <p05200f09bd70a0fc8e56@[192.168.1.100]>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

I was actually preparing a similar question for AAPORnet - I've been telling friends that it is probably due to difference in how different pollsters calculate "Likely voters" but I am beginning to wonder if that could account for differences that are this large.

We're also seeing big differences in state polls.

--

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 Doug Henwood

> Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 10:12 AM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Pew vs Gallup

>

> Pew has the pres race "dead even" - and Gallup now has Bush

> 13 points ahead. What is going on?

> --

> Doug Henwood

> Producer, Behind the News

> Thursdays, 5-6 PM, WBAI, New York 99.5 FM

> 38 Greene St - 4th fl

> New York NY 10013-2505 USA  
> +1-212-219-0010 voice +1-212-219-0098 fax  
> email: <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>  
> web: <http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Radio.html>

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

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

---

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 09:34:11 -0500  
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Organization: Market Shares Corporation  
Subject: Re: Weighting Election Polls  
Comments: To: "aapornet@asu.edu" <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
In-Reply-To: <[414AE9E9.9000306@marketsharescorp.com](mailto:414AE9E9.9000306@marketsharescorp.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=windows-1252; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

Edit: In our poll, which did not offer "independent" as an answer choice, only 31% called themselves independents although they may be less likely to vote.

Nick Panagakis wrote:

>  
> A comment on a couple of points below from someone who is not an  
> opponent of RBS sampling.  
>  
> Registered Voter List Quality  
> There are probably variations in the quality of registration data from  
> state to state. But the quality of state registration should be  
> generally suspect. The FEC collects registration data from the states  
> which do raise questions about this.  
> <http://www.fec.gov/pages/2000turnout/reg&to00.htm>  
>  
> Nationally, in 2000 the FEC showed 5 million fewer votes than reported  
> by Census Voting and Registration survey which the Census does not  
> dispute.  
>  
> On the other hand, the FEC also showed almost 27 million more  
> registered voters than reported in the Census survey, 156,421,311 vs.  
> 129,549,000. Needless to say, purging non-voters, duplicate  
> registrations of voters who moved or for other reasons appears to be  
> less than current. SOS offices in Alaska and Montana in particular  
> seem to be somewhat behind in their work - their registered voter

> counts are 110% and 105% of VAP estimates in 2000.

>

> Party Registration

> We don't do many polls in states with party registration. In 2000, we

> did a poll in New Jersey. According to party registration data at the

> time which is still available on-line, 57% of voters were registered

> as independents.

>

> In our poll, which did not even offer "independent" as an answer

> choice, only 31% called themselves independents. Cliff Zukin could

> probably add to this.

>

> Nick

>

> Christopher B. Mann wrote:

>

>> I would like to clarify a couple of points about using past voter

>> turnout from registration data for weighting because I think that

>> several people have dismissed it without properly understanding the

>> nature of the data.

>>

>> First, the registration data is from the lists held by the public agency

>> supervising elections (e.g. county clerks) and contains the entire

>> universe of registered voters. Thus calculations of past turnout are

>> based on the entire universe, not a sample. There are imperfections in

>> this registration data, but they are very minimal recordkeeping mistakes

>> and are not variation from sampling. Thus, it seems that any other

>> weights - even the very good estimates from the Census sampling or the

>> estimates from VNS - are more likely to introduce variation than using

>> registration based data. Just to reiterate, I am NOT referring to

>> self-reported registration or any other self-reported information.

>>

>> Second, using past turnout from registration data as weights allows one

>> to eliminate the bias that may result from using screens for registered

>> voters or likely voters. In my research in the 2002 cycle, adding vote

>> screens to the past voting history weights did not appear to result in a

>> significant improvement in forecast accuracy. Thus, for a sample of the

>> whole population that is weighted to the Census and then by likely

>> voters, two sources of bias can be eliminated: sampling issues from the

>> Census and problems with the screen.

>>

>> Third, weighting to past turnout from registration data is an entirely

>> separate question from using registration based samples. Objections to

>> using the sample because of unlisted phone numbers are not a good reason

>> to ignore other potential uses for registration data that don't involve

>> phone numbers.

>>

>> Fourth, election day registration is a problem for all types of samples.

>> However, using past turnout data from registration lists can provide

>> useful weights for this data. Since date of registration on the

>> registration lists will allow us to build a profile of those who have

>> registered on past election days, we can calculate a set of weights for

>> the age, gender, geography, etc that can be used to weight the

>> sub-sample that is not registered when contacted. This subsample can in

>> turn be weighted into the whole sample including registered voters  
>> according to the past proportions of election day registrants and  
>> previously registered voters.  
>>  
>> Finally, I concede the variation in turnout from election to election is  
>> something of a problem for weighting to past turnout from registration  
>> data, as it was for using exit poll data for weighting. However, I  
>> believe that the past (a single election or averaging several past  
>> elections) introduces less bias than relying on the Census which we know  
>> doesn't look like the voting population, vote screens which have their  
>> own variation and significant element of researcher judgment, or  
>> self-reported and unstable items such as party ID.

>>  
>>  
>>  
>> --

>> Christopher B. Mann  
>> Yale University  
>> Department of Political Science  
>> christopher.mann@yale.edu  
>> (203) 668-3430

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

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

---

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 10:47:19 -0400  
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[0I4600J3SWDGPW@chimmx02.algx.net](mailto:0I4600J3SWDGPW@chimmx02.algx.net)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Gallup's numbers seem consistently favorable to Bush, and not only in the presidential preference question, but also in approval ratings over the last couple of years. (I'm certainly not accusing them of political bias - it's just an empirical fact.) Doesn't something that persistent have to reflect something about technique, and not just noise?

--

Doug Henwood  
Producer, Behind the News  
Thursdays, 5-6 PM, WBAI, New York 99.5 FM  
38 Greene St - 4th fl  
New York NY 10013-2505 USA  
+1-212-219-0010 voice +1-212-219-0098 fax  
email: <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>  
web: <http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Radio.html>

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

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 10:52:58 -0400  
Reply-To: "Straw, Gretchen" <GStraw@AARP.ORG>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Straw, Gretchen" <GStraw@AARP.ORG>  
Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup  
Comments: To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I would be especially interested in knowing the differences in response rate. It appears that the Pew Poll had a longer field period and a 10 call back methodology with attempts to convert refusals. Gallup offered up no information on their call back and refusal conversion and their field period was 3 days. It makes me wonder if some of the difference is that Pew includes some of the harder to reach and convert population.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Doug Henwood  
Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 10:12 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Pew vs Gallup

Pew has the pres race "dead even" - and Gallup now has Bush 13 points ahead. What is going on?

--

Doug Henwood  
Producer, Behind the News  
Thursdays, 5-6 PM, WBAI, New York 99.5 FM  
38 Greene St - 4th fl  
New York NY 10013-2505 USA  
+1-212-219-0010 voice +1-212-219-0098 fax  
email: <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>  
web: <http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Radio.html>

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

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

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 10:54:38 -0400  
Reply-To: Philip Meyer <[pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU](mailto:pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Philip Meyer <[pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU](mailto:pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup  
Comments: To: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[0I4600J3SWDGPW@chimmx02.algx.net](mailto:0I4600J3SWDGPW@chimmx02.algx.net)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Let's ask Andy and Frank. Guys, would you give us a couple of grafs on how your respective non-voter screens work?

---

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](http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer)

---

On Fri, 17 Sep 2004, Leo Simonetta wrote:

> Date: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 10:28:57 -0400  
> From: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
> To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
> Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup

>  
> I was actually preparing a similar question for AAPORnet - I've been  
> telling friends that it is probably due to difference in how different  
> pollsters calculate "Likely voters" but I am beginning to wonder if that  
> could account for differences that are this large.

>  
> We're also seeing big differences in state polls.

> --

> 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 Doug Henwood

>> Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 10:12 AM

>> To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

>> Subject: Pew vs Gallup

>>

>> Pew has the pres race "dead even" - and Gallup now has Bush

>> 13 points ahead. What is going on?  
>> --  
>> Doug Henwood  
>> Producer, Behind the News  
>> Thursdays, 5-6 PM, WBAI, New York 99.5 FM  
>> 38 Greene St - 4th fl  
>> New York NY 10013-2505 USA  
>> +1-212-219-0010 voice +1-212-219-0098 fax  
>> email: <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>  
>> web: <http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Radio.html>

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

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

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

---

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 11:05:04 -0400  
Reply-To: [agreenberg@greenbergresearch.com](mailto:agreenberg@greenbergresearch.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Anna Greenberg <[agreenberg@GREENBERGRESEARCH.COM](mailto:agreenberg@GREENBERGRESEARCH.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[p05200f0dbd70a8f96ecf@\[192.168.1.100\]](mailto:p05200f0dbd70a8f96ecf@[192.168.1.100])>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

Gallup uses 7 screening questions, which I think basically assumes a very low turnout scenario and would be consistently favorable towards Republicans even though they weight down the likeliest of voters to reflect their turnout assumptions.

From Ruy Teixeira's report on [emergingamericanmajority.com](http://emergingamericanmajority.com):

According to David Moore of Gallup:

Gallup asks each [RV] respondent seven LV screening questions, and gives each person an LV score of 0 to 7. [Assuming a turnout of 55 percent], the top 55% are classified as likely voters.

Here are the seven LV screening questions:

1. SALIENCE: How much thought have you given to the upcoming election for president?— quite a lot, or only a little? (“Quite a lot” or “Some” as a

volunteered response score one point)

2. KNOWLEDGE: Do you happen to know where people who live in your neighborhood go to vote? (“Yes” scores one point)

3. BEHAVIOR: Have you ever voted in your precinct or election district? (“Yes” scores one point)

4. BEHAVIOR: How often would you say you vote—always, nearly always, part of the time, or seldom? (“Always” or “Nearly always” scores one point)

5. INTENTION: Do you, yourself, plan to vote in the presidential election on November (\*), or not? (“Yes” scores one point)

6. BEHAVIOR: In the [last] presidential election, did you vote for (\*) or (\*), or did things come up to keep you from voting?

7. INTENTION: I’d like you to rate your chances of voting in the upcoming election for president on a scale of 1 to 10. If “1” represents someone who definitely will not vote, and “10” represents someone who definitely will vote, where on this scale of 1 to 10 would you place yourself?

If a voter answers each of these questions the “right” way, they get a 7, miss one and you get a 6, and so on. In practice that typically means all of the 7s—given full weight—plus some proportion of those with lower scores (usually the 6s), who are weighted down so that the size of the likely voter sample matches the projected turnout for the year (apparently 55 percent this year). All other voters are discarded from the sample.

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

From: Doug Henwood [mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM]

Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 10:47 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup

Gallup's numbers seem consistently favorable to Bush, and not only in the presidential preference question, but also in approval ratings over the last couple of years. (I'm certainly not accusing them of political bias - it's just an empirical fact.) Doesn't something that persistent have to reflect something about technique, and not just noise?

--

Doug Henwood

Producer, Behind the News

Thursdays, 5-6 PM, WBAI, New York 99.5 FM

38 Greene St - 4th fl

New York NY 10013-2505 USA

+1-212-219-0010 voice +1-212-219-0098 fax

email: <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>

web: <<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Radio.html>>

-----



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

---

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

---

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 11:04:52 -0400  
Reply-To: Nancy Belden <[nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM](mailto:nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nancy Belden <[nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM](mailto:nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM)>  
Subject: immigrants  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Does anyone have or know about research on immigrants' attitudes toward law enforcement, immigration officials, reporting domestic violence or related matters? Thank you.

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

---

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 11:49:21 -0500  
Reply-To: cgaziano <[cgaziano@PRODIGY.NET](mailto:cgaziano@PRODIGY.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: cgaziano <[cgaziano@PRODIGY.NET](mailto:cgaziano@PRODIGY.NET)>  
Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup  
Comments: To: AAPOR net <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I am wondering if there is a difference in the way that each selects respondents within households, especially if Gallup is using "youngest male/oldest female" and Pew is using a more "pure" random method. Such differences might result in some differences in demographic distributions. If demographics are related to substantive responses, that could explain some of the candidate preference differences.

Cecilie Gaziano  
Research Solutions, Inc.  
4511 Fremont Avenue South

Minneapolis, MN 55419-4744  
(612) 825-5199 Phone  
(612) 825-1966 Fax  
cgaziano@prodigy.net

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

From: "Straw, Gretchen" <GStraw@AARP.ORG>  
To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 9:52 AM  
Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup

I would be especially interested in knowing the differences in response rate. It appears that the Pew Poll had a longer field period and a 10 call back methodology with attempts to convert refusals. Gallup offered up no information on their call back and refusal conversion and their field period was 3 days. It makes me wonder if some of the difference is that Pew includes some of the harder to reach and convert population.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Doug Henwood  
Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 10:12 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Pew vs Gallup

Pew has the pres race "dead even" - and Gallup now has Bush 13 points ahead. What is going on?

--

Doug Henwood  
Producer, Behind the News  
Thursdays, 5-6 PM, WBAI, New York 99.5 FM  
38 Greene St - 4th fl  
New York NY 10013-2505 USA  
+1-212-219-0010 voice +1-212-219-0098 fax  
email: <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>  
web: <http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Radio.html>

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

---

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 12:48:59 -0400  
Reply-To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Jan Werner <[jwerner@JWDP.COM](mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM)>  
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing  
Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup  
Comments: To: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <0I4600J3SWDGPW@chimmx02.algx.net>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Gallup shows a 13 point Bush lead among LV and an 8 point lead among RV, so their LV algorithm may have shifted their results by 5 points, but clearly does not account for the entire difference. Pew has a 1 point Bush lead for LV and even for RV.

Among other polls conducted during the past 7 days, ICR tends to agree with Gallup, albeit somewhat less dramatically, whereas IBD/TIPP and Democracy Corps (Greenberg/Quinlan/Rosner) tend to agree with Pew.

So much for the "Margin Of Error" in assessing poll results!

It would be interesting to find out what weighting schemes each of these polls use. It would also be interesting to see what their unweighted results were.

Jan Werner

---

Leo Simonetta wrote:

> I was actually preparing a similar question for AAPORnet - I've been  
> telling friends that it is probably due to difference in how different  
> pollsters calculate "Likely voters" but I am beginning to wonder if that  
> could account for differences that are this large.

>  
> We're also seeing big differences in state polls.

>  
> --

> 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 Doug Henwood

>>Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 10:12 AM

>>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>>Subject: Pew vs Gallup

>>  
>>Pew has the pres race "dead even" - and Gallup now has Bush  
>>13 points ahead. What is going on?

>>--

>>Doug Henwood

>>Producer, Behind the News

>>Thursdays, 5-6 PM, WBAI, New York 99.5 FM

>>38 Greene St - 4th fl

>>New York NY 10013-2505 USA

>>+1-212-219-0010 voice +1-212-219-0098 fax

>>email: <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>

>>web: <http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Radio.html>

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

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 11:58:28 -0500  
Reply-To: "Moore, David" <David\_Moore@GALLUP.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Moore, David" <David\_Moore@GALLUP.COM>  
Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup  
Comments: To: cgaziano <cgaziano@PRODIGY.NET>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Actually, it's the other way around. Gallup is using a random in-house selection (most recent birthday, though if there are too few males, then Gallup asks for male with most recent birthday), and Pew is using the youngest male/oldest female method.

=20  
David

David W. Moore  
Senior Editor  
The Gallup Poll

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

From: cgaziano [mailto:cgaziano@PRODIGY.NET]=20  
Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 12:49 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup

I am wondering if there is a difference in the way that each selects respondents within households, especially if Gallup is using "youngest male/oldest female" and Pew is using a more "pure" random method. Such differences might result in some differences in demographic distributions.

If demographics are related to substantive responses, that could explain some of the candidate preference differences.

Cecilie Gaziano  
Research Solutions, Inc.  
4511 Fremont Avenue South  
Minneapolis, MN 55419-4744  
(612) 825-5199 Phone  
(612) 825-1966 Fax  
cgaziano@prodigy.net

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

From: "Straw, Gretchen" <GStraw@AARP.ORG>  
To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 9:52 AM  
Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup

I would be especially interested in knowing the differences in response rate. It appears that the Pew Poll had a longer field period and a 10 call back methodology with attempts to convert refusals. Gallup offered up no information on their call back and refusal conversion and their field period was 3 days. It makes me wonder if some of the difference is that Pew includes some of the harder to reach and convert population.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Doug Henwood  
Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 10:12 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Pew vs Gallup

Pew has the pres race "dead even" - and Gallup now has Bush 13 points ahead. What is going on?

--

Doug Henwood  
Producer, Behind the News  
Thursdays, 5-6 PM, WBAI, New York 99.5 FM  
38 Greene St - 4th fl  
New York NY 10013-2505 USA  
+1-212-219-0010 voice +1-212-219-0098 fax  
email: <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>  
web: <http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Radio.html>

-----  
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: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 13:10:52 -0400  
Reply-To: Allan Rivlin <arivlin@HARTRESEARCH.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Allan Rivlin <arivlin@HARTRESEARCH.COM>

Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <414B157B.8070902@jwdp.com>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I do not understand all the fretting. What in all of these results (taking the registered voters numbers not the likely voters) is inconsistent with Bush 49% Kerry 44% plus or minus three points?

Allan Rivlin

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jan Werner  
Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 12:49 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup

Gallup shows a 13 point Bush lead among LV and an 8 point lead among RV, so their LV algorithm may have shifted their results by 5 points, but clearly does not account for the entire difference. Pew has a 1 point Bush lead for LV and even for RV.

Among other polls conducted during the past 7 days, ICR tends to agree with Gallup, albeit somewhat less dramatically, whereas IBD/TIPP and Democracy Corps (Greenberg/Quinlan/Rosner) tend to agree with Pew.

So much for the "Margin Of Error" in assessing poll results!

It would be interesting to find out what weighting schemes each of these polls use. It would also be interesting to see what their unweighted results were.

Jan Werner

---

Leo Simonetta wrote:

> I was actually preparing a similar question for AAPORnet - I've been  
> telling friends that it is probably due to difference in how different  
> pollsters calculate "Likely voters" but I am beginning to wonder if that  
> could account for differences that are this large.  
>  
> We're also seeing big differences in state polls.  
>  
> --  
> 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 Doug Henwood  
>>Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 10:12 AM  
>>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>>Subject: Pew vs Gallup

>>  
>>Pew has the pres race "dead even" - and Gallup now has Bush  
>>13 points ahead. What is going on?

>>--  
>>Doug Henwood  
>>Producer, Behind the News  
>>Thursdays, 5-6 PM, WBAI, New York 99.5 FM  
>>38 Greene St - 4th fl  
>>New York NY 10013-2505 USA  
>>+1-212-219-0010 voice +1-212-219-0098 fax  
>>email: <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>  
>>web: <http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Radio.html>

>>  
>>-----  
>>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>  
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: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 13:36:58 -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: Weighting Election Polls  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
In-Reply-To: <0I460023D341EJ@asu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8bit

Another clarification is in order about the nature of the registration based data because I have received several queries off the listserve as

well as one on it: In looking at past turnout from registration data, we are looking at people who have actually shown up at the polling place (or mailed a ballot) in previous elections. Legally, this cannot include dead people or people who have moved away (and even the old precinct captains I grew up around in Chicago can't pull it off illegally anymore). Therefore the demographic profile of turnout does have this problem. Sampling from poorly maintained lists may confront this problem, but using registration data in weighting does not bring the issue into play.

--

Christopher B. Mann  
Yale University  
Department of Political Science  
christopher.mann@yale.edu  
(203) 668-3430

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

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 10:59:57 -0700  
Reply-To: Douglas Rivers <doug@POLIMETRIX.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Douglas Rivers <doug@POLIMETRIX.COM>  
Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup  
Comments: To: Allan Rivlin <arivlin@HARTRESEARCH.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <004b01c49cd9\$49ecaba0\$8400000a@bellatlantic.netc>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The margin of error for the 7% = 54% - 47% difference is the square root of the sum of the squared margins of error. In this case, the margin of error of the difference is  $\sqrt{4^2 + 2.5^2} = \sqrt{22.5} = 4.7\%$ , so the 7% difference is certainly statistically significant.

If you want to test the multiple hypothesis that both polls are sampling a population 49% Bush, we can use a chi-squared statistic  $[(54-49)/2]^2 + [(47-49)/1.25]^2 = 8.8$ , which, under the null, has a chi-square distribution with 2 d.f. The p-value is 0.012.

Of course, as someone previously pointed out, the sampling error calculations only serve to indicate that the sources of error here are unlikely to be due to sampling alone.

Doug Rivers

>I do not understand all the fretting. What in all of these results (taking  
>the registered voters numbers not the likely voters) is inconsistent with  
>Bush 49% Kerry 44% plus or minus three points?

>

>Allan Rivlin



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

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 13:11:46 -0500  
Reply-To: cgaziano <[cgaziano@PRODIGY.NET](mailto:cgaziano@PRODIGY.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: cgaziano <[cgaziano@PRODIGY.NET](mailto:cgaziano@PRODIGY.NET)>  
Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup  
Comments: To: "Moore, David" <[David\\_Moore@gallup.com](mailto:David_Moore@gallup.com)>, AAPOR net <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Samples obtained by the most recent birthday (also known as last birthday -- LB) method have tended to overrepresent females. LB may more accurately represent blacks and perhaps Hispanics, compared to census data. Surveys using the youngest male/oldest female (YMOF) technique often have gender quotas and also often ask for the designated respondent who is "at home right now," whereas callbacks are used more frequently with LB. One study comparing these two methods reported, however, that there were fewer males under 45 in a LB sample than in a YMOF sample, so there may be differences in age by gender distributions. Not everyone agrees that LB is a random method; some term it quasi-random. Problems with the LB method have been linked to larger households (informants are less likely to know all birthdays), lower education, and difficulties in understanding the selection questions. LB also allows more opportunity for respondents to self-select. It would be interesting to know if samples obtained by these two (or other) respondent selection methods do tend to have differences in political substantive responses.

Cecilie Gaziano  
Research Solutions, Inc.  
Minneapolis, MN 55419-4744

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

From: "Moore, David" <[David\\_Moore@gallup.com](mailto:David_Moore@gallup.com)>  
To: "cgaziano" <[cgaziano@PRODIGY.NET](mailto:cgaziano@PRODIGY.NET)>; <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 11:58 AM  
Subject: RE: Pew vs Gallup

Actually, it's the other way around. Gallup is using a random in-house selection (most recent birthday, though if there are too few males, then Gallup asks for male with most recent birthday), and Pew is using the youngest male/oldest female method.

David

David W. Moore  
Senior Editor  
The Gallup Poll

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

From: cgaziano [mailto:cgaziano@PRODIGY.NET]  
Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 12:49 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup

I am wondering if there is a difference in the way that each selects respondents within households, especially if Gallup is using "youngest male/oldest female" and Pew is using a more "pure" random method. Such differences might result in some differences in demographic distributions.

If demographics are related to substantive responses, that could explain some of the candidate preference differences.

Cecilie Gaziano  
Research Solutions, Inc.  
4511 Fremont Avenue South  
Minneapolis, MN 55419-4744  
(612) 825-5199 Phone  
(612) 825-1966 Fax  
cgaziano@prodigy.net

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

From: "Straw, Gretchen" <GStraw@AARP.ORG>  
To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 9:52 AM  
Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup

I would be especially interested in knowing the differences in response rate. It appears that the Pew Poll had a longer field period and a 10 call back methodology with attempts to convert refusals. Gallup offered up no information on their call back and refusal conversion and their field period was 3 days. It makes me wonder if some of the difference is that Pew includes some of the harder to reach and convert population.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Doug Henwood  
Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 10:12 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Pew vs Gallup

Pew has the pres race "dead even" - and Gallup now has Bush 13 points ahead. What is going on?

--

Doug Henwood  
Producer, Behind the News  
Thursdays, 5-6 PM, WBAI, New York 99.5 FM  
38 Greene St - 4th fl  
New York NY 10013-2505 USA  
+1-212-219-0010 voice +1-212-219-0098 fax

email: <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>  
web: <http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Radio.html>

---

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: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 14:07:01 -0400  
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <004b01c49cd9\$49ecaba0\$8400000a@bellatlantic.netc>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Allan Rivlin wrote:

>I do not understand all the fretting. What in all of these results (taking  
>the registered voters numbers not the likely voters) is inconsistent with  
>Bush 49% Kerry 44% plus or minus three points?

But the differences seem more systematic than that, with Gallup consistently reporting higher numbers for Bush, both in preference and approval.

Doug

---

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

---

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 14:09:10 -0400  
Reply-To: Allan Rivlin <arivlin@HARTRESEARCH.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Allan Rivlin <arivlin@HARTRESEARCH.COM>  
Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <WASHINGTONnSGi7qCeB00007831@mail.polimetrix.com>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

That was using the LV numbers not the RV. Gallup has Bush at 52% in the 2 way (52% - 44%) and 50% in the 3 way (50%, 42%, 4%). I do not think the null hypothesis will be rejected for a 3 point difference (49% - 52%) on a poll of 935 registered voters, but I have not run the numbers.

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

From: Douglas Rivers [mailto:doug@polimetrix.com]

Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 2:00 PM

To: 'Allan Rivlin'; AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: RE: Pew vs Gallup

The margin of error for the 7% = 54% - 47% difference is the square root of the sum of the squared margins of error. In this case, the margin of error of the difference is  $\sqrt{4^2 + 2.5^2} = \sqrt{22.5} = 4.7\%$ , so the 7% difference is certainly statistically significant.

If you want to test the multiple hypothesis that both polls are sampling a population 49% Bush, we can use a chi-squared statistic  $[(54-49)/2]^2 + [(47-49)/1.25]^2 = 8.8$ , which, under the null, has a chi-square distribution with 2 d.f. The p-value is 0.012.

Of course, as someone previously pointed out, the sampling error calculations only serve to indicate that the sources of error here are unlikely to be due to sampling alone.

Doug Rivers

>I do not understand all the fretting. What in all of these results (taking  
>the registered voters numbers not the likely voters) is inconsistent with  
>Bush 49% Kerry 44% plus or minus three points?

>

>Allan Rivlin

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

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 14:07:28 -0400

Reply-To: Vijay Talluri <[vijay@THEARF.ORG](mailto:vijay@THEARF.ORG)>

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

From: Vijay Talluri <[vijay@THEARF.ORG](mailto:vijay@THEARF.ORG)>

Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup

Comments: To: "Moore, David" <[David\\_Moore@GALLUP.COM](mailto:David_Moore@GALLUP.COM)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

David,

I am not sure if the Gallup Poll results released today broke the numbers by party identification. Could you tell us what they were?

Thanks.

Vijay.

Dr. Vijay S. Talluri

Associate Research Director  
ARF -- The Research Authority  
p. 212.751.5656, x223  
e. vijay@theARF.org <mailto:vijay@theARF.org>=20

---

BREAK|THROUGH

The ARF's Week of Workshops  
November 3-5, 2004

New York Marriott Financial Center

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

From: Moore, David [mailto:David\_Moore@GALLUP.COM]=20  
Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 12:58 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup

Actually, it's the other way around. Gallup is using a random in-house selection (most recent birthday, though if there are too few males, then Gallup asks for male with most recent birthday), and Pew is using the youngest male/oldest female method.

=20  
David

David W. Moore  
Senior Editor  
The Gallup Poll

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

From: cgaziano [mailto:cgaziano@PRODIGY.NET]=20  
Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 12:49 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup

I am wondering if there is a difference in the way that each selects respondents within households, especially if Gallup is using "youngest male/oldest female" and Pew is using a more "pure" random method. Such differences might result in some differences in demographic distributions.

If demographics are related to substantive responses, that could explain some of the candidate preference differences.

Cecilie Gaziano  
Research Solutions, Inc.  
4511 Fremont Avenue South  
Minneapolis, MN 55419-4744  
(612) 825-5199 Phone  
(612) 825-1966 Fax  
cgaziano@prodigy.net

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

From: "Straw, Gretchen" <GStraw@AARP.ORG>

To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 9:52 AM

Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup

I would be especially interested in knowing the differences in response rate. It appears that the Pew Poll had a longer field period and a 10 call back methodology with attempts to convert refusals. Gallup offered up no information on their call back and refusal conversion and their field period was 3 days. It makes me wonder if some of the difference is that Pew includes some of the harder to reach and convert population.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Doug Henwood

Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 10:12 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Pew vs Gallup

Pew has the pres race "dead even" - and Gallup now has Bush 13 points ahead. What is going on?

--

Doug Henwood

Producer, Behind the News

Thursdays, 5-6 PM, WBAI, New York 99.5 FM

38 Greene St - 4th fl

New York NY 10013-2505 USA

+1-212-219-0010 voice +1-212-219-0098 fax

email: <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>

web: <http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Radio.html>

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

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

[aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

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

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

[aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

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

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 13:20:36 -0500

Reply-To: "Saad, Lydia" <Lydia\_Saad@GALLUP.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Saad, Lydia" <Lydia\_Saad@GALLUP.COM>

Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup

Comments: To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Doug,

I would refer you to Larry Hugick's 2004 AAPOR paper which provides an empirical review of various firms' presidential approval ratings over time (1996-2003). Based on his comprehensive review across the major media polling firms, by no means has Gallup been consistently more pro-Bush. And nothing has changed in our polling methods since that period that would change that. According to Larry, the biggest differences between the firms had to do with the magnitude of "no opinion" responses, not partisanship.

I'm not sure what other data you might have, Doug, to state that the contrary is an "empirical fact."

Lydia Saad

---

Lydia K. Saad  
Senior Editor, The Gallup Poll  
502 Carnegie Center, Suite 300  
Princeton, NJ 08540  
(609) 924-9600  
lydia\_saad@gallup.com=20

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

From: Doug Henwood [mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM]=20  
Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 10:47 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup

Gallup's numbers seem consistently favorable to Bush, and not only in the presidential preference question, but also in approval ratings over the last couple of years. (I'm certainly not accusing them of political bias - it's just an empirical fact.) Doesn't something that persistent have to reflect something about technique, and not just noise?

--

Doug Henwood  
Producer, Behind the News  
Thursdays, 5-6 PM, WBAI, New York 99.5 FM  
38 Greene St - 4th fl  
New York NY 10013-2505 USA  
+1-212-219-0010 voice +1-212-219-0098 fax  
email: <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>  
web: <http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Radio.html>

-----  
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: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 14:54:26 -0400  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <004b01c49cd9\$49ecaba0\$8400000a@bellatlantic.netc>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

I can't say this with certainty but I don't think anyone is too worried about the registered voter numbers (as you note they are well within expected error ranges under certain assumptions) instead my concern is the widely reported differences in the likely voters numbers.

--  
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 Allan Rivlin  
> Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 1:11 PM  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup

>  
> I do not understand all the fretting. What in all of these  
> results (taking the registered voters numbers not the likely  
> voters) is inconsistent with Bush 49% Kerry 44% plus or minus  
> three points?

>  
> Allan Rivlin

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jan Werner  
> Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 12:49 PM  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup

>  
>  
> Gallup shows a 13 point Bush lead among LV and an 8 point  
> lead among RV, so their LV algorithm may have shifted their  
> results by 5 points, but clearly does not account for the  
> entire difference. Pew has a 1 point Bush lead for LV and  
> even for RV.

>  
> Among other polls conducted during the past 7 days, ICR tends  
> to agree with Gallup, albeit somewhat less dramatically,



> whereas IBD/TIPP and Democracy Corps  
> (Greenberg/Quinlan/Rosner) tend to agree with Pew.  
>  
> So much for the "Margin Of Error" in assessing poll results!  
>  
> It would be interesting to find out what weighting schemes  
> each of these polls use. It would also be interesting to see  
> what their unweighted results were.  
>  
> Jan Werner  
> \_\_\_\_\_  
>  
> Leo Simonetta wrote:  
>  
>> I was actually preparing a similar question for AAPORnet -  
> I've been  
>> telling friends that it is probably due to difference in  
> how different  
>> pollsters calculate "Likely voters" but I am beginning to wonder if  
>> that could account for differences that are this large.  
>>  
>> We're also seeing big differences in state polls.  
>>  
>> --  
>> 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 Doug Henwood  
>>>Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 10:12 AM  
>>>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>>>Subject: Pew vs Gallup  
>>>  
>>>Pew has the pres race "dead even" - and Gallup now has Bush  
>>>13 points ahead. What is going on?  
>>>--  
>>>Doug Henwood  
>>>Producer, Behind the News  
>>>Thursdays, 5-6 PM, WBAI, New York 99.5 FM  
>>>38 Greene St - 4th fl  
>>>New York NY 10013-2505 USA  
>>>+1-212-219-0010 voice +1-212-219-0098 fax  
>>>email: <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>  
>>>web: <http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Radio.html>  
>>>  
>>>-----  
>>>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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 15:01:16 -0400

Reply-To: [JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM](mailto:JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM)

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

From: "J. Ann Selzer" <[JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM](mailto:JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM)>

Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup

Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Likely voters should be a subset of registered voters and therefore be a the more valid indicator. Is there some reason why registered voters are reported? Is there a theory guiding this reporting--that actual voters will look more

like a cross-section of registered voters than a cross-section of those self-defined (sometimes with empirical assists) as likely voters? JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.

Selzer & Company, Inc.

Des Moines, Iowa 50312

515.271.5700

visit our website: [www.SelzerCo.com](http://www.SelzerCo.com)

E-mail address for purposes of this list: [JAnnSelzer@aol.com](mailto:JAnnSelzer@aol.com); otherwise, contact [JASelzer@SelzerCo.com](mailto:JASelzer@SelzerCo.com).

In a message dated 9/17/2004 1:26:14 PM Central Daylight Time,

arivlin@HARTRESEARCH.COM writes:

That was using the LV numbers not the RV. Gallup has Bush at 52% in the 2 way (52% - 44%) and 50% in the 3 way (50%, 42%, 4%). I do not think the null hypothesis will be rejected for a 3 point difference (49% - 52%) on a poll of 935 registered voters, but I have not run the numbers.

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

From: Douglas Rivers [mailto:doug@polimetrix.com]  
Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 2:00 PM  
To: 'Allan Rivlin'; AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: RE: Pew vs Gallup

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

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 15:27:20 -0400  
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup  
Comments: To: "Saad, Lydia" <Lydia\_Saad@GALLUP.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To:  
<06C64DE644F85843A90884803225A8070182F66A@exchn12.noam.gallup.com>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Saad, Lydia wrote:

>I'm not sure what other data you might have, Doug, to state that the  
>contrary is an "empirical fact."

Take a look at this chart:

<[http://www.pollkatz.homestead.com/files/pollkatzmainGRAPHICS\\_8911\\_image001.gif](http://www.pollkatz.homestead.com/files/pollkatzmainGRAPHICS_8911_image001.gif)>

It's not the user-friendliest graphic in the world, but it sure looks like Gallup comes in at the high end for almost the entire series.

Doug

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

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 14:32:28 -0500  
Reply-To: "Saad, Lydia" <Lydia\_Saad@GALLUP.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Saad, Lydia" <Lydia\_Saad@GALLUP.COM>  
Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup  
Comments: To: Sid Groeneman <sid@groeneman.com>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Sid,

Here is an answer from Gallup Poll Managing Editor, Jeff Jones:

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

From: Jones, Jeff=20

Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 3:29 PM

To: Saad, Lydia

Subject: RE: Pew vs Gallup

Gallup uses the same procedures in our election and non-election polling. =20

Gallup uses a 6-call design on its standard three-day polls, with two call attempts made per day, one in the earlier part (e.g., 5-7 on weeknights) and one in the later part (e.g., 7-9 on weeknights) of the day's interviewing schedule. By extension, on a four-day poll we would do up to 8 calls, on a two-day poll up to 4.

We choose a random respondent from each household using the "most recent birthday method," and will only conduct interviews with that respondent.

Interviewers schedule call-back times if the respondent cannot be reached during the initial contact, and attempts are made to do the call-back even if it falls outside of the normal interviewing day (e.g., on a weekday). Callbacks are also typically the first numbers dialed on each new interviewing day. =20

We also make attempts to convert "soft refusals".

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

From: Sid Groeneman [mailto:sid@groeneman.com]=20

Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 3:01 PM

To: 'Saad, Lydia'; AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: RE: Pew vs Gallup

Lydia,

Can you comment on the contact procedures (callbacks, etc.) Gallup uses in presidential election preference polls?

Sid Groeneman

Groeneman Research & Consulting, Inc.

Bethesda, Maryland

sid@groeneman.com (New!)

301 469-0813

<http://www.groeneman.com>

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Saad, Lydia

Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 2:21 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup

Doug,

I would refer you to Larry Hugick's 2004 AAPOR paper which provides an empirical review of various firms' presidential approval ratings over time (1996-2003). Based on his comprehensive review across the major media polling firms, by no means has Gallup been consistently more pro-Bush. And nothing has changed in our polling methods since that period that would change that. According to Larry, the biggest differences between the firms had to do with the magnitude of "no opinion" responses, not partisanship.

I'm not sure what other data you might have, Doug, to state that the contrary is an "empirical fact."

Lydia Saad

---

Lydia K. Saad  
Senior Editor, The Gallup Poll  
502 Carnegie Center, Suite 300  
Princeton, NJ 08540  
(609) 924-9600  
lydia\_saad@gallup.com=20

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

---

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 15:42:56 -0400  
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To:  
<06C64DE644F85843A90884803225A8070182F66A@exchn12.noam.gallup.com>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Another chart in which Gallup appears to be on the high end:  
<<http://www.hist.umn.edu/~ruggles/Approval.htm>>.

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

---

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 15:57:26 -0400  
Reply-To: Allan Rivlin <arivlin@HARTRESEARCH.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Allan Rivlin <arivlin@HARTRESEARCH.COM>

Subject: FW: Pew vs Gallup  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I think the relevant numbers are: (per Hotline)

Pew - Bush 46%, (Kerry 46%) n=1002 registered voters surveyed 9/11-9/14  
Gallup - Bush 52%, (Kerry 44%) n=935 registered voters surveyed 9/13-9/15

By my calculations of the formula for the difference between two means this is significant because the difference  $52\% - 46\% = 6\%$  exceeds 4.46%. But I still don't think it's worthy of all this hand wringing. The poll date mismatch alone could be responsible for the point and a half (just a point if you allow for rounding error) by which this misses the cut-off for insignificance.

Yes differences in polling organizations, methods, and such things as likely voter screens certainly affect poll results, and are precisely the reason for having discussions on AAPORnet, but the media (see, Hotline, or WashPost's Kurtz for example) is taking these findings as evidence that polls are miles apart and the message from pollsters should be that there is more consistency here than divergence if people look at the numbers correctly.

All of the recent surveys of registered voters are consistent with Bush 49% Kerry 44% -- plus or minus each poll's margin of error.

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

=====  
Date: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 16:58:17 -0400  
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
Subject: Re: About those Gallup numbers  
Comments: To: Rico Unsuave <backupid13@hotmail.com>  
Comments: cc: aapornet <aapornet@asu.edu>  
In-Reply-To: <BAY19-F10gTFur2iz2M00000b15@hotmail.com>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

As far as I can see this went just to me, and not to the list, but the text of the msg shows it was intended for AAPORnet.

Rico Unsuave wrote:

>Wonder if one of their folks on AAPORNet will confirm the breakdown  
>on the most recent poll  
>  
><<http://www.theleftcoaster.com/archives/002806.html>><http://www.theleftcoaster.com/archives/002806.html>

At which we learn:

>The real problem here is that Gallup is spreading a false impression  
>of this race. Through its 1992 partnership with two international  
>media outlets (CNN and USA Today), Gallup is telling voters and  
>other media by using badly-sampled polls that the GOP and its  
>candidates are more popular than they really are. Given that  
>Gallup's CEO is a GOP donor, this should not be a surprise. But it  
>does require us to remind the media, like Susan Page of USA Today,  
>who wrote the lead story on the poll in the morning paper, and other  
>members of the media who cite this poll today, that it is based on a  
>faulty sample composition of 40% GOP and 33% Democratic.

The donation was in 2003 to Herman Cain, a very right-wing Senate candidate in Georgia.

This is rather shocking. Most mainstream journalists are discouraged or forbidden to contribute to political candidates. For the CEO of the country's most famous pollster to contribute to a very right-wing candidate is pretty amazing. What's up with 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>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 17:03:00 -0400  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Subject: Differing views of the polls  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Despite differences, pollsters defend their surveys  
By BILL STRAUB  
Scripps Howard News Service

"To hear the pollsters tell it, the disparity is mostly timing."

<http://www.knoxstudio.com/shns/story.cfm?pk=CAMPAIGN-POLLS-09-17-04&cat=AN>

Polls vary wildly in view of race for White House

"Pew director Andrew Kohut says after months of deadlock, voter opinion is now unsettled. He said that's going to mean more variation in the polls."

<http://msnbc.msn.com/id/6025962/>

Bush Leads Kerry 55% to 42% in Nationwide Gallup Poll

The Gallup survey ``is a rogue poll," said Kerry spokesman Phil Singer. ``There is a reason the Olympics don't count the high and the low scores."

[http://quote.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=10000087&sid=aZ41\\_ZpqyBaA&refer=top\\_world\\_news](http://quote.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=10000087&sid=aZ41_ZpqyBaA&refer=top_world_news)

--

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

=====  
Date: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 14:59:10 -0700  
Reply-To: [jdrogers@sfsu.edu](mailto:jdrogers@sfsu.edu)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: John Rogers <[jdrogers@SFSU.EDU](mailto:jdrogers@SFSU.EDU)>  
Organization: Public Research Institute  
Subject: Re: Differing views of the polls  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[0I4700J87EM7SC@chimmx04.algx.net](mailto:0I4700J87EM7SC@chimmx04.algx.net)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I have been following this discussion with interest and would like to echo some of the requests for response rates on the polls in question. In order to complete a poll in 3 days, it seems to me that they would have to be disturbingly low if calculated correctly. I would also like to know if design effects and weighting are ever included in the published "margin of error", and whether anyone has looked at how much of a difference it makes in political polls.

John Rogers



-----  
John Rogers, PhD  
Associate Director  
Public Research Institute  
San Francisco State University  
jdrogers@sfsu.edu  
(415)405-3800  
http://pri.sfsu.edu

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

---

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 18:41:49 -0400  
Reply-To: "Frankovic, Kathleen" <KAF@CBSNEWS.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Frankovic, Kathleen" <KAF@CBSNEWS.COM>  
Subject: The Latest CBS News/New York Times Poll  
Comments: To: "aapornet@asu.edu" <aapornet@asu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

AAPORnetters may be interested in the CBS News/NY Times Poll which is being reported on tonight's CBS Evening News and in tomorrow's New York Times. You can check for more complete data on our respective websites: [www.cbsnews.com](http://www.cbsnews.com) and [www.nytimes.com](http://www.nytimes.com). The complete stories will be posted later this evening. And the poll results include an assessment of the quality of the campaign -- despite nearly half the voters saying this campaign is more negative than campaigns they remember, two-thirds describe it as "interesting" -- more than described the 1988, 1992, 1996 and 2000 campaigns that way at this point in the campaign season.

#### THE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN September 12-16, 2004

The contest between President George W. Bush and Democratic challenger John Kerry looks much as it did in a CBS News Poll conducted last week, after the Republican convention. Bush's post-convention bounce remains intact, if even slightly larger in this poll; Bush now leads Kerry 50% to 41% among registered voters, giving the President a 9-point margin.

#### PRESIDENTIAL HORSERACE (Registered Voters)

	Now	Last week
Bush-Cheney	50%	49%
Kerry-Edwards	41	42
Nader-Camejo	3	1

Ralph Nader may be on the ballot in some states in November, and he receives 3% of the vote. Without Nader on the ballot, Bush's lead is slightly smaller, at 8 points; in a two-way contest, Bush would receive 50% to Kerry's 42%.

This poll was conducted among a nationwide random sample of 1,287 adults interviewed by telephone September 12-16, 2004. There were 1,088 registered voters. The error due to sampling could be plus or minus three percentage points for results based on all adults and all registered voters.

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

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 18:56:58 -0400  
Reply-To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jan Werner <[jwerner@JWDP.COM](mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM)>  
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing  
Subject: Re: About those Gallup numbers  
Comments: To: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[p05200f07bd70ff879b8f@\[192.168.0.196\]](mailto:p05200f07bd70ff879b8f@[192.168.0.196])>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

This is real sleaze!

The Gallup poll is not designed and carried out by the CEO of the Gallup Organization, but by a group of some of the finest professionals in the field of survey research, including Frank Newport, David Moore, Lydia Saad and Jeff Jones, who have consistently shown far more openness in AAPOR forums about the details and methodologies of their work over the past decade than any other commercial polling organization.

I may often disagree with them on methodological or analytical grounds, but to imply that any of these people would knowingly allow the Gallup Poll results to be slanted for the political advantage of one party or another is ridiculous.

Jan Werner

-----  
Doug Henwood wrote:

> As far as I can see this went just to me, and not to the list, but  
> the text of the msg shows it was intended for AAPORnet.

>

> Rico Unsuave wrote:

>

>> Wonder if one of their folks on AAPORNet will confirm the breakdown  
>> on the most recent poll

>>

>>

<<http://www.theleftcoaster.com/archives/002806.html>><http://www.theleftcoaster.com/archives/002806.html>

>>

>  
>> At which we learn:  
>  
>> The real problem here is that Gallup is spreading a false impression  
>> of this race. Through its 1992 partnership with two international  
>> media outlets (CNN and USA Today), Gallup is telling voters and  
>> other media by using badly-sampled polls that the GOP and its  
>> candidates are more popular than they really are. Given that  
>> Gallup's CEO is a GOP donor, this should not be a surprise. But it  
>> does require us to remind the media, like Susan Page of USA Today,  
>> who wrote the lead story on the poll in the morning paper, and other  
>> members of the media who cite this poll today, that it is based on a  
>> faulty sample composition of 40% GOP and 33% Democratic.  
>  
>  
> The donation was in 2003 to Herman Cain, a very right-wing Senate  
> candidate in Georgia.  
>  
> This is rather shocking. Most mainstream journalists are discouraged  
> or forbidden to contribute to political candidates. For the CEO of  
> the country's most famous pollster to contribute to a very right-wing  
> candidate is pretty amazing. What's up with 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>  
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>  
>

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

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 18:46:28 -0400  
Reply-To: [ericmcghee@mindspring.com](mailto:ericmcghee@mindspring.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Eric McGhee <[ericmcghee@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:ericmcghee@MINDSPRING.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Differing views of the polls  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Two thoughts:

--Despite the difference in the polls, everyone seems to have shown improvement for GWB from late Aug on. In other words, each house has its own intercept (starting value), but the trends over time have generally been the same.

--How well has each poll predicted the final result in past elections? Do they tend to converge at the end?

Cheers,  
Eric McGhee  
University of Oregon

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

From: John Rogers <jdrogers@SFSU.EDU>  
Sent: Sep 17, 2004 5:59 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Differing views of the polls

I have been following this discussion with interest and would like to echo some of the requests for response rates on the polls in question. In order to complete a poll in 3 days, it seems to me that they would have to be disturbingly low if calculated correctly. I would also like to know if design effects and weighting are ever included in the published "margin of error", and whether anyone has looked at how much of a difference it makes in political polls.

John Rogers

-----  
John Rogers, PhD  
Associate Director  
Public Research Institute  
San Francisco State University  
jdrogers@sfsu.edu  
(415)405-3800  
<http://pri.sfsu.edu>

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

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

-----  
Date: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 23:10:03 -0400  
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>  
Subject: Past presidential polls  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

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

To see the results of the final presidential polls from 1936 to 2000 go to [www.ncpp.org](http://www.ncpp.org) and click on press releases.

---

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

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 23:16:45 -0400

Reply-To: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>

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

From: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>

Subject: Re: About those Gallup numbers

Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

In-Reply-To: <[414B6BBA.8020402@jwdp.com](mailto:414B6BBA.8020402@jwdp.com)>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Jan Werner wrote:

>The Gallup poll is not designed and carried out by the CEO of the  
>Gallup Organization, but by a group of some of the finest  
>professionals in the field of survey research, including Frank  
>Newport, David Moore, Lydia Saad and Jeff Jones, who have  
>consistently shown far more openness in AAPOR forums about the  
>details and methodologies of their work over the past decade than  
>any other commercial polling organization.

The reason journalists are not supposed to contribute to campaigns -  
and many newspapers aren't even allowing their reporters to go to  
Kerry benefits headed by Bruce Springsteen - is to avoid any  
appearance of bias or conflict of interest. Shouldn't pollsters be  
held to the same standard?

Doug

---

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

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 23:25:36 -0400

Reply-To: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>

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

From: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>

Subject: Teixeira on the polls

Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)

MIME-version: 1.0

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

<<http://www.emergingdemocraticmajorityweblog.com/donkeyrising/index.php>>

Gallup Strikes Again!

Here are Bush's leads in the three national polls released before Gallup's current poll (no RV data available for DCorps and Harris; Pew and Harris matchups include Nader):

Democracy Corps, September 12-14 RVs: +1  
Pew Research Center, September 11-14 RVs: tied  
Harris Interactive: September 9-13 LVs: -1

Looks like a tie ball game, right? But according to the Gallup poll conducted September 13-15 and released today, Bush is up.....13???

Let's just say I'm just a wee bit skeptical of this one. First, Gallup's poll only includes one day (the 15th) these three other polls do not, so it can't be Gallup's survey dates that explain the big Bush lead.

Second, this 13 point lead is an LV figure and, as I've repeatedly emphasized, Gallup's LV screening procedure produces completely untrustworthy measures of voter sentiment this far in advance of the election. Here is a summary of the case against Gallup's LV data:

Sampling likely voters is a technique Gallup developed to measure voter sentiment on the eve of an election and predict the outcome, not to track voter sentiment weeks and months before the actual election. There is simply no evidence, and no good reason to believe, that it works well for the latter purpose. In fact, the evidence and compelling arguments are on the other side: that the registered voters are the more reliable gauge of voter sentiment during the course of the campaign.

Here's why. Gallup decides who likely voters are based on 7 questions about their interest in voting, attention to the campaign and knowledge about how to vote (e.g., where their polling place is located). The interested/attentive/knowledgeable voters are designated "likely" and the rest are thrown out of the sample. But as a campaign progresses, the level of interest among voters tends to change, particularly among those with partisan inclinations whose interest level will rise when their party seems to be mobilized and doing well and fall when it is not. Because of this, partisans of the mobilized party (lately, Republicans) tend to be screened into the likely voter sample and partisans of the demobilized party (lately, Democrats) tend to get screened out. But tomorrow, of course, the Democrats could surge, in which case their partisans may be the ones over-represented in likely voter samples.

That suggests the uncomfortable possibility that observed changes in the sentiments of "likely voters" represent not actual changes in voter sentiment, but rather changes in the composition of likely voter samples as political enthusiasm waxes and wanes among the different parties' supporters. And that is exactly what political scientists Robert Erikson, Costas Panagopoulos, and Christopher Wlezien find in their analysis of Gallup's 2000 RV/LV data in their forthcoming paper, "Likely (and Unlikely) Voters and the Assessment

of Campaign Dynamics" in Public Opinion Quarterly: "shifts in voter classification as likely or unlikely account for more observed change in the preferences of likely voters than do actual changes in voters' candidate preferences."

That means that, instead of giving you a better picture of voter sentiment and how it is changing than conventional registered voter data, likely voter data give you a worse one since true changes in voter sentiment are swamped by changes in who is classified as a likely voter.

I think the case against the Gallup LV data looks rock solid. In my view, it's time for them to drop reporting these data because they are highly likely to give an inaccurate picture of the state of the race and, by doing so--especially given the high profile of Gallup's polls--unfairly pump up one side of the race and demoralize the other. That doesn't seem acceptable to me.

Of course they'll reply: well, our data work so well right before the election, they must be the best data to use all the time. But, for the reasons outlined above, that reasoning is completely specious. And then there's this: the LV data haven't been working so well lately even right before the actual election. In 3 of the last 4 presidential elections (including the last one), Gallup's final RV reading was actually closer to the final result than their final LV reading!

As I say, maybe it's time for a rethink down at Gallup HQ.

Throwing out the Gallup LV data, then, let's move on to their RV result: an 8 point Bush lead. Obviously pretty far off the results of the other contemporaneous polls summarized above, but....could be I suppose.

But then there's this: the Gallup internals show Kerry with a 7 point lead among independent RVs. Huh? Kerry's losing by 8 points overall, yet leading among independents by 7. How is that possible? Only if there are substantially more Republicans than Democrats in the sample.

That suggests that reweighting the sample to reflect the 2000 exit poll distribution (39D/35R/26I) would give a different result. It does: the race then becomes dead-even, instead of an 8 point Bush lead. (Note: Steve Soto of The Left Coaster got Gallup to give him their party ID distributions for this poll and confirms a 5 point Republican party ID advantage in their RV sample.)

One final note: I mentioned the Pew Research Center poll had the race dead-even just like the reweighted Gallup data. And what was Pew's party ID distribution in their RV sample? You guessed it: a 4 point lead (37-33) for the Democrats, just like in the 2000 exits.

I think we've finally found out how to make these polls get along!  
Posted by Ruy Teixeira at 07:22 PM |

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

Date: Sat, 18 Sep 2004 10:41:48 -0400  
Reply-To: Mike Donatello <[MDonatello@COX.NET](mailto:MDonatello@COX.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mike Donatello <[MDonatello@COX.NET](mailto:MDonatello@COX.NET)>  
Subject: Re: AIDS questionnaire  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[4149B589.89AC35E3@wright.edu](mailto:4149B589.89AC35E3@wright.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Jane,

Try Glen Nowak at the CDC: [gjn0@cdc.gov](mailto:gjn0@cdc.gov)

--

Mike Donatello  
703.582.5680  
[MDonatello@cox.net](mailto:MDonatello@cox.net)

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

From: AAPORNET [[mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)] On Behalf Of Jane Dockery  
Sent: Thursday, 16 September, 2004 11:47  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Subject: AIDS questionnaire

We are working with a regional organization to assess African Americans' attitudes and behaviors regarding AIDS prevention and awareness. We are interested in any survey instruments that have been used to probe this topic at the local, state, or national level. Please reply to [david.jones@wright.edu](mailto:david.jones@wright.edu)

Thank you, Jane

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

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

Date: Sat, 18 Sep 2004 11:04:24 -0400  
Reply-To: Philip Meyer <[pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU](mailto:pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU)>



Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>  
Subject: Re: About those Gallup numbers  
Comments: To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <p05200f07bd7158cda297@[192.168.1.100]>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Doug is right in that it is traditional for journalists to conceal their political leanings. However, that standard was created in a different media environment, when a few media reached large numbers of people. With the demassification of the media, new standards are emerging, and transparency is becoming more important than the pseudo-objectivity that results from concealment. If most of us are going to be using niche media aimed at narrow collections of citizens, we should know the nature of those niches.

I agree that the published polls should follow standards at least as high as those of journalists. Polling, after all, was born in journalism, and it has moved beyond journalism in its development and enforcement of standards. In my various efforts to push journalism toward professional status, I often cite the APPOR standards and their enforcement process as an example to consider.

---

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](http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer)

---

On Fri, 17 Sep 2004, Doug Henwood wrote:

> Date: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 23:16:45 -0400  
> From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: Re: About those Gallup numbers  
>  
> Jan Werner wrote:  
>  
>>The Gallup poll is not designed and carried out by the CEO of the  
>>Gallup Organization, but by a group of some of the finest  
>>professionals in the field of survey research, including Frank  
>>Newport, David Moore, Lydia Saad and Jeff Jones, who have  
>>consistently shown far more openness in AAPOR forums about the  
>>details and methodologies of their work over the past decade than  
>>any other commercial polling organization.  
>  
> The reason journalists are not supposed to contribute to campaigns -  
> and many newspapers aren't even allowing their reporters to go to  
> Kerry benefits headed by Bruce Springsteen - is to avoid any  
> appearance of bias or conflict of interest. Shouldn't pollsters be

> held to the same standard?  
>  
> Doug  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>

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

---

Date: Sat, 18 Sep 2004 21:08:18 -0700  
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <[lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM](mailto:lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leora Lawton <[lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM](mailto:lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM)>  
Subject: polls  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

I'm not a political poll survey researcher, so the ins and outs of sampling, screening, etc. are not something I'm familiar with and I've been interested in the discussions about the great discrepancy in polls. But even before this recent Gallup poll came out I have been pondering what might be construed as an ethical dilemma for pollsters.

The way I see it is that poll results are frequently quoted by the media to the effect of communicating that a candidate has an edge, and therefore, conclusions potential voters might draw is that their candidate is losing/winning anyhow, so why vote. Is not voting more likely among those who think their candidate is losing? Or to rephrase, do polls have an impact on voter behavior?

Because if so, then I have to ask, how can pollsters, knowing that even if the method is the best to their ability (and I believe that this is the case in polls by our aapor members), when they know that there are so many caveats to the sampling and response as we have been discussing here, be truly comfortable when they see that what is statistically unknowable be presented as an influential fact?

Be well,  
Leora

Dr. Leora Lawton, Principal  
TechSociety Research  
2342 Shattuck Avenue PMB 362, Berkeley, CA 94704  
(510) 548-6174; fax (510) 548-6175; cell (510) 928-7572  
[www.techsociety.com](http://www.techsociety.com)

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

Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Sun, 19 Sep 2004 07:02:51 +0100

Reply-To: Bob Worcester <[Bob.Worcester@MORI.COM](mailto:Bob.Worcester@MORI.COM)>

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

From: Bob Worcester <[Bob.Worcester@MORI.COM](mailto:Bob.Worcester@MORI.COM)>

Subject: Zogby panel

Comments: To: [DMMerkle@AOL.COM](mailto:DMMerkle@AOL.COM), [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Interesting,=20I=20too=20am=20on=20his=20panel,=20as=20an=20overseas=20vot=20er,=20yet=20I=20vote=20in=20New=20Jersey=20(last=20state=20of=20residence)=20and=20the=20questionnaire=20doesn't=20ask=20me=20in=20which=20state=20my=20vote=20(already=20posted,=20and=20not=20for=20Nader!)=20is=20counted.=20=20I=20emailed=20Zogby=20several=20weeks=20ago=20to=20ask=20John=20get=20in=20touch=20to=20discuss=20questionnaire=20flaws=20as=20I=20see=20them,=20but=20have=20had=20no=20reply.

How=20many=20other=20AAPOR=20members=20are=20on=20his=20panel=20I=20wonder=20.=20=20What=20are=20the=20[raw]odds=20of=20two=20AAPOR=20members=20being=20on=20the=20panel=20out=20of=20the=20total=20electorate=20I=20wonder?

Bob=20Worcester

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

From:=20Daniel=20M.=20Merkle=20[mailto:[DMMerkle@AOL.COM](mailto:DMMerkle@AOL.COM)]=20

Sent:=2017=20September=202004=2002:43

To:=20AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject:=20Re:=20Making=20call=20on=20sham=20of=20political=20polling

Zogby=20does=20have=20an=20online=20panel,=20but=20the=20most=20recent=20Z=20ogby=20pre-election=20poll=20(and=20others)=20on=20his=20website=20(conducted=20Sept.=2008-9)=20was=20done=20by=20telephone:

"Zogby=20International=20conducted=20telephone=20interviews=20of=201018=20likely=20voters=20chosen=20at=20random=20nationwide.=20=20All=20calls=20were=20made=20from=20Zogby=20International=20headquarters=20in=20Utica,=20N.Y.,=20from=20Wednesday,=20September=2008=20through=20Thursday,=20September=2009,=202004.=20The=20margin=20of=20error=20=



y=20  
prohibited.=20If=20you=20have=20received=20this=20e-mail=20in=20error=20pl=  
ease=20either=20  
notify=20the=20MORI=20Systems=20Helpdesk=20by=20telephone=20on=2044=20(0)=20=  
20=207347=203000=20  
or=20respond=20to=20this=20e-mail=20with=20WRONG=20RECIPIENT=20in=20the=20=  
title=20line.  
=3D=  
=3D=3D=3D=20

---

This=20e-mail=20has=20been=20scanned=20for=20viruses=20for=20MORI=20by=20M=  
essageLabs.=20For=20further=20information=20visit=20http://www.mci.com

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

---

Date: Sun, 19 Sep 2004 11:44:14 -0400  
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <[mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Warren Mitofsky <[mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM)>  
Subject: Re: polls  
Comments: To: Leora Lawton <[lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM](mailto:lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[20040918205005.D79123@synergy.transbay.net](mailto:20040918205005.D79123@synergy.transbay.net)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Instead of pondering, why not search the literature and see if there is support for your position before stating that their may be an ethical dilemma for pollsters? Then you will be on more solid ground.  
warren mitofsky

At 12:08 AM 9/19/2004, Leora Lawton wrote:  
>...I have been pondering  
>what might be construed as an ethical dilemma for pollsters.  
>  
>...do polls have an impact on voter behavior?  
>  
>Because if so, then I have to ask, how can pollsters, ... be  
>truly comfortable when they see that what is statistically unknowable be  
>presented as an influential fact?  
>  
>Be well,  
>Leora  
>  
>Dr. Leora Lawton, Principal  
>TechSociety Research  
>2342 Shattuck Avenue PMB 362, Berkeley, CA 94704  
>(510) 548-6174; fax (510) 548-6175; cell (510) 928-7572

>www.techsociety.com

>

>-----

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

>Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

>set aapornet nomail

>On your return send: set aapornet mail

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

Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Sun, 19 Sep 2004 15:04:53 -0400

Reply-To: dick halpern <[dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET](mailto:dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET)>

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

From: dick halpern <[dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET](mailto:dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET)>

Subject: Varying Polls Reflect Volatility -- NY Times

Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: multipart/mixed; x-avg-checked=avg-ok-CCE708E;  
boundary="Boundary\_(ID\_jOKS1hkNpTRJ3wLvCZ/E4w)"

--Boundary\_(ID\_jOKS1hkNpTRJ3wLvCZ/E4w)

Content-type: text/plain; x-avg-checked=avg-ok-CCE708E; charset=us-ascii;  
format=flowed

Content-transfer-encoding: 8bit

From today's NY Times, further commentary about the differences in findings re Bush vs Kerry as reported by Pew and Gallup.

Dick Halpern

Varying Polls Reflect Volatility, Experts Say

By CARL HULSE

NY Times, Published: September 18, 2004

WASHINGTON, Sept. 17 - With national public opinion surveys showing the presidential race to be anywhere from a dead heat between

<<http://www.nytimes.com/top/news/washington/campaign2004/candidates/georgewbus h/index.html?inline=nyt-per-pol>>President

Bush and

<<http://www.nytimes.com/top/news/washington/campaign2004/candidates/johnfkerry /index.html?inline=nyt-per-pol>>Senator

John Kerry to Mr. Bush's holding a commanding lead, potential voters have their choice of what to believe.

But survey experts say such disparities in the polls are not unusual at this stage of a campaign and reflect both a volatile electorate and methodological differences between the polling organizations.

"What has happened is that the convention period, especially the Republican convention period, unsettled public opinion," said Andrew Kohut, director of the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press. "When opinion is unsettled, even small differences can make for even bigger differences in results."

The Pew poll released Thursday was based on a survey of 1,972 registered voters in two waves between Sept. 8 and 14. It found that Mr. Bush and Mr. Kerry were tied at 46 percent among registered voters while Mr. Bush held a statistically insignificant 47 percent to 46 percent lead among likely voters by the end of the second stage of polling, from Sept. 11 to 14. The first stage, Sept. 8-10, showed Mr. Bush leading Mr. Kerry by 12 and 16 points in those groups, respectively - a clear sign of voter volatility.

A Gallup Poll released Friday, on the other hand, found Mr. Bush with 52 percent to Mr. Kerry's 44 percent among registered voters and a 55 percent to 42 percent lead among likely voters in a survey taken Sept. 13 to 15. The New York Times/CBS News poll conducted Sept. 12 to 16 had Mr. Bush over Mr. Kerry by 50 percent to 42 percent among registered voters. Mr. Bush's edge increased slightly - 51 percent to 42 percent - among likely voters. Other national polls have reflected a closer contest.

David W. Moore, senior editor of the Gallup Poll, said he believed that even slight differences in the time periods when the surveys were conducted could shift the results, given the intense news media coverage of the issue of Mr. Bush's time in the National Guard and whether disputed memos regarding his service there were forged.

"That issue is so key to the character of the two candidates," Mr. Moore said.

Given the shifting opinions, Mr. Moore and his fellow polling experts acknowledge that differences in the way survey organizations conduct their polls could be reflected in the results. For instance, the Gallup Poll had a lower percentage of undecided voters than the Pew poll, which some interpreted as evidence that the Gallup survey takers might press harder for a definitive response from those questioned.

Others note that the ways that different polling groups identify likely voters also vary, contributing to different findings in that closely watched group. In the key polls, Mr. Bush typically did better among likely voters than the broader group of registered voters.

"The most difficult thing in pre-election polling is to know who is going to show up on Election Day," said Andrew E. Smith, director of the University of New Hampshire Survey Center. "As you get closer to the election, all the various likely voter models work better."

Despite the differences in the final numbers, the pollsters all say some basic conclusions can be drawn from the varied results.

"One of the things that is pretty clear from all of the polls, that seems to be very consistent, is that Bush had a very good convention, that his support has increased and that he is probably leading Kerry," said Michael Traugott, a University of Michigan professor and author on the subject of polls.

But the voter sentiment shifts reflected in the surveys also indicate that the contest is far from over.

"My sense is that Bush is ahead by several percentage points, that the public is pretty volatile, that the National Guard issue could play either way for one of the candidates," Mr. Moore said. "It is clearly not decided what the outcome will be."

---

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

--Boundary\_(ID\_jOKS1hkNpTRJ3wLvCZ/E4w)  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-avg=cert;  
x-avg-checked=avg-ok-CCE708E  
Content-disposition: inline

---  
Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.  
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).  
Version: 6.0.752 / Virus Database: 503 - Release Date: 9/3/2004

---

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

--Boundary\_(ID\_jOKS1hkNpTRJ3wLvCZ/E4w)--

---

Date: Mon, 20 Sep 2004 09:10:22 -0400  
Reply-To: [hnorpoth@NOTES.CC.SUNYSB.EDU](mailto:hnorpoth@NOTES.CC.SUNYSB.EDU)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: [hnorpoth@NOTES.CC.SUNYSB.EDU](mailto:hnorpoth@NOTES.CC.SUNYSB.EDU)  
Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <006a01c49cf0\$8eed0a80\$8400000a@bellatlantic.netc>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

I don't understand what the fuss is all about. As I read the latest numbers (registered voters, as reported by the Polling Report), they are statistically indistinguishable:



Pew: Bush 49 -- Kerry 43 (9/8-14, wave I + II average)  
Gallup : Bush 52 -- Kerry 44 (9/13-15)  
CBS/NYT: Bush 50 -- Kerry 42 (9/12-16)

-----  
Helmut Norpoth  
Dept. of Political Science  
Stony Brook University  
Stony Brook, NY 11794-4392  
(631) 632-7640 (voice)  
(631) 632-4116 (fax)  
hnorpoth@notes.cc.sunysb.edu  
<http://www.sunysb.edu/polsci/>  
-----

Allan Rivlin  
<arivlin@HARTRESE  
ARCH.COM> To  
Sent by: AAPORNET AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
<AAPORNET@ASU.EDU cc  
>

Subject

FW: Pew vs Gallup

09/17/2004 03:57  
PM

Please respond to  
Allan Rivlin  
<arivlin@HARTRESE  
ARCH.COM>

I think the relevant numbers are: (per Hotline)

Pew - Bush 46%, (Kerry 46%) n=1002 registered voters surveyed 9/11-9/14  
Gallup - Bush 52%, (Kerry 44%) n=935 registered voters surveyed 9/13-9/15

By my calculations of the formula for the difference between two means this is significant because the difference  $52\% - 46\% = 6\%$  exceeds 4.46%. But I still don't think it's worthy of all this hand wringing. The poll date mismatch alone could be responsible for the point and a half (just a point if you allow for rounding error) by which this misses the cut-off for insignificance.

Yes differences in polling organizations, methods, and such things as

likely voter screens certainly affect poll results, and are precisely the reason for having discussions on AAPORnet, but the media (see, Hotline, or WashPost's Kurtz for example) is taking these findings as evidence that polls are miles apart and the message from pollsters should be that there is more consistency here than divergence if people look at the numbers correctly.

All of the recent surveys of registered voters are consistent with Bush 49% Kerry 44% -- plus or minus each poll's margin of error.

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

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

=====  
Date: Mon, 20 Sep 2004 12:23:43 -0400  
Reply-To: Roger Tourangeau <[rtourangeau@SURVEY.UMD.EDU](mailto:rtourangeau@SURVEY.UMD.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Roger Tourangeau <[rtourangeau@SURVEY.UMD.EDU](mailto:rtourangeau@SURVEY.UMD.EDU)>  
Subject: Morris Hansen Lecture  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit  
Content-disposition: inline

This year the Morris Hansen Lecture Series speaker is Dr. Jennifer Madans. This is the Fourteenth Hansen Lecture. The title of her talk will be "Bridging the Gap: Moving to the 1997 Standards for Collecting Data on Race and Ethnicity."

The talk will be held from 3:30 to 5:30 on Wednesday, November 17 in the Jefferson Auditorium, in the South Building of the Department of Agriculture. A reception will immediately follow in the Whitten Building. The discussants will be Clyde Tucker of the Bureau of Labor Statistics and Robert Hill of Westat. Nat Schenker of the National Center for Health Statistics will serve as this year's Chair.

Systems for classifying persons by race, ethnic background, and other attributes make it possible to compare population characteristics across data collection programs and over time. However, population changes make it necessary to update such systems periodically. To monitor population trends, bridges need to be developed that allow us to transition between system changes. The Office of Management and Budget's 1997 standards for the collection of data on race and ethnicity presented many challenges, especially because it allowed respondents to choose more than one race. The need for a bridging mechanism was particularly acute at the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS). Calculating vital rates, a major NCHS program activity, requires data

from the census for the denominators but data from state vital statistics offices for the numerators. Although the 2000 census adopted the 1997 standards, state vital statistics offices generally have not yet adopted them. Thus there is incompatibility between the race classifications used for the vital records and those used to estimate population counts. Bridging this gap required the development of strategies to modify data from one or both of the data sources, based on models for the relationship between race reporting under the new standards and the old ones, so that valid race-specific rates could be calculated. In the course of this project, we analyzed multiple data sets addressing different aspects of multiple-race reporting. This lecture will describe the approach taken by NCHS to build the bridge and the related infrastructure that supported the project. The importance of problem solving such as this to the mission of a statistical agency will also be discussed.

Dr. Madans has been the Associate Director for Science, National Center for Health Statistics, since May, 1996, and is responsible for the overall plan and development of NCHS's data collection and analysis programs. Since Dr. Madans joined the Center, she has concentrated her research efforts on data collection methodology, health services research and chronic disease epidemiology. She has directed two national longitudinal studies (NHANES I Epidemiologic Followup Study and the National Nursing Home Followup Study) as well as the redesign of the National Health Interview Survey questionnaire. She was one of the designers of the DHHS Survey Integration Plan. Dr. Madans is a graduate of Bard College (B.A.) and the University of Michigan (M.A. and Ph.D., Sociology). She completed a Postdoctoral Fellowship in the Department of Epidemiology and Public Health at Yale University. She has served as a lecturer in the Division of Biostatistics and Epidemiology, Department of Community and Family Medicine, Georgetown University School of Medicine and in the Department of Demography at Georgetown. She is a Fellow of the American Statistical Association.

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

---

Date: Mon, 20 Sep 2004 12:25:26 -0400  
Reply-To: Richard Rockwell <[richard.rockwell@UCONN.EDU](mailto:richard.rockwell@UCONN.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Richard Rockwell <[richard.rockwell@UCONN.EDU](mailto:richard.rockwell@UCONN.EDU)>  
Subject: Integrity of the Gallup Poll  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The Gallup Organization has historically been among the most forthcoming of all polling organizations about their methods and about any problems that might arise from those particular methods. This goes back to the 1940s, when Gallup (i.e., George) was among the founders of AAPOR. Moreover, the Gallup Organization makes its data available for public inspection through the archives of the Roper Center for Public Opinion Research at the

University of Connecticut - the raw data, not just the tabular reports. Anyone can check out these data for any evidence of error or bias. You can even re-weight the data as you wish. The Gallup archives go back to the 1930s. Given the public availability of their data on a site not owned or controlled by the Gallup Organization, it would be extraordinarily difficult for Gallup to mess with the data for political or any other reasons. Polling is, in general, an extraordinary profession because many polling firms make their data available through the Roper Center. I have found it hard to identify a parallel in any other profession, with the partial exception of clinical trials for pharmaceuticals.

Four years ago there was a furor about the Gallup "tracking poll," which led to a set of interesting exchanges in which the Gallup professionals participated fully and helpfully. More recently, there was discussion about Gallup's methodology in its horrendously difficult-to-field poll of the Islamic World. Again, Gallup professionals fully participated in the analysis and critique, including holding a plenary session at AAPOR.

I can think of no firm that I would less suspect of letting political bias influence its results. Too much rides on Gallup's professionalism and objectivity. Jim Clifton, CEO of Gallup, is far too good a businessperson to let his own political views endanger the integrity of the Gallup Poll. I shudder to think what assumptions might have been made about me and my motives had the politics of my "CEO" been used to infer something about my actions.

Richard C. Rockwell

Professor of Sociology

University of Connecticut

Former Executive Director, the Roper Center for Public Opinion Research

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

Date: Mon, 20 Sep 2004 12:48:41 -0400  
Reply-To: martin plissner <[plissner@VERIZON.NET](mailto:plissner@VERIZON.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: martin plissner <[plissner@VERIZON.NET](mailto:plissner@VERIZON.NET)>  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

This message is for somebody at Gallup.

=20

The Washington Post reports today that the Bush and Kerry campaigns have reached tentative agreement on three presidential debates and that the principal remaining issue involves the "town hall" format for an event = at Washington University in St. Louis. According to the university's = website, under this format questions would be directed to the candidates by = "about 140 undecided St. Louis area voters selected by the Gallup = Organization."

=20

The White House has been reported for some time to be skeptical about = how one goes about selecting undecided voters in this instance. Given the relatively small portion of the population currently found in surveys = not to have a choice and what must surely be a widespread realization in the = St. Louis area that if you want an upfront seat at the debate and a chance = to pop questions in front of maybe 50 million viewers the right answer to = give the pollsters is "undecided," this skepticism is not entirely = far-fetched.

=20

What exactly is the sequence of questions asked in qualifying voters for this panel? How many potential respondents, more or less, need to be approached to find 140 town hall participants under these conditions. = How, in the past, have the percentages of undecided voters found in selecting such panels compared with those found in contemporaneous Gallup surveys = of the general population?

=20

Martin Plissner=20

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

Date: Mon, 20 Sep 2004 12:48:32 -0400  
Reply-To: Charles Kadushin <kadushin@BRANDEIS.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Charles Kadushin <kadushin@BRANDEIS.EDU>  
Subject: Re: FW: Pew vs Gallup  
Comments: To: Allan Rivlin <arivlin@HARTRESEARCH.COM>  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <006a01c49cf0\$8eed0a80\$840000a@bellatlantic.netc>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Note John Rogers query to this list.

ALL calculations using standard formulae for margin of error for percentages and means that both writers to the list and the polls themselves seem to be using calculate margins that are too small. ALL the samples are weighted, and some are stratified. This means that that the variances must be calculated using SUDDAN, Wesvar, or Stata, for example. These programs use either Taylor series or jackknife calculations, something you can not do with your spreadsheet or calculator. The Feds generally require such calculations for funded grants and contracts. What the margins actually are depends on the weighting scheme, basically its range -- the greater the range and the more respondents at the extreme weights the greater the margin of error. Stratification schemes may reduce the variance or in some cases increase it. Unfortunately, polling organizations generally do not release their files with the weights and with their PSU's, so the rest of us can only guess at the correct statistical margin of error [Ignoring, of course, other sources of error], though the Roper Center does have the Gallup Poll series for past years, along with the weights. In my experience, the "design effects" for the kinds of samples and weights for these polls run between 1.2 and 1.5 but sometimes as large as 2 or more at percentages around 50%. Note that the design effects will vary for more skewed marginals. But again, the statistically correct answer depends on performing the calculations, something one cannot do without further information.

At 03:57 PM 9/17/2004 -0400, you wrote:

>I think the relevant numbers are: (per Hotline)  
>  
>Pew - Bush 46%, (Kerry 46%) n=1002 registered voters surveyed 9/11-9/14  
>Gallup - Bush 52%, (Kerry 44%) n=935 registered voters surveyed 9/13-9/15  
>  
>By my calculations of the formula for the difference between two means this  
>is significant because the difference  $52\% - 46\% = 6\%$  exceeds 4.46%. But I still  
>don't think it's worthy of all this hand wringing. The poll date mismatch  
>alone could be responsible for the point and a half (just a point if you  
>allow for rounding error) by which this misses the cut-off for  
>insignificance.  
>  
>Yes differences in polling organizations, methods, and such things as likely  
>voter screens certainly affect poll results, and are precisely the reason  
>for having discussions on AAPORnet, but the media (see, Hotline, or  
>WashPost's Kurtz for example) is taking these findings as evidence that  
>polls are miles apart and the message from pollsters should be that there is  
>more consistency here than divergence if people look at the numbers  
>correctly.  
>

>All of the recent surveys of registered voters are consistent with Bush 49%  
>Kerry 44% -- plus or minus each poll's margin of error.

>  
>-----

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

Charles Kadushin  
Distinguished Scholar, Cohen Center for Modern Jewish Studies  
Brandeis University

212-865-4369

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

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

Date: Mon, 20 Sep 2004 14:23:30 -0400  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Making call on sham of political polling  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

From the Zogby website:  
<http://www.zogby.com/news/ReadNews.dbm?ID=866>

Response to Breslin Column

SNIP

First of all, I still conduct telephone polls. The reality is that polling on the telephone is becoming more difficult; caller id and the widespread use of cell phones are affecting response rates. That said, I feel that representative samples can still be achieved on the phone.

SNIP

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

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

> From: Leo Simonetta [mailto:simonetta@artsci.com]  
> Sent: Thursday, September 16, 2004 12:01 PM  
> To: 'AAPORNET@asu.edu'  
> Subject: Making call on sham of political polling  
>  
> John Zogby says: "I don't use telephones anymore because  
> there is no easy way to use them," "The people who are using  
> telephone surveys are in denial," Zogby was saying. "It is  
> similar to the '30s, when they first started polling by  
> telephones and there were people who laughed at that and said  
> you couldn't trust them because not everybody had a home  
> phone. Now they try not to mention cell phones. They don't  
> look or listen. They go ahead with a method that is old and wrong."  
>  
>  
> Making call on sham of political polling Jimmy Breslin  
> Newsday  
> <http://www.nynewsday.com/news/local/newyork/columnists/ny-nybr>  
> [es163973220sep16,0,6250241,print.column?coll=ny-ny-columnists](http://www.nynewsday.com/news/local/newyork/columnists/ny-nybr)  
>  
> September 16, 2004  
>  
> Anybody who believes these national political polls are  
> giving you facts is a gullible fool.  
>  
> Any editors of newspapers or television news shows who use  
> poll results as a story are beyond gullible. On behalf of the  
> public they profess to serve, they are indolent salesmen of  
> falsehoods.  
>  
> This is because these political polls are done by telephone.  
> Land-line telephones, as your house phone is called.  
>  
> The telephone polls do not include cellular phones. There are  
> almost 169 million cell phones being used in America today -  
> 168,900,019 as of Sept. 15, according to the cell phone  
> institute in Washington.  
>  
> There is no way to poll cell phone users, so it isn't done.  
>  
> Not one cell phone user has received a call on their cell  
> phone asking them how they plan to vote as of today.  
>  
> Out of 168 million, anything can happen. Midway through  
> election night, these stern-faced network announcers suddenly  
> will be frozen white and they have to give a result:  
>  
> SNIP  
>  
> If you want a poll on the Kerry-Bush race, sit down and make  
> up your own. It is just as good as the monstrous frauds  
> presented on television and the newspaper first pages.  
>  
> Copyright C 2004, Newsday, Inc.



>  
> --  
> 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>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Mon, 20 Sep 2004 16:19:54 -0400  
Reply-To: Eric Plutzer <[exp12@PSU.EDU](mailto:exp12@PSU.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Eric Plutzer <[exp12@PSU.EDU](mailto:exp12@PSU.EDU)>  
Subject: About those Gallup/Pew numbers  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
In-Reply-To: <[200409190433.AAA200994@f05n16.cac.psu.edu](mailto:200409190433.AAA200994@f05n16.cac.psu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Colleagues,

I've found the entire exchange about the difference between Gallup and Pew fascinating and I've learned quite a bit.

Ruy Teixeira's analysis suggests that the *major* difference among polls is less due to volatility as it is in the partisan make-up of their weighted samples of either likely or registered voters. Let's assume that Teixeira's is largely correct in a mathematical sense. He could be wrong in assuming that democrats still hold an edge in identification. And if conservatives shifted from independent to republican, that could explain how Kerry could lead among (the remaining) independents but trail nationally.

So here are the \$64,000 questions:

What's our best guess as to the current (or election day) partisan split?  
Could a nine point swing toward the Republicans have occurred in the last 3.8 years?

A nine point swing in the direction of an incumbent president is very possible given the historic volatility of Gallup's party preference question (it's less likely if you look at partisanship in National Election Studies data). But if the shift to the Republican Party is real, then why did Pew (& IBD/TIPP; DC) miss it while it was picked up by Gallup and CBS/NYT? Is it in the weighting or do unweighted numbers show the same difference?

Insiders and methodologists: is this the nub of the question? if so, any thoughts on why such big differences in party preference?

ERIC

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

Date: Mon, 20 Sep 2004 18:39:44 -0500  
Reply-To: "Saad, Lydia" <Lydia\_Saad@GALLUP.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Saad, Lydia" <Lydia\_Saad@GALLUP.COM>  
Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup  
Comments: To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@panix.com>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Doug,

I'm hard pressed to see a problem for Gallup in this data. Certainly nothing to support your allegation that Gallup has a pro-Bush bias in our approval ratings.

While a visual inspection of Professor Pollkatz' approval graphs may convince you that Gallup is more favorable to the GOP than the norm, Pollkatz himself reports that there is no statistical difference between the various organizations' ratings when you actually crunch the numbers. Scroll down to his section titled "Regarding Poll Bias."

In their 2004 AAPOR paper, "Presidential Approval Ratings in Perspective," Larry Hugick, et al found the very same thing when looking at approval for 5 major media firms spanning 1997-2004. They write: =20

"The five media polls studied track very closely with one another in their presidential job approval ratings, especially when the focus is narrowed to the most-widely reported statistic (percent approve) rather than the full set of results that includes the percent disapprove and "don't know." For the period of 1997 to 2003, the typical difference across all five polls in average annual approval is just four percentage points, and the five poll trend lines move up and down largely in concert."

Furthermore...

"The four conventional polls' trend lines tend to converge when the DK is factored out of the equation, but FOX does not join the pack. FOX seems to register lower disapproval ratings, not only during the Bush years but during the Clinton years as well." =20

So once you factor in Gallup's disapproval ratings for Bush together with Gallup's approval ratings -- as Hugick et al do in their paper, and as Professor Pollkatz does with his Bush Approval/Disapproval spread and Bush Approval Z-scores -- Gallup is right in line with CBS, ABC and Newsweek.

Lydia  
=20

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

From: Doug Henwood [mailto:dhenwood@panix.com]=20  
Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 3:27 PM  
To: Saad, Lydia; AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup

Saad, Lydia wrote:

>I'm not sure what other data you might have, Doug, to state that the=20  
>contrary is an "empirical fact."

Take a look at this chart:=20

<[http://www.pollkatz.homestead.com/files/pollkatzmainGRAPHICS\\_8911\\_image001.gif](http://www.pollkatz.homestead.com/files/pollkatzmainGRAPHICS_8911_image001.gif)>.=20

It's not the user-friendliest graphic in the world, but it sure looks like Gallup comes in at the high end for almost the entire series.

Doug

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

=====  
Date: Mon, 20 Sep 2004 17:16:13 -0700  
Reply-To: [jdrogers@sfsu.edu](mailto:jdrogers@sfsu.edu)  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: John Rogers <[jdrogers@SFSU.EDU](mailto:jdrogers@SFSU.EDU)>  
Organization: Public Research Institute  
Subject: Weights and confidence intervals (was Pew vs Gallup)  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Comments: cc: Charles Kadushin <[kadushin@BRANDEIS.EDU](mailto:kadushin@BRANDEIS.EDU)>  
In-Reply-To: <5.2.0.9.2.20040920123433.01aa6ce0@imap.staff.brandeis.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Charles,

Thank you for sharing your experience and explaining the issue in more detail. I think it's worth amplifying the point that each item or = analysis will have its own margin of error, so even if the numbers reflect an averaged design effect (which used to be done pretty frequently) there = can still be a lot of variation depending on which item you are looking at.

Would it be correct to say that a design effect of 2 implies a = confidence interval that is increased by a factor of the square root of 2 (i.e., an increase of approximately 40%)? =20

I would really like to know if any major polling organizations are = making

these adjustments; it is a practice that should be encouraged.=20

John

-----  
John Rogers, PhD  
Associate Director  
Public Research Institute  
San Francisco State University  
jdrogers@sfsu.edu  
(415)405-3800  
<http://pri.sfsu.edu>=20

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Charles Kadushin  
Sent: Monday, September 20, 2004 8:49 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: FW: Pew vs Gallup

Note John Rogers query to this list.

ALL calculations using standard formulae for margin of error for =  
percentages  
and means that both writers to the list and the polls themselves seem to =  
be  
using calculate margins that are too small. ALL the samples are =  
weighted,  
and some are stratified. This means that that the variances must be  
calculated using SUDDAN, Wesvar, or Stata, for example. These programs =  
use  
either Taylor series or jackknife calculations, something you can not do  
with your spreadsheet or calculator. The Feds generally require such  
calculations for funded grants and contracts. What the margins actually =  
are  
depends on the weighting scheme, basically its range -- the greater the  
range and the more respondents at the extreme weights the greater the =  
margin  
of error. Stratification schemes may reduce the variance or in some =  
cases  
increase it. Unfortunately, polling organizations generally do not =  
release  
their files with the weights and with their PSU's, so the rest of us can  
only guess at the correct statistical margin of error [Ignoring, of =  
course,  
other sources of error], though the Roper Center does have the Gallup =  
Poll  
series for past years, along with the weights. In my experience, the =  
"design  
effects" for the kinds of samples and weights for these polls run =  
between  
1.2 and 1.5 but sometimes as large as 2 or more at percentages around =

50%.

Note that the design effects will vary for more skewed marginals. But = again, the statistically correct answer depends on performing the calculations, something one cannot do without further information.

Charles Kadushin

Distinguished Scholar, Cohen Center for Modern Jewish Studies Brandeis University

212-865-4369

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

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

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

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

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Mon, 20 Sep 2004 21:15:14 -0400

Reply-To: dick halpern <[dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET](mailto:dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET)>

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

From: dick halpern <[dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET](mailto:dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET)>

Subject: Pew vs Gallup: Today's Wall Street Journal

Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: multipart/mixed; x-avg-checked=avg-ok-DAD5161;  
boundary="Boundary\_(ID\_dsA9OFCBhH78PtjSudK/1A)"

--Boundary\_(ID\_dsA9OFCBhH78PtjSudK/1A)

Content-type: text/plain; x-avg-checked=avg-ok-DAD5161; charset=us-ascii;  
format=flowed

Content-transfer-encoding: 8bit

Hi folks,

The Pew vs Gallup discussion has hit the front page of today's Wall Street Journal. The essence of the article is similar to that contained in the NY Times the other day, namely a discussion of the methodological differences between Pew and Gallup which presumably account for the differences in their respective findings. Unfortunately, not being an on-line subscriber, I can't download it or send it.

Dick Halpern

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

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

--Boundary\_(ID\_dsA9OFCBhH78PtjSudK/1A)

Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-avg=cert;  
x-avg-checked=avg-ok-DAD5161  
Content-disposition: inline

---  
Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.  
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).  
Version: 6.0.752 / Virus Database: 503 - Release Date: 9/3/2004

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

--Boundary\_(ID\_dsA9OFCBhH78PtjSudK/1A)--  
=====

Date: Mon, 20 Sep 2004 20:48:12 -0500  
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Organization: Market Shares Corporation  
Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup  
Comments: To: "aapornet@asu.edu" <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
In-Reply-To: <[414F87D4.9080604@marketsharescorp.com](mailto:414F87D4.9080604@marketsharescorp.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Nick Panagakis wrote:

>> Doug's first problem is that the link to the site is this.  
>> <http://www.pollkatz.homestead.com/>  
>>  
>> The second problem is that once I got there and click approval, I  
>> have no idea what he is talking about.  
>>  
>> Nick  
>> .  
>>  
>>  
>> Saad, Lydia wrote:  
>>  
>>> Doug,  
>>>  
>>> I'm hard pressed to see a problem for Gallup in this data. Certainly  
>>> nothing to support your allegation that Gallup has a pro-Bush bias in  
>>> our approval ratings.  
>>>  
>>> While a visual inspection of Professor Pollkatz' approval graphs may  
>>> convince you that Gallup is more favorable to the GOP than the norm,  
>>> Pollkatz himself reports that there is no statistical difference between  
>>> the various organizations' ratings when you actually crunch the numbers.  
>>> Scroll down to his section titled "Regarding Poll Bias."  
>>>

>>>>In their 2004 AAPOR paper, "Presidential Approval Ratings in  
>>>>Perspective," Larry Hugick, et al found the very same thing when looking  
>>>>at approval for 5 major media firms spanning 1997-2004. They write:

>>>>"The five media polls studied track very closely with one another in  
>>>>their presidential job approval ratings, especially when the focus is  
>>>>narrowed to the most-widely reported statistic (percent approve) rather  
>>>>than the full set of results that includes the percent disapprove and  
>>>>"don't know." For the period of 1997 to 2003, the typical difference  
>>>>across all five polls in average annual approval is just four percentage  
>>>>points, and the five poll trend lines move up and down largely in  
>>>>concert."

>>>>Furthermore...

>>>>"The four conventional polls' trend lines tend to converge when the DK  
>>>>is factored out of the equation, but FOX does not join the pack. FOX  
>>>>seems to register lower disapproval ratings, not only during the Bush  
>>>>years but during the Clinton years as well."

>>>>So once you factor in Gallup's disapproval ratings for Bush together  
>>>>with Gallup's approval ratings -- as Hugick et al do in their paper, and  
>>>>as Professor Pollkatz does with his Bush Approval/Disapproval spread and  
>>>>Bush Approval Z-scores -- Gallup is right in line with CBS, ABC and  
>>>>Newsweek.

>>>>Lydia

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

>>>>From: Doug Henwood [mailto:dhenwood@panix.com]  
>>>>Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 3:27 PM  
>>>>To: Saad, Lydia; AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>>>>Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup

>>>>Saad, Lydia wrote:

>>>>>>>I'm not sure what other data you might have, Doug, to state that the  
>>>>>>>contrary is an "empirical fact."

>>>>>>>Take a look at this chart:  
>>>>>>><[http://www.pollkatz.homestead.com/files/pollkatzmainGRAPHICS\\_8911\\_image001.gif](http://www.pollkatz.homestead.com/files/pollkatzmainGRAPHICS_8911_image001.gif)>.

>>>>>>>It's not the user-friendliest graphic in the world, but it sure looks  
>>>>>>>like Gallup comes in at the high end for almost the entire series.

>>>>>>>Doug

>>>>>>>

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

Date: Mon, 20 Sep 2004 19:03:00 -0700  
Reply-To: Doug Rivers <[doug@POLIMETRIX.COM](mailto:doug@POLIMETRIX.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Doug Rivers <[doug@POLIMETRIX.COM](mailto:doug@POLIMETRIX.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Weights and confidence intervals (was Pew vs Gallup)  
Comments: To: [jdrogers@sfsu.edu](mailto:jdrogers@sfsu.edu), [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

There seems to be some confusion about the design of the surveys in question. Most of the ones being discussed are either RDD (with a single respondent per household) or RBS (which is a SRS). In either case the design effect is either exactly one or indistinguishable from one.

It is correct that all of these surveys are weighted and that this is not reflected in the standard error calculations. However, the weights do not come from unequal probabilities of selection, but from post-stratification. The assumptions needed for post-stratification to work are, of course, controversial, but *if* nonresponse is ignorable, the standard errors for post-stratification can be (and usually are) smaller than those assuming SRS.

Here is an example. Suppose we divide the sample into 2 categories, with  $p$  being the population proportion in the first category and  $q$  the corresponding sample proportion. Suppose we want to estimate the mean of some variable which has the same variance  $s^2$  in each subpopulation and we draw a sample of size  $n$  with ignorable nonresponse. Then the variance of the sample mean calculated assuming SRS is  $s^2/n$ , while the variance of the weighted mean is  $p^2 s^2/qn + (1-p)^2 s^2/(1-q)n = 3D [p^2 (1-q) + (1-p)^2 q]/q(1-q) * s^2/n$ . The factor on the left is never greater than one with equality iff  $p=3Dq$ .

So I don't think design effects are very important here. This does *not* mean that the standard error calculations give an accurate indication of total survey error, however.

Doug Rivers

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

Date: Mon, 20 Sep 2004 22:04:40 -0400  
Reply-To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jan Werner <[jwerner@JWDP.COM](mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM)>  
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing  
Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup: Today's Wall Street Journal



Comments: To: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <6.1.2.0.2.20040920210914.0368ab18@mail.atl.bellsouth.net>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The article is available online for free at:

<http://online.wsj.com/public/article/0,,SB109564790195022098,00.html?mod%3Cbr%20/%3E=todays%5Ffree%5Ffeature>

Since that URL will probably wrap in your email reader, you can either cut and paste it back together, or you can go to the Columbia Journalism Review's Campaign Desk blog (<http://campaigndesk.org/>) and link to the WSJ article from the entry by Thomas Lang discussing it.

Jan Werner

---

dick halpern wrote:

> Hi folks,  
>  
> The Pew vs Gallup discussion has hit the front page of today's Wall Street  
> Journal. The essence of the article is similar to that contained in the NY  
> Times the other day, namely a discussion of the methodological differences  
> between Pew and Gallup which presumably account for the differences in  
> their respective findings. Unfortunately, not being an on-line subscriber,  
> I can't download it or send it.

> Dick Halpern

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

> -----  
>  
> ---  
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.  
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).  
> Version: 6.0.752 / Virus Database: 503 - Release Date: 9/3/2004

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

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

Date: Mon, 20 Sep 2004 22:14:14 -0400  
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <414F885C.1060006@marketsharescorp.com>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Nick Panagakis wrote:

>Nick Panagakis wrote:

>

>>>Doug's first problem is that the link to the site is this.

>>><http://www.pollkatz.homestead.com/>

Well, no it's not. A graphic pops up if you click on this link:

<[http://www.pollkatz.homestead.com/files/pollkatzmainGRAPHICS\\_8911\\_image001.gif](http://www.pollkatz.homestead.com/files/pollkatzmainGRAPHICS_8911_image001.gif)>

that, like a standard time series, has time on the x axis, and approval on the y. At nearly any given time, Gallup usually comes in at the high end. It's not the clearest or prettiest graphic, but that's what it whos.

>>>The second problem is that once I got there and click approval, I  
>>>have no idea what he is talking about.

Try again.

Doug

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

=====  
Date: Mon, 20 Sep 2004 23:03:28 -0400  
Reply-To: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup  
Comments: To: "Saad, Lydia" <Lydia\_Saad@GALLUP.COM>  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <06C64DE644F85843A90884803225A80703EE5E2F@exchng12.noam.gallup.com>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

About 20-25 years ago, Tom Smith had a couple of pieces in POQ on "house effects," small but systematic differences among research houses trying to measure the same thing. It was around then, or maybe earlier, when Harris and Gallup were the main pre-election polls, that somebody showed Harris

leaning more toward the Democrats than Gallup. There was no suggestion of malice or intentional bias, just a persisting difference -- a house effect. Maybe somebody can support or refute my memory here.

---

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](http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer)

---

On Mon, 20 Sep 2004, Saad, Lydia wrote:

> Date: Mon, 20 Sep 2004 18:39:44 -0500  
> From: "Saad, Lydia" <Lydia\_Saad@GALLUP.COM>  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup  
>  
> Doug,  
>  
> I'm hard pressed to see a problem for Gallup in this data. Certainly  
> nothing to support your allegation that Gallup has a pro-Bush bias in  
> our approval ratings.  
>  
> While a visual inspection of Professor Pollkatz' approval graphs may  
> convince you that Gallup is more favorable to the GOP than the norm,  
> Pollkatz himself reports that there is no statistical difference between  
> the various organizations' ratings when you actually crunch the numbers.  
> Scroll down to his section titled "Regarding Poll Bias."  
>  
> In their 2004 AAPOR paper, "Presidential Approval Ratings in  
> Perspective," Larry Hugick, et al found the very same thing when looking  
> at approval for 5 major media firms spanning 1997-2004. They write:  
>  
> "The five media polls studied track very closely with one another in  
> their presidential job approval ratings, especially when the focus is  
> narrowed to the most-widely reported statistic (percent approve) rather  
> than the full set of results that includes the percent disapprove and  
> "don't know." For the period of 1997 to 2003, the typical difference  
> across all five polls in average annual approval is just four percentage  
> points, and the five poll trend lines move up and down largely in  
> concert."  
>  
> Furthermore...  
>  
> "The four conventional polls' trend lines tend to converge when the DK  
> is factored out of the equation, but FOX does not join the pack. FOX  
> seems to register lower disapproval ratings, not only during the Bush  
> years but during the Clinton years as well."  
>  
> So once you factor in Gallup's disapproval ratings for Bush together

> with Gallup's approval ratings -- as Hugick et al do in their paper, and  
> as Professor Pollkatz does with his Bush Approval/Disapproval spread and  
> Bush Approval Z-scores -- Gallup is right in line with CBS, ABC and  
> Newsweek.

>

> Lydia

>

>

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

> From: Doug Henwood [mailto:dhenwood@panix.com]

> Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 3:27 PM

> To: Saad, Lydia; AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup

>

> Saad, Lydia wrote:

>

> >I'm not sure what other data you might have, Doug, to state that the

> >contrary is an "empirical fact."

>

> Take a look at this chart:

> <[http://www.pollkatz.homestead.com/files/pollkatzmainGRAPHICS\\_8911\\_image](http://www.pollkatz.homestead.com/files/pollkatzmainGRAPHICS_8911_image)

> 001.gif>.

> It's not the user-friendliest graphic in the world, but it sure looks

> like Gallup comes in at the high end for almost the entire series.

>

> Doug

>

> -----

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

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

>

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

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Sat, 18 Sep 2004 17:12:13 -0400

Reply-To: martin plissner <[plissner@VERIZON.NET](mailto:plissner@VERIZON.NET)>

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

From: martin plissner <[plissner@VERIZON.NET](mailto:plissner@VERIZON.NET)>

Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

This question is for somebody at Gallup.

=20

The Commission on Presidential Debates and Washington University of St.

Louis both state that, should the second presidential debate be held =

there,

questions would be posed to the candidates by "about 140 undecided =

St.Louis

area voters.selected by the Gallup Organization." The Bush campaign is reported to have raised the possibility that persons who are not at all undecided might so identify themselves for the purpose of getting front = row seats and popping questions. This does not seem entirely far-fetched. Since some might take the Gallup imprimatur as a badge of purity on the selection process, what precautions does Gallup take (or has it taken in = the past) to guard against this possibility?

=20

Martin Plissner

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

=====  
Date: Sat, 18 Sep 2004 10:47:14 -0400  
Reply-To: Andrew A Beveridge <[andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU](mailto:andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Andrew A Beveridge <[andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU](mailto:andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU)>  
Subject: Registration Lists are Permeated With Error of Undetermined Size  
Comments: To: "Christopher B. Mann" <[christopher.mann@YALE.EDU](mailto:christopher.mann@YALE.EDU)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[1095442618.414b20baac230@www.mail.yale.edu](mailto:1095442618.414b20baac230@www.mail.yale.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Dear:

Registration data is a list that at this writing must include anyone who has voted in any of the last four elections, dead or alive, present or absent unless the registering authority has information to the contrary. They often contain demographic data: age, sex, registration, etc. Motor voter seems to have increased registration without increasing turnout.

Depending on purge policies they are often horrible proxies for who can vote. Sometimes one finds registration rates above 100%. If "no purge" orders are in effect, this means that renters for examples are more likely to appear to be on the list than they are.

Of course, in the surveys, the respondent is asked to report if he/she is registered. Since being registered to vote is socially desirable, one gets lots of over-reporting.

Turnout should be computed based upon those potentially eligible to vote (aka Voting Age Citizens).

The whole issue of design effects and survey adjustments, along with the

relatively low response rate plainly means that tracking public opinion has more uncertainty year by year.

Andy Beveridge  
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](mailto:beveridg@optonline.net)  
web: [www.sociaexplorer.com](http://www.sociaexplorer.com)

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Christopher B. Mann  
Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 1:37 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Weighting Election Polls

Another clarification is in order about the nature of the registration based data because I have received several queries off the listserve as well as one on it: In looking at past turnout from registration data, we are looking at people who have actually shown up at the polling place (or mailed a ballot) in previous elections. Legally, this cannot include dead people or people who have moved away (and even the old precinct captains I grew up around in Chicago can't pull it off illegally anymore). Therefore the demographic profile of turnout does have this problem. Sampling from poorly maintained lists may confront this problem, but using registration data in weighting does not bring the issue into play.

--

Christopher B. Mann  
Yale University  
Department of Political Science  
[christopher.mann@yale.edu](mailto:christopher.mann@yale.edu)  
(203) 668-3430

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

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

-----  
Date: Sat, 18 Sep 2004 08:39:17 -0400  
Reply-To: [jtatur@NOTES.CC.SUNYSB.EDU](mailto:jtatur@NOTES.CC.SUNYSB.EDU)



However, the debate seems to have shifted to the former. My final case for voter history based weighting is that it provides as exact a count of past turnout as is humanly possible. Since such exact counts of the universe in we are sampling with polls are usually the holy grail for measuring sampling accuracy, it seems like it has value.

On the front of registration based sampling: I will readily concede all of the problems of inadequate purging that have been pointed out. Some states are clearly miles ahead of others. However, if an area has a decent database - and they all will be required to improve to a higher level in the next few years due to the new federal elections regulations - then the advantages to RBS can be great. Research in 4 states conducted at Yale in conjunction with the Washington Post, CBS, and the Quinnipiac University Poll in the 2002 election show that RBS is at least as accurate in forecasting election outcomes as RDD. Moreover, for those pollsters without unlimited budgets, RBS was significantly less expensive to conduct. Sampling from among only those who are registered is a smaller universe than an RDD frame (except for a few places that just have plain rotten data). People who are dead or moved away still claim phone numbers (either active or not released for new customers), just as they may appear on registration rolls so this criticism seems more smoke than fire. If the sample is stratified to include greater numbers of voters who have been active in recent elections (as I believe it should be), then the universe is narrower still. This means a lot less calls to folks who aren't in the target universe --> bigger sample sizes for less money. For polls in a geographic area that doesn't match phone exchanges well (e.g. congressional districts), RBS has the further advantage of saving a lot of out of area calls.

RBS isn't a perfect solution for all problems or all situations, but it has some real merit that deserves consideration. As government agencies catch up with the available technology, the criticisms of RBS from 2, 5, or 10 years ago are less and less true. These databases are better and will continue to get better. We should not neglect the opportunities this improvement brings to make polls better and cheaper.

--

Christopher B. Mann  
Yale University  
Department of Political Science  
christopher.mann@yale.edu  
(203) 668-3430

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

=====  
Date: Sat, 18 Sep 2004 22:02:46 -0400  
Reply-To: dick halpern <[dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET](mailto:dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>



From: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>  
Subject: Varying Polls Reflect Volatility -- NY Times  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: multipart/mixed; x-avg-checked=avg-ok-29305D41;  
boundary="Boundary\_(ID\_1Z9Tc1domqljMoeHisO6Kg)"

--Boundary\_(ID\_1Z9Tc1domqljMoeHisO6Kg)  
Content-type: text/plain; x-avg-checked=avg-ok-29305D41; charset=us-ascii;  
format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8bit

From today's NY Times, further commentary about the differences in findings re Bush vs Kerry as reported by Pew and Gallup.

Dick Halpern

Varying Polls Reflect Volatility, Experts Say

By CARL HULSE

NY Times, Published: September 18, 2004

WASHINGTON, Sept. 17 - With national public opinion surveys showing the presidential race to be anywhere from a dead heat between  
<<http://www.nytimes.com/top/news/washington/campaign2004/candidates/georgewbus/h/index.html?inline=nyt-per-pol>>President  
Bush and  
<<http://www.nytimes.com/top/news/washington/campaign2004/candidates/johnfkerry/index.html?inline=nyt-per-pol>>Senator  
John Kerry to Mr. Bush's holding a commanding lead, potential voters have their choice of what to believe.

But survey experts say such disparities in the polls are not unusual at this stage of a campaign and reflect both a volatile electorate and methodological differences between the polling organizations.

"What has happened is that the convention period, especially the Republican convention period, unsettled public opinion," said Andrew Kohut, director of the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press. "When opinion is unsettled, even small differences can make for even bigger differences in results."

The Pew poll released Thursday was based on a survey of 1,972 registered voters in two waves between Sept. 8 and 14. It found that Mr. Bush and Mr. Kerry were tied at 46 percent among registered voters while Mr. Bush held a statistically insignificant 47 percent to 46 percent lead among likely voters by the end of the second stage of polling, from Sept. 11 to 14. The first stage, Sept. 8-10, showed Mr. Bush leading Mr. Kerry by 12 and 16 points in those groups, respectively - a clear sign of voter volatility.

A Gallup Poll released Friday, on the other hand, found Mr. Bush with 52

percent to Mr. Kerry's 44 percent among registered voters and a 55 percent to 42 percent lead among likely voters in a survey taken Sept. 13 to 15. The New York Times/CBS News poll conducted Sept. 12 to 16 had Mr. Bush over Mr. Kerry by 50 percent to 42 percent among registered voters. Mr. Bush's edge increased slightly - 51 percent to 42 percent - among likely voters. Other national polls have reflected a closer contest.

David W. Moore, senior editor of the Gallup Poll, said he believed that even slight differences in the time periods when the surveys were conducted could shift the results, given the intense news media coverage of the issue of Mr. Bush's time in the National Guard and whether disputed memos regarding his service there were forged.

"That issue is so key to the character of the two candidates," Mr. Moore said.

Given the shifting opinions, Mr. Moore and his fellow polling experts acknowledge that differences in the way survey organizations conduct their polls could be reflected in the results. For instance, the Gallup Poll had a lower percentage of undecided voters than the Pew poll, which some interpreted as evidence that the Gallup survey takers might press harder for a definitive response from those questioned.

Others note that the ways that different polling groups identify likely voters also vary, contributing to different findings in that closely watched group. In the key polls, Mr. Bush typically did better among likely voters than the broader group of registered voters.

"The most difficult thing in pre-election polling is to know who is going to show up on Election Day," said Andrew E. Smith, director of the University of New Hampshire Survey Center. "As you get closer to the election, all the various likely voter models work better."

Despite the differences in the final numbers, the pollsters all say some basic conclusions can be drawn from the varied results.

"One of the things that is pretty clear from all of the polls, that seems to be very consistent, is that Bush had a very good convention, that his support has increased and that he is probably leading Kerry," said Michael Traugott, a University of Michigan professor and author on the subject of polls.

But the voter sentiment shifts reflected in the surveys also indicate that the contest is far from over.

"My sense is that Bush is ahead by several percentage points, that the public is pretty volatile, that the National Guard issue could play either way for one of the candidates," Mr. Moore said. "It is clearly not decided what the outcome will be."

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

On your return send: set aapornet mail

--Boundary\_(ID\_1Z9Tc1domqljMoeHisO6Kg)  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-avg=cert;  
x-avg-checked=avg-ok-29305D41  
Content-disposition: inline

---  
Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.  
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).  
Version: 6.0.752 / Virus Database: 503 - Release Date: 9/3/2004

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

--Boundary\_(ID\_1Z9Tc1domqljMoeHisO6Kg)--

=====  
Date: Sat, 18 Sep 2004 11:12:42 -0400  
Reply-To: martin plissner <[plissner@VERIZON.NET](mailto:plissner@VERIZON.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: martin plissner <[plissner@VERIZON.NET](mailto:plissner@VERIZON.NET)>  
Comments: To: [AAPORnet@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORnet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

The question here is for somebody at Gallup.

=20

The Commission on Presidential Debates and Washington University of St. Louis have both announced that for the second presidential debate, = should it take place there, questions would be posed by approximately 140 = undecided St. Louis area voters selected as being such by the Gallup organization. The Bush campaign appears to have raised the possibility that persons = who are not at all undecided might so identify themselves for the purpose of getting front row seats and popping questions. This does not seem = entirely far-fetched. Since the Gallup name is obviously being employed by the commission to put a stamp of validity on the selection process, what precautions does Gallup have in mind (or has it used in the past) to = guard against this possibility?

=20

Marty Plissner

=20

=20

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

Date: Tue, 21 Sep 2004 09:35:24 -0400  
Reply-To: Charles Kadushin <[kadushin@BRANDEIS.EDU](mailto:kadushin@BRANDEIS.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Charles Kadushin <[kadushin@BRANDEIS.EDU](mailto:kadushin@BRANDEIS.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Weights and confidence intervals (was Pew vs Gallup)  
Comments: To: Doug Rivers <[doug@POLIMETRIX.COM](mailto:doug@POLIMETRIX.COM)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <016D23FB66B59D45A107C4741789271A0568EB@washington.polimetr  
ix.com>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Correct when the strata are minimal or none as is often the case. Not correct when the data are weighted. Usually, there are two sources of weighting. One is the design weights -- number of voice lines into the household and the number of persons in the household, and the second is the post-stratification weights -- adjustments for demographic differences in non-response. They are multiplied. If the weights do not have much of a range, then design effects are small. If they do have considerable range and there are a fair number of cases with high or low weights, then the design effects are not trivial. Try it out with the correct software. You cannot do these calculations by formulae. Rather, both jackknife and Taylor series are iterative numerical processes. Most of our statistical thinking dates to the days before the widespread availability of computers that can do these processes in relatively little time. The folks at Westat (Wesvar), SAS (SUDDAN), or Stata will be happy to sell you their software. Not worth it to program it yourself. New editions of the software can do either jackknife or Taylor series. In my experience, they all produce the same results. Hurrah for science.

At 07:03 PM 9/20/2004 -0700, Doug Rivers wrote:

>There seems to be some confusion about the design of the surveys in  
>question. Most of the ones being discussed are either RDD (with a single  
>respondent per household) or RBS (which is a SRS). In either case the  
>design effect is either exactly one or indistinguishable from one.

>  
>It is correct that all of these surveys are weighted and that this is  
>not reflected in the standard error calculations. However, the weights  
>do not come from unequal probabilities of selection, but from  
>post-stratification. The assumptions needed for post-stratification to  
>work are, of course, controversial, but \*if\* nonresponse is ignorable,  
>the standard errors for post-stratification can be (and usually are)  
>smaller than those assuming SRS.

>  
>Here is an example. Suppose we divide the sample into 2 categories, with  
>p being the population proportion in the first category and q the  
>corresponding sample proportion. Suppose we want to estimate the mean of  
>some variable which has the same variance  $s^2$  in each subpopulation and  
>we draw a sample of size n with ignorable nonresponse. Then the variance  
>of the sample mean calculated assuming SRS is  $s^2/n$ , while the variance  
>of the weighted mean is  $p^2 s^2/qn + (1-p)^2 s^2/(1-q)n = [p^2 (1-q) +$   
> $(1-p)^2 q]/q(1-q) * s^2/n$ . The factor on the left is never greater than  
>one with equality iff  $p=q$ .

>  
>So I don't think design effects are very important here. This does \*not\*  
>mean that the standard error calculations give an accurate indication of  
>total survey error, however.

>  
>Doug Rivers

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

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

=====  
Date: Tue, 21 Sep 2004 10:13:58 -0400  
Reply-To: "James P. Murphy" <[jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM](mailto:jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "James P. Murphy" <[jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM](mailto:jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM)>  
Subject: Gallup To Choose Debate Audience  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

If I were Gallup, I would be cautious about accepting (or having =  
accepted) responsibility for this. One hopes there is a pool of =  
self-identified Undecideds that predates announcement of the debate =  
concept and location. Survey researchers deal with populations in the =  
aggregate and with trends, not with certifying individuals, motivations =  
or behavior potentials. Let someone like a big name accounting firm, who =  
frequently accept assignments for which they lack qualifications =  
(population surveys and feasibility studies come to mind, along with =  
guarding results of the Oscar voting), have this one.

Another concern is the fact that the Republican convention and Bush =  
campaign have been harshly and deservedly criticized for their =  
Nixonesque screening of audiences to exclude people with serious =  
questions about the Iraq war, the economy, civil liberties, and the =  
like. Is this just going to be another scripted TV show? There are many =  
potential downsides.

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

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

Date: Tue, 21 Sep 2004 10:07:45 -0400  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Push polling  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

When is a push poll a 'message test?'

By SETH MULLER  
Arizona Daily Sun Staff Reporter  
09/21/2004

As the 1st Congressional District race between Paul Babbitt and Rick Renzi and the presidential election heats up, area registered voters can expect their phones to ring off the hook for a bevy of polls.

While most polls are legitimate, some can have a hidden agenda of swaying the opinion of the person surveyed, rather than merely recording and statistically documenting it. Called "push polls," they gained attention during the 2000 presidential election.

SNIP

On the surface, it sounds like push polling, but there's another gradient that Northern Arizona University pollster Fred Solop suspects: message testing.

"It is difficult from the information provided to determine definitively whether this is a push poll," Solop wrote in an e-mail correspondence Monday. He responded to testimony provided about the surveys, reportedly conducted last week.

"I will say that from the vantage point of a respondent answering questions, there is a fine line between a push poll and a 'message testing' poll. A message testing poll presents information from different angles and registers which appeals resonate best with the electorate."

He added, "This information is then used to create advertising campaigns."

Solop, who runs NAU's Social Research Laboratory, said that he always encourages people to participate in polls and surveys. However, he said that those who are concerned they're being drawn in to a push poll or something less than ethical need to start asking questions themselves.

"People have the right to know who is collecting information from them and how this information is going to be used," Solop wrote. "If there is a question about the legitimacy of a poll, people should feel comfortable asking the interviewer who they work for and who is sponsoring the survey."

If the answer is less than complete or denied, the participant can conclude the survey. Also, those who respond to a poll should be suspicious if it is brief -- say, lasting less than five minutes. Usually, legitimate polls are more thorough.

Solop has taken a stand against push polls. In May, he filed a complaint with the American Association for Public Opinion Research, charging a survey during the Flagstaff city election was really a push poll designed to campaign against three open-space bond issues.

SNIP

--

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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Tue, 21 Sep 2004 10:14:57 -0400  
Reply-To: martin plissner <[plissner@VERIZON.NET](mailto:plissner@VERIZON.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: martin plissner <[plissner@VERIZON.NET](mailto:plissner@VERIZON.NET)>  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The Associated Press reports today that, for the "town meeting" at the second presidential debate, Gallup will be tasked to assemble a panel, not of "undecided voters" but composed equally of voters who are "soft supporters" respectively of Bush and Kerry. When Gallup has devised a methodology for doing so, one assumes it will make this public.

Martin Plissner

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

Date: Tue, 21 Sep 2004 09:22:18 -0500  
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Organization: Market Shares Corporation  
Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[p05200f00bd753e72de2f@\[192.168.1.100\]](mailto:p05200f00bd753e72de2f@[192.168.1.100])>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Doug-

Here is the problem. We are looking at two different charts at:  
<http://www.pollkatz.homestead.com/>

I think the link - "Approval/Disapproval Spread" - is the better measure.

The problem with looking at "Approval" only is that polls with lower no opinion levels rise to the top of the distribution - notably Gallup and ABC. Their no opinions are in low single digits this year. Many other polls have double digit no opinion levels. Fox no opinion has ranged between 6%-11% in the current election year.

Use Pollkatz's "Approval/Disapproval Spread" - ruling out no opinion level differences - and Gallup and ABC data blend in with the others.

Perhaps this is why, as Lydia said "Pollkatz himself reports that there is no statistical difference between the various organizations".

There is another issue here that I have noted on this listserve before. Polls using the 4-point excellent-poor scale cannot be compared with dichotomous approve/disapprove results. Combined excellent/good scores are not the same as approve. I have noticed excellent-poor lagging approve scores for many years. In a 1980 experiment, I asked both questions and found "fair" raters choosing "approve" when given the option.

Click "approval" on the Pollkatz site and Zogby and to some extent Harris are at the bottom of the distribution. Click "Disapproval" and they are at the top. (I have no information about ARG - question wording or no opinion level.)

Nothing wrong with using the 4-point scale. It's just that they can't be compared with approve/diapprove results.

Also on wording, I notice that some polls asking approve/diapprove also



offer a third answer option - AP/Ipsos includes "mixed feelings" as an option to respondents and Investors Business Daily/Christian Science Monitor include "not familiar enough".

I would like to see someone do an apples and apples analysis - perhaps Pollkatz - comparing results among polls asking approve/disapprove only.

For raw numbers and question wording for some of the polls go to:

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

Click "President Bush" and then click "job ratings". At the bottom of the page click "Earlier job ratings" for ratings earlier than the current week.

Nick

Doug Henwood wrote:

> Nick Panagakis wrote:

>

>> Nick Panagakis wrote:

>>

>>>> Doug's first problem is that the link to the site is this.

>>>> <http://www.pollkatz.homestead.com/>

>>>>

>

> Well, no it's not. A graphic pops up if you click on this link:

>

>

<[http://www.pollkatz.homestead.com/files/pollkatzmainGRAPHICS\\_8911\\_image001.gif](http://www.pollkatz.homestead.com/files/pollkatzmainGRAPHICS_8911_image001.gif)

f>

>

>

> that, like a standard time series, has time on the x axis, and

> approval on the y. At nearly any given time, Gallup usually comes in

> at the high end. It's not the clearest or prettiest graphic, but

> that's what it whos.

>

>>>> The second problem is that once I got there and click approval, I

>>>> have no idea what he is talking about.

>>>>

>

> Try again.

>

> Doug

>

> -----

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

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

=====  
Date: Tue, 21 Sep 2004 10:39:21 -0400  
Reply-To: "Wilson, Harry" <[wilson@ROANOKE.EDU](mailto:wilson@ROANOKE.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Wilson, Harry" <[wilson@ROANOKE.EDU](mailto:wilson@ROANOKE.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Varying Polls Reflect Volatility -- NY Times  
Comments: To: dick halpern <[dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET](mailto:dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

In this article and others that I've read, Andrew Kohut is quoted as =  
saying that the Republican convention unsettled public opinion. Of =  
course, I know that Bush seemed to get a bounce, although that may have =  
been the continuation of a trend begun prior to the convention.  
=20

My basic question is what happened at the Convention to change things? =  
Prior to the Republican convention the conventional wisdom (even on =  
[AAPORNET](mailto:AAPORNET) if I'm not mistaken) was that there were very few "Undecideds" =  
in this campaign. In fact that was offered as a reason by many, =  
including me, for the lack of a Kerry bounce after the Democratic =  
convention.  
=20

I guess I'm not convinced that the differences in the polls really do =  
reflect a volatile electorate. If they do, then what made the =  
electorate volatile? Or was it always volatile and the earlier polls =  
and their interpretation was not completely correct? If the basic =  
situation did change and the polls measured shifting opinion at =  
different points in time, then theoretically the polls should converge =  
again unless the electorate remains in a constant state of flux.  
=20  
=20

Harry Wilson  
Director, Center for Community Research  
Roanoke College

---

From: AAPORNET on behalf of dick halpern  
Sent: Sat 9/18/2004 10:02 PM  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Subject: Varying Polls Reflect Volatility -- NY Times

From today's NY Times, further commentary about the differences in findings re Bush vs Kerry as reported by Pew and Gallup.

Dick Halpern

Varying Polls Reflect Volatility, Experts Say

By CARL HULSE

NY Times, Published: September 18, 2004

WASHINGTON, Sept. 17 - With national public opinion surveys showing the presidential race to be anywhere from a dead heat between <http://www.nytimes.com/top/news/washington/campaign2004/candidates/georgewebush/index.html?inline=3Dnyt-per-pol> President Bush and <http://www.nytimes.com/top/news/washington/campaign2004/candidates/johnferry/index.html?inline=3Dnyt-per-pol> Senator John Kerry to Mr. Bush's holding a commanding lead, potential voters have their choice of what to believe.

But survey experts say such disparities in the polls are not unusual at this stage of a campaign and reflect both a volatile electorate and methodological differences between the polling organizations.

"What has happened is that the convention period, especially the Republican convention period, unsettled public opinion," said Andrew Kohut, director of the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press. "When opinion is unsettled, even small differences can make for even bigger differences in results."

The Pew poll released Thursday was based on a survey of 1,972 registered voters in two waves between Sept. 8 and 14. It found that Mr. Bush and Mr. Kerry were tied at 46 percent among registered voters while Mr. Bush held a statistically insignificant 47 percent to 46 percent lead among likely voters by the end of the second stage of polling, from Sept. 11 to 14. The first stage, Sept. 8-10, showed Mr. Bush leading Mr. Kerry by 12 and 16 points in those groups, respectively - a clear sign of voter volatility.

A Gallup Poll released Friday, on the other hand, found Mr. Bush with 52 percent to Mr. Kerry's 44 percent among registered voters and a 55 percent to 42 percent lead among likely voters in a survey taken Sept. 13 to 15. The New York Times/CBS News poll conducted Sept. 12 to 16 had Mr. Bush =

over  
Mr. Kerry by 50 percent to 42 percent among registered voters. Mr. =  
Bush's  
edge increased slightly - 51 percent to 42 percent - among likely =  
voters.  
Other national polls have reflected a closer contest.

David W. Moore, senior editor of the Gallup Poll, said he believed that  
even slight differences in the time periods when the surveys were =  
conducted  
could shift the results, given the intense news media coverage of the =  
issue  
of Mr. Bush's time in the National Guard and whether disputed memos  
regarding his service there were forged.

"That issue is so key to the character of the two candidates," Mr. =  
Moore said.

Given the shifting opinions, Mr. Moore and his fellow polling experts  
acknowledge that differences in the way survey organizations conduct =  
their  
polls could be reflected in the results. For instance, the Gallup Poll =  
had  
a lower percentage of undecided voters than the Pew poll, which some  
interpreted as evidence that the Gallup survey takers might press harder  
for a definitive response from those questioned.

Others note that the ways that different polling groups identify likely  
voters also vary, contributing to different findings in that closely  
watched group. In the key polls, Mr. Bush typically did better among =  
likely  
voters than the broader group of registered voters.

"The most difficult thing in pre-election polling is to know who is =  
going  
to show up on Election Day," said Andrew E. Smith, director of the  
University of New Hampshire Survey Center. "As you get closer to the  
election, all the various likely voter models work better."

Despite the differences in the final numbers, the pollsters all say some  
basic conclusions can be drawn from the varied results.

"One of the things that is pretty clear from all of the polls, that =  
seems  
to be very consistent, is that Bush had a very good convention, that his  
support has increased and that he is probably leading Kerry," said =  
Michael  
Traugott, a University of Michigan professor and author on the subject =  
of  
polls.

But the voter sentiment shifts reflected in the surveys also indicate =  
that  
the contest is far from over.

"My sense is that Bush is ahead by several percentage points, that the public is pretty volatile, that the National Guard issue could play = either way for one of the candidates," Mr. Moore said. "It is clearly not = decided what the outcome will be."

---

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

---

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

---

Date: Tue, 21 Sep 2004 10:54:40 -0400  
Reply-To: Andrew A Beveridge <[andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU](mailto:andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Andrew A Beveridge <[andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU](mailto:andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Weights and confidence intervals (was Pew vs Gallup)  
Comments: To: Charles Kadushin <[kadushin@BRANDEIS.EDU](mailto:kadushin@BRANDEIS.EDU)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[5.2.0.9.2.20040921092508.01a5add8@imap.staff.brandeis.edu](mailto:5.2.0.9.2.20040921092508.01a5add8@imap.staff.brandeis.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Dear All:

Just a quick note to add to my colleague Kadushin's comments. There is work that shows that the Taylor series approximations and the boot strapping end up about the same. In the newest versions of SAS (version 9.1) and SPSS (some version of 12) there are procedures to take the design effect into account. In SAS there is now a series of so-called Sample Procedures (e.g. Samplefreq) that do these.

Design effects are directly related to the clustering of the sample. So an RDD cluster approach will actually not be equivalent to the number of phone interviews completed. To carry these out for the Taylor series one needs to know the weighting and the nesting of the sample: (e.g. state, zip or area code, hundreds banks, and the fraction at each level). For boot strapping one needs to have that plus (replicates). Some of the major samples collected by government agencies now have this material as a matter of course.

Post stratification (e.g. weighting back to Census numbers or to registration numbers or whatever) more likely introduces non-sampling error. The problem here is that there is an assumption that coverage errors are

random.

Then of course, there is non-response, which is what Zogby is complaining about vis a vis phones.

Andy Beveridge

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Charles Kadushin

Sent: Tuesday, September 21, 2004 9:35 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: Weights and confidence intervals (was Pew vs Gallup)

Correct when the strata are minimal or none as is often the case. Not correct when the data are weighted. Usually, there are two sources of weighting. One is the design weights -- number of voice lines into the household and the number of persons in the household, and the second is the post-stratification weights -- adjustments for demographic differences in non-response. They are multiplied. If the weights do not have much of a range, then design effects are small. If they do have considerable range and there are a fair number of cases with high or low weights, then the design effects are not trivial. Try it out with the correct software. You cannot do these calculations by formulae. Rather, both jackknife and Taylor series are iterative numerical processes. Most of our statistical thinking dates to the days before the widespread availability of computers that can do these processes in relatively little time. The folks at Westat (Wesvar), SAS (SUDDAN), or Stata will be happy to sell you their software. Not worth it to program it yourself. New editions of the software can do either jackknife or Taylor series. In my experience, they all produce the same results. Hurrah for science.

At 07:03 PM 9/20/2004 -0700, Doug Rivers wrote:

>There seems to be some confusion about the design of the surveys in  
>question. Most of the ones being discussed are either RDD (with a  
>single respondent per household) or RBS (which is a SRS). In either  
>case the design effect is either exactly one or indistinguishable from one.

>  
>It is correct that all of these surveys are weighted and that this is  
>not reflected in the standard error calculations. However, the weights  
>do not come from unequal probabilities of selection, but from  
>post-stratification. The assumptions needed for post-stratification to  
>work are, of course, controversial, but \*if\* nonresponse is ignorable,  
>the standard errors for post-stratification can be (and usually are)  
>smaller than those assuming SRS.

>  
>Here is an example. Suppose we divide the sample into 2 categories,  
>with p being the population proportion in the first category and q the  
>corresponding sample proportion. Suppose we want to estimate the mean  
>of some variable which has the same variance  $s^2$  in each subpopulation  
>and we draw a sample of size n with ignorable nonresponse. Then the  
>variance of the sample mean calculated assuming SRS is  $s^2/n$ , while the  
>variance of the weighted mean is  $p^2 s^2/qn + (1-p)^2 s^2/(1-q)n = [p^2$

>(1-q) +  
>(1-p)^2q]/q(1-q) \* s^2/n. The factor on the left is never greater than  
>one with equality iff p=q.

>  
>So I don't think design effects are very important here. This does  
>\*not\* mean that the standard error calculations give an accurate  
>indication of total survey error, however.

>  
>Doug Rivers

>  
>-----  
>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](mailto: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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Tue, 21 Sep 2004 12:07:13 -0400  
Reply-To: [ptuckel@HUNTER.CUNY.EDU](mailto:ptuckel@HUNTER.CUNY.EDU)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Peter Tuckel <[ptuckel@HUNTER.CUNY.EDU](mailto:ptuckel@HUNTER.CUNY.EDU)>  
Subject: only cell phone households  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8bit

Harry O'Neill and I presented data on only cell phone users at the AAPOR conference in Phoenix. The data were based on a random sample of approximately 2000 respondents interviewed in their homes in February/March 2004. We found that just 2.5 percent of adults reported belonging to "only cellular households." The figure was somewhat higher among certain subgroups such as 18-24 year olds (3.4%) and renters (3.8%).

It appears that, as of now, only cellular households are not a major impediment to reaching respondents. The problem derives more from call screening (primarily through Caller ID) and respondent refusals.

Peter Tuckel  
Hunter College

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

Date: Tue, 21 Sep 2004 12:17:36 -0400  
Reply-To: "Sand Mountain Comm." <[sandmtn@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:sandmtn@MINDSPRING.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Sand Mountain Comm." <[sandmtn@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:sandmtn@MINDSPRING.COM)>  
Subject: Push Polling v. Message Development  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[0I4E006FKA27LG@chimmx03.algx.net](mailto:0I4E006FKA27LG@chimmx03.algx.net)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I come at this issue as a professional political consultant who conducts both survey research and paid media. Here are my thoughts on how to differentiate.

1. Timing- Message development comes relatively early during the election cycle. It may come in January or February for a June or July Primary. It would typically come after primaries (and any runoffs) for a general election. Push polling tends to come in the last three weeks or even the last few days of the election. Message development is used as a tool for fine-tuning the paid media message, and part of the determination of whether it's push-polling or development has to be whether it is early enough to actually be used for message development given the lead time for various types of paid media. Note however that you may legitimately do message development on negative issues well into the campaign if issues emerge that were previously unknown.

2. Length of survey - Were enough questions asked that it appears to be a "real" survey. For development surveys, we typically ask anywhere from 10 to 50 questions. We don't ask demographics, but take that information from the voter registration database, as it is more likely to be reliable. Also, we can't target direct mail or many other media based on information not in the voter database. For example, try targeting self-identified "conservative Christians" from the voter database alone. What we do typically ask is "Fav/Unfav" on a number of public figures, including the candidates in the race at issue. We will ask "does [incumbent name] deserve reelection or is it time for someone else". Head-to-head ballot test and possibly different runoff combinations in a three-or-more candidate race. Then we get to the issues. We will finish with a post-message-test rematch on the ballot test to gauge the effect of the various negative and positive messages taken as a whole.

If the only question asked is "would you be more or less likely to vote for [candidate name] if you knew he enjoys kicking puppies" is clearly a push-poll.

3. Sample size - If it's a legitimate survey, I would expect the sample to range from 250 (for a homogenous population in a geographically-compact



district with a candidate with limited funds) to as many as 3000-5000 in a statewide race where you are developing both message and targeting for direct mail. The very large sample size in mail targeting reflects both the scope of the budget for polling and for mailing, and the need to "drill down" several layers while still having large enough number of respondents in subsets of the sample.

4. - Some random thoughts.

You should understand that there is an additional technique called "Voter ID" where we call every likely voter in the district (or in a subset of the district) and ask who they will vote for. No pretense is made of being a neutral survey, but we don't necessarily identify the sponsor, because we don't want to contaminate the respondents before we know their vote preference.

In my experience, phones are not a good medium for effective delivery of a negative message. No one trusts unknown callers, and you may have a backlash against your candidate for putting out negative information in a poorly-received medium. If you're going negative, do it in TV or direct mail where you have the opportunity to back up your claims with documentation, newspaper headlines, etc. If voters don't believe the message, they won't act on it. Also, push-polling seems to be done primarily by inexperienced candidates and "consultants" not by professional consulting firms with a reputation for good work and winning campaigns.

Finally, we sometimes do not allow the individual phoners to know the name of the candidate who is sponsoring the poll because we are afraid it will bias their work.

Todd Rehm  
Sand Mountain Communications, LLC

on 9/21/04 10:07 AM, Leo Simonetta at [simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM) wrote:

> When is a push poll a 'message test?'

>

> By SETH MULLER

> Arizona Daily Sun Staff Reporter

> 09/21/2004

>

> As the 1st Congressional District race between Paul Babbitt and Rick Renzi

> and the presidential election heats up, area registered voters can expect

> their phones to ring off the hook for a bevy of polls.

>

> While most polls are legitimate, some can have a hidden agenda of swaying

> the opinion of the person surveyed, rather than merely recording and

> statistically documenting it. Called "push polls," they gained attention  
> during the 2000 presidential election.  
>  
> SNIP  
>  
> On the surface, it sounds like push polling, but there's another gradient  
> that Northern Arizona University pollster Fred Solop suspects: message  
> testing.  
>  
> "It is difficult from the information provided to determine definitively  
> whether this is a push poll," Solop wrote in an e-mail correspondence  
> Monday. He responded to testimony provided about the surveys, reportedly  
> conducted last week.  
>  
> "I will say that from the vantage point of a respondent answering  
> questions, there is a fine line between a push poll and a 'message testing'  
> poll. A message testing poll presents information from different angles and  
> registers which appeals resonate best with the electorate."  
>  
> He added, "This information is then used to create advertising campaigns."  
>  
> Solop, who runs NAU's Social Research Laboratory, said that he always  
> encourages people to participate in polls and surveys. However, he said  
> that those who are concerned they're being drawn in to a push poll or  
> something less than ethical need to start asking questions themselves.  
>  
> "People have the right to know who is collecting information from them and  
> how this information is going to be used," Solop wrote. "If there is a  
> question about the legitimacy of a poll, people should feel comfortable  
> asking the interviewer who they work for and who is sponsoring the survey."  
>  
>  
> If the answer is less than complete or denied, the participant can conclude  
> the survey. Also, those who respond to a poll should be suspicious if it is  
> brief -- say, lasting less than five minutes. Usually, legitimate polls are  
> more thorough.  
>  
> Solop has taken a stand against push polls. In May, he filed a complaint  
> with the American Association for Public Opinion Research, charging a  
> survey during the Flagstaff city election was really a push poll designed  
> to campaign against three open-space bond issues.  
>  
> SNIP  
> --  
> 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](mailto: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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Tue, 21 Sep 2004 12:28:24 -0400  
Reply-To: "DeBell, Matthew" <[MDeBell@AIR.ORG](mailto:MDeBell@AIR.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "DeBell, Matthew" <[MDeBell@AIR.ORG](mailto:MDeBell@AIR.ORG)>  
Subject: Re: Weights and confidence intervals (was Pew vs Gallup)  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Charles Kadushin wrote:=20  
>The folks at Westat (Wesvar), SAS (SUDDAN), or Stata will be happy to  
sell=20  
>you their software.=20

There is also free software: <http://am.air.org>=20  
And the new version of SPSS apparently handles complex samples, too.

--  
Matthew DeBell, Ph.D.  
Research Analyst  
Education Statistics Services Institute  
American Institutes for Research  
1990 K St., NW, Suite 500  
Washington, DC 20006  
tel. 202-403-6503=20  
[mdebell@air.org](mailto:mdebell@air.org)

---

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

---

Date: Wed, 22 Sep 2004 11:14:49 -0400  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Frank Newport on NPR this AM  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

"NPR : Accuracy of Political Polling"  
Americans are inundated each day with results from the latest opinion

polls, results which often differ wildly. How can one poll show the President leading by 10 points, while another maintains the two candidates are in a dead heat? NPR's Steve Inskeep talks with Frank Newport, head of the Gallup Organization, about the accuracy and reliability of political polls  
<<http://www.npr.org/rundowns/segment.php?wfId=3930565>>

To download a player or to find solutions to common problems, please visit NPR's audio help page at <<http://www.npr.org/audiohelp/>>.

(I can't get it to download or run but I have been having regular problems with sound files)

--

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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Wed, 22 Sep 2004 11:37:17 -0400  
Reply-To: [JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM](mailto:JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "J. Ann Selzer" <[JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM](mailto:JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM)>  
Subject: A flurry of polls  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Like many of you, I'm getting a fair number of press calls about the differing findings. I'm left thinking the problem is in the unpublished details which would allow us to compare one poll to another. I've long complained that we all use the term "likely voter" but we fail to define it operationally. How would the same respondent answering the same way qualify differently or be counted differently (with weighting) for each of the polls you are trying to compare? Is there a way to do this exercise?

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.  
Selzer & Company, Inc.  
Des Moines, Iowa 50312  
515.271.5700

visit our website: [www.SelzerCo.com](http://www.SelzerCo.com)

E-mail address for purposes of this list: JAnnSelzer@aol.com; otherwise, contact JASelzer@SelzerCo.com.

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

=====  
Date: Wed, 22 Sep 2004 13:49:16 -0400  
Reply-To: Frank Rusciano <[rusciano@RIDER.EDU](mailto:rusciano@RIDER.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Frank Rusciano <[rusciano@RIDER.EDU](mailto:rusciano@RIDER.EDU)>  
Subject: Here we go again  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Just thought I'd muddy the waters with the latest from Zogby...  
<http://www.zogby.com/news/ReadNews868.html>

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

=====  
Date: Wed, 22 Sep 2004 14:54:35 -0400  
Reply-To: Howard Schuman <[hschuman@UMICH.EDU](mailto:hschuman@UMICH.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Howard Schuman <[hschuman@UMICH.EDU](mailto:hschuman@UMICH.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: A flurry of polls  
Comments: To: [aapor@asu.edu](mailto:aapor@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[97.4deb2db6.2e82f62d@aol.com](mailto:97.4deb2db6.2e82f62d@aol.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Is it naive to ask for the results of polls before they are weighted at all, to supplement whatever weighting and other manipulations each poll prefers? That should make time effects easier to disentangle.

J. Ann Selzer wrote:

>Like many of you, I'm getting a fair number of press calls about the  
>differing findings. I'm left thinking the problem is in the unpublished  
>details which  
>would allow us to compare one poll to another. I've long complained that we  
>all use the term "likely voter" but we fail to define it operationally. How  
>would the same respondent answering the same way qualify differently or be  
>counted differently (with weighting) for each of the polls you are trying to  
>compare? Is there a way to do this exercise?

>  
>  
>  
>J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.  
>Selzer & Company, Inc.  
>Des Moines, Iowa 50312  
>515.271.5700  
>  
>visit our website: [www.SelzerCo.com](http://www.SelzerCo.com)  
>  
>E-mail address for purposes of this list: [JAnnSelzer@aol.com](mailto:JAnnSelzer@aol.com); otherwise,  
>contact [JASelzer@SelzerCo.com](mailto:JASelzer@SelzerCo.com).  
>  
>-----  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>set aapornet nomail  
>On your return send: set aapornet mail  
>  
>  
>  
>

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

---

Date: Wed, 22 Sep 2004 15:53:17 -0400  
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <[mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Warren Mitofsky <[mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM)>  
Subject: 30 new state polls  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

For those of you who have not seen these polls there are 30 new presidential state polls conducted by the American Research Group. You can view them at: <http://www.americanresearchgroup.com/>

This seems like quite an undertaking with interesting results.

One thing missing on the ARG web site is the source of funding for these 30 polls. Maybe Dick Bennett can enlighten us.  
warren mitofsky

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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail  
=====

Date: Wed, 22 Sep 2004 17:18:41 -0400  
Reply-To: Charles Kadushin <[kadushin@BRANDEIS.EDU](mailto:kadushin@BRANDEIS.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Charles Kadushin <[kadushin@BRANDEIS.EDU](mailto:kadushin@BRANDEIS.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: 30 new state polls  
Comments: To: Warren Mitofsky <[mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[6.1.2.0.2.20040922153353.03cdfc58@mail.mindspring.com](mailto:6.1.2.0.2.20040922153353.03cdfc58@mail.mindspring.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Note margin of error calculator is, as stated before, incorrect. It is larger.

At 03:53 PM 9/22/2004 -0400, Warren Mitofsky wrote:

>For those of you who have not seen these polls there are 30 new  
>presidential state polls conducted by the American Research Group.  
>You can view them at: <http://www.americanresearchgroup.com/>  
>  
>This seems like quite an undertaking with interesting results.  
>  
>One thing missing on the ARG web site is the source of funding for these 30  
>polls. Maybe Dick Bennett can enlighten us.  
>warren mitofsky  
>  
>  
>MITOFSKY INTERNATIONAL  
>1776 Broadway, Suite 1708  
>New York, NY 10019  
>  
>212 980-3031  
>212 980-3107 Fax  
>  
>[www.mitofskyinternational.com](http://www.mitofskyinternational.com)  
>[mitofsky@mindspring.com](mailto:mitofsky@mindspring.com)  
>

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Wed, 22 Sep 2004 17:23:59 -0400  
Reply-To: "Meekins, Brian - BLS" <Meekins.Brian@BLS.GOV>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Meekins, Brian - BLS" <Meekins.Brian@BLS.GOV>  
Subject: Reminder Abstracts Due  
Comments: To: "aapornet@asu.edu" <aapornet@asu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain

> Second Conference on Telephone Survey Methodology  
> Reminder  
>  
> The deadline for submitting monograph abstracts is October 1. Please send  
> the abstracts or any questions about submitting to Clyde Tucker at  
> tucker\_c@bls.gov <mailto:tucker\_c@bls.gov> .  
>

---

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

---

Date: Wed, 22 Sep 2004 17:54:03 -0700  
Reply-To: Daniel Slotwiner <DSlotwiner@KNOWLEDGENETWORKS.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Daniel Slotwiner <DSlotwiner@KNOWLEDGENETWORKS.COM>  
Subject: Re: 30 new state polls  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

It's too bad they didn't ask a follow-up on the Colorado poll regarding the ballot initiative to distribute electoral votes proportionally. (This is not a criticism...I can think of several reasons why they didn't perhaps the initiative was not on the ballot yet, obtaining a reasonable sample size was cost-prohibitive, asking such a follow-up would have been imprudent due to question order effects etc.). =20

At any rate, has anyone seen or done any recent polling on the issue? The recent NYT article (<http://www.nytimes.com/2004/09/19/politics/campaign/19electoral.html>) doesn't report any poll results.

--Daniel Slotwiner

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Warren Mitofsky  
Sent: Wednesday, September 22, 2004 3:53 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu



Subject: 30 new state polls

For those of you who have not seen these polls there are 30 new presidential state polls conducted by the American Research Group. You can view them at: <http://www.americanresearchgroup.com/>

This seems like quite an undertaking with interesting results.

One thing missing on the ARG web site is the source of funding for these 30 polls. Maybe Dick Bennett can enlighten us.  
warren mitofsky

MITOFSKY INTERNATIONAL  
1776 Broadway, Suite 1708  
New York, NY 10019

212 980-3031  
212 980-3107 Fax

[www.mitofskyinternational.com](http://www.mitofskyinternational.com)  
[mitofsky@mindspring.com](mailto:mitofsky@mindspring.com)

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

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

-----  
Date: Thu, 23 Sep 2004 11:53:03 -0400  
Reply-To: "Dumont, Bryan" <[BDumont@APCOWORLDWIDE.COM](mailto:BDumont@APCOWORLDWIDE.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Dumont, Bryan" <[BDumont@APCOWORLDWIDE.COM](mailto:BDumont@APCOWORLDWIDE.COM)>  
Subject: Research Positions  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Research Positions - Global Public Affairs/Strategic Communications Firm

APCO Insight, the opinion research and message development division of APCO Worldwide, is adding research professionals. APCO is a global public affairs and strategic communications firm based in Washington, DC. APCO maintains offices in 21 cities throughout North America, Europe, and Asia. =20

APCO Insight is a fast-growing research organization offering a wide range of opinion and market research services. We specialize in using sophisticated qualitative and quantitative research techniques to guide reputation management, litigation and crisis communications, and issues management. We are also on the cutting-edge of proprietary brand research.=20

We provide research and strategic communications consulting for Fortune 500 companies, trade associations, NGO's and other clients from around the world. Our reputation and strategic positioning research is relied upon by senior executives at 6 of the Fortune 20. The work is always interesting and exciting, and we're often consulting at the highest levels on many of the front-page issues of our time.

We are adding research professionals at all levels to our Washington office, with possible opportunities for more senior professionals in our New York City, London and Brussels offices. We're looking for both junior-level candidates (1-3 years of experience in a fast-paced research organization), and mid- to senior-level professionals (5+ years of experience) who have applied research experience and a proven ability to develop and manage client relationships.=20

APCO offers an excellent working environment with great potential for career growth. We are a close-knit, collegial team looking for highly-motivated professionals to join us in an exciting period of growth for our firm. If you are interested, please send your resume to:

Bryan Dumont  
Vice President  
1615 L Street, NW  
Suite 900  
Washington, DC 20036

Or e-mail to [bdumont@apcoworldwide.com](mailto:bdumont@apcoworldwide.com)

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

---

Date: Thu, 23 Sep 2004 13:13:17 -0400  
Reply-To: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <[tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu](mailto:tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <[tmglp@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU](mailto:tmglp@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Pew vs Gallup  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
In-Reply-To: <[4150391A.4030003@marketsharescorp.com](mailto:4150391A.4030003@marketsharescorp.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit  
Content-disposition: inline

I've been following the discussion, and the news stories, about the current

discrepancies in the election polls and I'm puzzled by the "volatility" explanation that some have offered to explain it. The idea of volatility seems to come from the Pew experience that their national samples shifted quite a bit in successive waves spaced days apart. Volatility means (to me, at least) "subject to rapid or sudden change."

But if many voters are changing their minds a lot, would there not be a "Brownian motion" aspect to these movements? In other words, how does volatility at the individual level translate into a massive movement in overall opinion?

It makes more sense to me to think of some substantial numbers of voters as being ambivalent--riven with pretty clear, but conflicting messages and policy positions in relation to the candidates. (Example: "Bush is right on Iraq, wrong on the tax cuts.") In the old terms of Berelson & Lazarsfeld, they are "cross-pressured." We know that such voters are late deciders, are less committed to their candidates of choice, etc. They may be more subject to a variety of measurement effects in surveys, including question order, question wording, prompting for 'don't know' or leaning responses. I suppose they could also be more susceptible to events external to polls like: whatever is on the latest newscast or talk program.

Measurement of opinion on ambivalent voters is subject to larger measurement error, then. OK, but why would the error swing one way or another across many voters? Why would it be biasing rather than just larger random error?

Andy Kohut suggests voters may be 'unsettled,' which sounds to me like it might be a term for ambivalence.

If the explanation for the unusual polling discrepancies is: there are more ambivalent voters out there now than there were a few months ago, when the polls were in closer agreement . . . doesn't that run contrary to everything we thought we knew about how public opinion progresses through the long campaign, with more and more on each side becoming mobilized and making up their minds as the campaign unfolds?

I've had several friends ask me to explain what's going on, and (although I've had plenty to say in response) at bottom I remain puzzled. Has somebody got this figured out?

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>

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Thu, 23 Sep 2004 18:18:51 +0000  
Reply-To: [kfuse@MCHSI.COM](mailto:kfuse@MCHSI.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Koji Fuse <[kfuse@MCHSI.COM](mailto:kfuse@MCHSI.COM)>

Subject: Re: Ethics in Research  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Dear AAPOR Members:

I would greatly appreciate it if you could give me your seasoned advice on the following issue ASAP. Here's the situation I have. I have a client who apparently doesn't know the importance of confidentiality. The client attempts to use bar-coded envelopes to covertly identify each respondent for a mail survey, for example. Then, the client wants to use those responses to do a direct-mail campaign later to "target" each respondent.

Would you please give me an example of how to phrase the introductory part of a mail survey/telephone survey to let respondents know that their identity will be used for a direct-mail campaign while trying the best to maintain a higher response rate?

AAPOR Code of Ethics III.D.2 states as follows:

"Unless the respondent waives confidentiality for specified uses, we shall hold as privileged and confidential all information that might identify a respondent with his or her responses. We shall also not disclose or use the names of respondents for non-research purposes unless the respondents grant us permission to do so."

I interpret this part as our obligation to tell our respondents that when doing a direct-mail campaign, we do know how they answered the questions before. How would you phrase the introduction while not breaching our code of ethics?

Thank you very much for answering this stupid question. You can simply e-mail me at [koji.fuse@drake.edu](mailto:koji.fuse@drake.edu).

Cordially,

Koji Fuse  
Drake University

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

Date: Thu, 23 Sep 2004 15:39:55 -0400  
Reply-To: Sid Groeneman <[sid@GROENEMAN.COM](mailto:sid@GROENEMAN.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Sid Groeneman <[sid@GROENEMAN.COM](mailto:sid@GROENEMAN.COM)>  
Subject: Survey Measures of Cultural Relativism? Political Correctness?  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Requesting help finding questions/items designed to measure two concepts which might be somewhat esoteric in survey research: (1) cultural relativism

- that judgments about the morality of an action depends on the cultural context or setting; and (2) "political correctness". Please respond off-line with suggestions. If others are interested, I will forward or post useful replies.

Sid Groeneman  
Groeneman Research & Consulting, Inc.  
Bethesda, Maryland  
sid@groeneman.com <mailto:sid.grc@verizon.net> (new)  
<http://www.groeneman.com> <<http://www.groeneman.com/>>

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

=====  
Date: Thu, 23 Sep 2004 12:54:10 -0700  
Reply-To: Joel Moskowitz <[jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU](mailto:jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Joel Moskowitz <[jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU](mailto:jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU)>  
Subject: Informed consent language for online study  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

I would be grateful if someone was willing to share with me the informed consent language and consent procedures employed in a survey or cohort study that was administered over the Internet.

=====  
Joel M. Moskowitz, Ph.D.  
Director  
Center for Family and Community Health  
School of Public Health  
University of California, Berkeley  
WWW: <http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~sph/CFCH>

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

=====  
Date: Thu, 23 Sep 2004 17:03:35 -0400  
Reply-To: "James P. Murphy" <[jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM](mailto:jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "James P. Murphy" <[jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM](mailto:jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Ethics in Research  
Comments: To: [kfuse@MCHSI.COM](mailto:kfuse@MCHSI.COM), [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

If the survey is solely for the purpose of the direct mail campaign, =

then it's not legitimate research and I wouldn't even do it.

If the survey is jointly in the service of being a bona fide survey AND = getting names for targeted direct mail, then I would insert a question = asking respondents if they would be willing to receive information = (etc.). They check Yes or No. But before doing this you have to have the = client agree that those checking No (plus those with No Answer) will not = be turned over to them.

In the case of telephone I guess you would have to do this right up = front -- before they start answering questions. In the case of = self-administered mail, I think it could go anywhere. (But, again, we're = not even doing this if it's for the direct mail targeting only.)

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

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

From: Koji Fuse=20

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu=20

Sent: Thursday, September 23, 2004 2:18 PM

Subject: Re: Ethics in Research

Dear AAPOR Members:

I would greatly appreciate it if you could give me your seasoned advice = on the following issue ASAP. Here's the situation I have. I have a client who apparently doesn't know the importance of confidentiality. The client = attempts to use bar-coded envelopes to covertly identify each respondent for a = mail survey, for example. Then, the client wants to use those responses to do = a direct-mail campaign later to "target" each respondent.

Would you please give me an example of how to phrase the introductory = part of a mail survey/telephone survey to let respondents know that their = identity will be used for a direct-mail campaign while trying the best to = maintain a higher response rate?

AAPOR Code of Ethics III.D.2 states as follows:

"Unless the respondent waives confidentiality for specified uses, we = shall hold as privileged and confidential all information that might identify = a respondent with his or her responses. We shall also not disclose or use =

the names of respondents for non-research purposes unless the respondents = grant us permission to do so."

I interpret this part as our obligation to tell our respondents that = when doing a direct-mail campaign, we do know how they answered the questions before. How would you phrase the introduction while not breaching our = code of ethics?

Thank you very much for answering this stupid question. You can simply = e-mail me at [koji.fuse@drake.edu](mailto:koji.fuse@drake.edu).

Cordially,

Koji Fuse  
Drake University

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

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

---

Date: Thu, 23 Sep 2004 17:16:20 -0400  
Reply-To: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <[tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu](mailto:tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <[tmglp@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU](mailto:tmglp@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Informed consent language for online study  
Comments: To: Joel Moskowitz <[jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU](mailto:jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU)>, AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
In-Reply-To: <[6.0.1.1.2.20040923125322.027533b0@calmail.berkeley.edu](mailto:6.0.1.1.2.20040923125322.027533b0@calmail.berkeley.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit  
Content-disposition: inline

Check out the examples posted on the AAPOR.org website. Look under standards and best practices, then under IRB under that heading. Mary Losch's IRB taskforce put them up there earlier this year for just this purpose.

Tom

--On Thursday, September 23, 2004 12:54 PM -0700 Joel Moskowitz <[jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU](mailto:jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU)> wrote:

> I would be grateful if someone was willing to share with me the informed

> consent language and consent procedures employed in a survey or cohort  
> study that was administered over the Internet.

>  
>  
> =====

> Joel M. Moskowitz, Ph.D.  
> Director  
> Center for Family and Community Health  
> School of Public Health  
> University of California, Berkeley  
> WWW: <http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~sph/CFCH>

> =====  
>  
> -----

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

Thomas M. Guterbock                      Voice: (434)243-5223  
Director                      CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222  
Center for Survey Research              FAX: (434)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](mailto:TomG@virginia.edu)

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

-----  
Date: Thu, 23 Sep 2004 16:36:52 -0500  
Reply-To: [Mary.Losch@uni.edu](mailto:Mary.Losch@uni.edu)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mary Losch <[Mary.Losch@UNI.EDU](mailto:Mary.Losch@UNI.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Informed consent language for online study  
Comments: To: Joel Moskowitz <[jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.edu](mailto:jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.edu)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[6.0.1.1.2.20040923125322.027533b0@calmail.berkeley.edu](mailto:6.0.1.1.2.20040923125322.027533b0@calmail.berkeley.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Templates are now available for this on the AAPOR website. Click on Survey Methods, then IRBs, then Example Consent Documents. Best, Mary Losch

On 23 Sep 2004 at 12:54, Joel Moskowitz wrote:

> I would be grateful if someone was willing to share with me the informed  
> consent language and consent procedures employed in a survey or cohort  
> study that was administered over the Internet.

>  
>



> =====  
> Joel M. Moskowitz, Ph.D.  
> Director  
> Center for Family and Community Health  
> School of Public Health  
> University of California, Berkeley  
> WWW: <http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~sph/CFCH>  
> =====

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

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

Date: Fri, 24 Sep 2004 11:04:18 -0400  
Reply-To: Diane Bowers <[dbowers@casro.org](mailto:dbowers@casro.org)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Diane Bowers <[dbowers@CASRO.ORG](mailto:dbowers@CASRO.ORG)>  
Organization: CASRO  
Subject: Re: Ethics in Research  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

This is a clear violation of survey research standards of confidentiality and transparency: both AAPOR's and CASRO's Codes prohibit this, to coin a phrase, "mugging" (mailing under the guise of research). If it's legitimate research (and this has to be the primary purpose) then confidentiality rules unless the INFORMED respondent agrees to pass along his/her personal info and responses. It's best if the two purposes--survey research and a direct mail campaign were completely separated. While "mail" isn't directly targeted in "sugging" and "frugging" laws that apply to telephone and email communication, nevertheless the government's stance against misleading, confusing the public about "informational" vs. "commercial" purposes is very clear, as are our Codes. Diane Bowers, CASRO

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

From: "Koji Fuse" <[kfuse@MCHSI.COM](mailto:kfuse@MCHSI.COM)>  
To: <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
Sent: Thursday, September 23, 2004 2:18 PM  
Subject: Re: Ethics in Research

> Dear AAPOR Members:  
>  
> I would greatly appreciate it if you could give me your seasoned advice on the  
> following issue ASAP. Here's the situation I have. I have a client who  
> apparently doesn't know the importance of confidentiality. The client  
> attempts  
> to use bar-coded envelopes to covertly identify each respondent for a mail

> survey, for example. Then, the client wants to use those responses to do a  
> direct-mail campaign later to "target" each respondent.  
>  
> Would you please give me an example of how to phrase the introductory part  
of  
> a mail survey/telephone survey to let respondents know that their identity  
> will be used for a direct-mail campaign while trying the best to maintain  
a  
> higher response rate?  
>  
> AAPOR Code of Ethics III.D.2 states as follows:  
>  
> "Unless the respondent waives confidentiality for specified uses, we shall  
> hold as privileged and confidential all information that might identify a  
> respondent with his or her responses. We shall also not disclose or use  
the  
> names of respondents for non-research purposes unless the respondents  
grant us  
> permission to do so."  
>  
> I interpret this part as our obligation to tell our respondents that when  
> doing a direct-mail campaign, we do know how they answered the questions  
> before. How would you phrase the introduction while not breaching our code  
of  
> ethics?  
>  
> Thank you very much for answering this stupid question. You can simply  
e-mail  
> me at [koji.fuse@drake.edu](mailto:koji.fuse@drake.edu).  
>  
> Cordially,  
>  
> Koji Fuse  
> Drake University  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

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

---

Date: Fri, 24 Sep 2004 11:13:13 -0400  
Reply-To: Diane Bowers <[dbowers@casro.org](mailto:dbowers@casro.org)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Diane Bowers <[dbowers@CASRO.ORG](mailto:dbowers@CASRO.ORG)>  
Organization: CASRO  
Subject: Re: Informed consent language for online study  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Joel: Here is (scroll down) the section of CASRO's Code that addresses Internet Research, requiring prior opt-in to email contact for research. Also, I have included the model opt-in, opt-out language from CASRO's Privacy Protection Program. Keep in mind that your stated Privacy Policy must conform with your internet research practices. Hope this is helpful. Diane Bowers, CASRO

The unique characteristics of internet research require specific notice that the principle of respondent privacy applies to this new technology and data collection methodology. The general principle of this section of the Code is that survey research organizations will not use unsolicited emails to recruit respondents for surveys.

1. Research organizations are required to verify that individuals contacted for research by email have a reasonable expectation that they will receive email contact for research. Such agreement can be assumed when ALL of the following conditions exist:

- a. A substantive pre-existing relationship exists between the individuals contacted and the research organization, the client or the list owners contracting the research (the latter being so identified);
- b. Individuals have a reasonable expectation, based on the pre-existing relationship, that they may be contacted for research;
- c. Individuals are offered the choice to be removed from future email contact in each invitation; and,
- d. The invitation list excludes all individuals who have previously taken the appropriate and timely steps to request the list owner to remove them.

2. Research organizations are prohibited from using any subterfuge in obtaining email addresses of potential respondents, such as collecting email addresses from public domains, using technologies or techniques to collect email addresses without individuals' awareness, and collecting email addresses under the guise of some other activity.

3. Research organizations are prohibited from using false or misleading return email addresses when recruiting respondents over the Internet.

4. When receiving email lists from clients or list owners, research organizations are required to have the client or list provider verify that individuals listed have a reasonable expectation that they will receive email contact, as defined, in (1) above.

#### Model Language Opt-in, Opt-out

"Research Company" must confirm that you are willing (or unwilling) to be contacted for participation in survey research prior to our receipt and use of any personal, demographic, or operating information (as defined in our Privacy Policy and Statement) that you provide to us.

"Research Company" complies with all applicable privacy laws, regulations, and Industry Codes of Conduct as described specifically in our Privacy Policy and Statement (available from "address" or on our website at "website address").

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

From: "Joel Moskowitz" <jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU>

To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Sent: Thursday, September 23, 2004 3:54 PM

Subject: Informed consent language for online study

> I would be grateful if someone was willing to share with me the informed  
> consent language and consent procedures employed in a survey or cohort  
> study that was administered over the Internet.

>

>

> =====

> Joel M. Moskowitz, Ph.D.

> Director

> Center for Family and Community Health

> School of Public Health

> University of California, Berkeley

> WWW: <http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~sph/CFCH>

> =====

>

> -----

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

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

-----

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Fri, 24 Sep 2004 09:26:02 -0700

Reply-To: Doug Rivers <doug@POLIMETRIX.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Doug Rivers <doug@POLIMETRIX.COM>

Subject: Re: Informed consent language for online study

Comments: To: Diane Bowers <dbowers@casro.org>, AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

It is interesting to note the differences between our standards for email-based contact and phone or in-person contact. Telephone and in-person surveys would be impossible if we required a "substantive pre-existing relationship between the individuals contacted and the research organization." I don't think anyone doing refusal conversion for a non-internet survey complies with 1(c) or (d).=20

But these are certainly the standards for Internet research. I'm struck by the irony that at both the companies I am associated with, Knowledge Networks and Polimetrix, we make unsolicited phone calls to establish the required relationship with the respondent before emailing them. There are, of course, reasons other than privacy and anti-spam rules for using phone recruitment (and Polimetrix uses non-phone recruitment methods as well, but no unsolicited email).

Can anyone explain \*why\* the standards are so different for Internet research? I don't think it's because an email contact is more intrusive than a phone call or a visit to one's home (in fact, the reverse is probably true). One might argue that unsolicited emails are so cheap (relative to phone calls or in-person contacts) that they are more open to abuse (but that could be addressed by limiting the number of unsolicited emails; and the same objection would apply to robo-surveys).

Doug Rivers

=20

=20

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Diane Bowers

Sent: Friday, September 24, 2004 7:13 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: Informed consent language for online study

Joel: Here is (scroll down) the section of CASRO's Code that addresses Internet Research, requiring prior opt-in to email contact for research. Also, I have included the model opt-in, opt-out language from CASRO's Privacy Protection Program. Keep in mind that your stated Privacy Policy must conform with your internet research practices.

Hope this is helpful. Diane Bowers, CASRO

The unique characteristics of internet research require specific notice that the principle of respondent privacy applies to this new technology and data collection methodology. The general principle of this section of the Code is that survey research organizations will not use unsolicited emails to recruit respondents for surveys.

1. Research organizations are required to verify that individuals contacted for research by email have a reasonable expectation that they will receive email contact for research. Such agreement can be assumed when ALL of the following conditions exist:

a. A substantive pre-existing relationship exists between the individuals contacted and the research organization, the client or the list owners contracting the research (the latter being so identified);

b. Individuals have a reasonable expectation, based on the pre-existing relationship, that they may be contacted for research;

c. Individuals are offered the choice to be removed from future email contact in each invitation; and,

d. The invitation list excludes all individuals who have previously taken the appropriate and timely steps to request the list owner to remove them.

2. Research organizations are prohibited from using any subterfuge in obtaining email addresses of potential respondents, such as collecting email addresses from public domains, using technologies or techniques to collect email addresses without individuals' awareness, and collecting email addresses under the guise of some other activity.

3. Research organizations are prohibited from using false or misleading return email addresses when recruiting respondents over the Internet.



Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Fri, 24 Sep 2004 13:01:13 -0400  
Reply-To: Andrew A Beveridge <[andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU](mailto:andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Andrew A Beveridge <[andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU](mailto:andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU)>  
Subject: Same-Sex Partners and Marriage in NYC  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Below is a link to my Gotham Gazette demography column posted today.

Portrait of Same-Sex (Married) Couples  
by Andrew Beveridge  
September, 2004

With gay and lesbian marriages now legal in Massachusetts, court cases pending in that state and California, and President George W. Bush pushing for a constitutional amendment that would ban them, the issue of same-sex marriage is hardly a remote one.

How many New York same-sex couples would marry if they could? How many would then divorce? And how would they differ from heterosexual relationships?

<http://www.gothamgazette.com/article/demographics/20040924/5/1128>

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

=====  
Date: Fri, 24 Sep 2004 13:02:36 -0400  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Lots of names I recognize  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT



I was deeply tempted to include it all . . .

Public-opinion polls still partly an art

SHARON BEGLEY, The Wall Street Journal

Friday, September 24, 2004

[http://online.wsj.com/public/article/0,,SB109597804433626536,00.html?mod=to\\_days\\_free\\_feature](http://online.wsj.com/public/article/0,,SB109597804433626536,00.html?mod=to_days_free_feature)

(09-24) 06:32 PDT (AP) --

It is enough to bring tears to the eyes of researchers who labor mightily to put public-opinion polling on a scientific footing: Last week, the Gallup Organization had President Bush up by 13 percentage points, while the Pew Research Center had him and Sen. John Kerry dead even.

Time, then, to check in with the scientists who probe the arcana of random-digit dialing and demographic weighting, yet who wrestle with the fact that their work is as much art as science. "There is no god-given right way to do a survey," says sociologist Stanley Presser of the University of Maryland, College Park. "Lots of decisions, made at every step, can influence the results."

First, let's puncture the myth that the growing number of people who tell the poll taker to buzz off results in polls missing a certain kind of voter. (Curmudgeons for Kerry, perhaps?) Recent studies show no difference between cooperators and noncooperators, says sociologist Robert Groves of the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. In large part, that's because people refuse to cooperate for what he calls "shallow reasons" -- their favorite show is on, the kid is screaming -- that have nothing to do with political leanings.

People not reached at all are more problematic. Phone polls are conducted with random-digit dialing, which theoretically gives every phone the same statistical chance of being rung. But cellphone numbers are not included. As a result, an estimated 3 percent of mostly under-30 U.S. households have no chance of being polled.

An undercount of young voters is easy to spot and easy to fix, recent fulminating by political pundits notwithstanding. Poll takers always adjust raw results so their sample matches the demographic profile of eligible voters, says Nancy Belden, a partner in the survey firm Belden, Russonello & Stewart, Washington, D.C., and the president of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, or AAPOR. If the sample has only half the percentage of young people that the voting-age population does, for example, you count each of their responses double. Poll takers do the same for sex, education and income.

But adjusting for age may not capture the cell-only crowd. "My sense is that those with only cellphones are different from those in the same age group with land lines," says Cliff Zukin, professor of public policy at

Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J. "They're "probably more mobile, more urban." A straightforward age adjustment may not capture this, but no one is sure what else to do.

SNIP

As I said, art as much as science.

--

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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Fri, 24 Sep 2004 14:03:53 -0400  
Reply-To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <[Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU](mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <[Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU](mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Lots of names I recognize  
Comments: To: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain

I am truly amazed to read that " Recent studies show no difference between cooperators and noncooperators, says sociologist Robert Groves of the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. In large part, that's because people refuse to cooperate for what he calls "shallow reasons" -- their favorite show is on, the kid is screaming -- that have nothing to do with political leanings."

In the Spring 2004 issue of POQ the lead article -- certainly a "recent study" -- was "The Role of Topic Interest in Survey Participation Decisions" by Groves, Presser and Dipko. Quoting from the Summary and Conclusions, one reads "we found that persons cooperated at higher rates to surveys on topics of likely interest to them. The odds of cooperating are roughly 40 percent higher for topics of likely interest than for other topics."

There seems to be a little contradiction here. And the implications are legion. If one sees one party more united and committed to their standard bearer than the other, one would presume that there would be more willing cooperators from that party.

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: Leo Simonetta [mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM]  
Sent: Friday, September 24, 2004 12:03 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Lots of names I recognize

I was deeply tempted to include it all . . .

Public-opinion polls still partly an art

SHARON BEGLEY, The Wall Street Journal  
Friday, September 24, 2004

[http://online.wsj.com/public/article/0,,SB109597804433626536,00.html?mod=to\\_days\\_free\\_feature](http://online.wsj.com/public/article/0,,SB109597804433626536,00.html?mod=to_days_free_feature)

(09-24) 06:32 PDT (AP) --

It is enough to bring tears to the eyes of researchers who labor mightily to put public-opinion polling on a scientific footing: Last week, the Gallup Organization had President Bush up by 13 percentage points, while the Pew Research Center had him and Sen. John Kerry dead even.

Time, then, to check in with the scientists who probe the arcana of random-digit dialing and demographic weighting, yet who wrestle with the fact that their work is as much art as science. "There is no god-given right way to do a survey," says sociologist Stanley Presser of the University of Maryland, College Park. "Lots of decisions, made at every step, can influence the results."

First, let's puncture the myth that the growing number of people who tell the poll taker to buzz off results in polls missing a certain kind of voter. (Curmudgeons for Kerry, perhaps?) Recent studies show no difference between cooperators and noncooperators, says sociologist Robert Groves of the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. In large part, that's because people refuse to cooperate for what he calls "shallow reasons" -- their favorite show is on, the kid is screaming -- that have nothing to do with political leanings.

People not reached at all are more problematic. Phone polls are conducted with random-digit dialing, which theoretically gives every phone the same statistical chance of being rung. But cellphone numbers are not included. As a result, an estimated 3 percent of mostly under-30 U.S. households have no chance of being polled.

An undercount of young voters is easy to spot and easy to fix, recent fulminating by political pundits notwithstanding. Poll takers always adjust raw results so their sample matches the demographic profile of eligible voters, says Nancy Belden, a partner in the survey firm Belden, Russonello

& Stewart, Washington, D.C., and the president of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, or AAPOR. If the sample has only half the percentage of young people that the voting-age population does, for example, you count each of their responses double. Poll takers do the same for sex, education and income.

But adjusting for age may not capture the cell-only crowd. "My sense is that those with only cellphones are different from those in the same age group with land lines," says Cliff Zukin, professor of public policy at Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J. "They're "probably more mobile, more urban." A straightforward age adjustment may not capture this, but no one is sure what else to do.

SNIP

As I said, art as much as science.

--

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](mailto: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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Fri, 24 Sep 2004 14:10:22 -0400  
Reply-To: "Trussell, Norman" <[Norman.Trussell@NIELSENMEDIA.COM](mailto:Norman.Trussell@NIELSENMEDIA.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Trussell, Norman" <[Norman.Trussell@NIELSENMEDIA.COM](mailto:Norman.Trussell@NIELSENMEDIA.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Informed consent language for online study  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I understand your frustration Doug, and personally agree with you. =20  
However, as Jim Bason pointed out in a thread earlier this year, the  
real cost of an email is mainly borne by the recipient. Whereas with a  
phone call or mail piece the sender has a real cost and has to send them  
one at a time, with email they can send thousands at once. =20

Recipients of email also have the additional burden of sorting through

all the junk email they receive to find their important mail while running the risk of getting a virus or worm from the unsolicited mail. I was recently forced to change my primary home email address when it got to the point where 99% of my mail was spam. Until the nearly impossible task of implementing an effective means of controlling spam can be implemented, I wouldn't image that CASRO will bend on this.=20

Norm Trussell

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Doug Rivers  
Sent: Friday, September 24, 2004 12:26 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Informed consent language for online study

It is interesting to note the differences between our standards for email-based contact and phone or in-person contact. Telephone and in-person surveys would be impossible if we required a "substantive pre-existing relationship between the individuals contacted and the research organization." I don't think anyone doing refusal conversion for a non-internet survey complies with 1(c) or (d).=20

But these are certainly the standards for Internet research. I'm struck by the irony that at both the companies I am associated with, Knowledge Networks and Polimetrix, we make unsolicited phone calls to establish the required relationship with the respondent before emailing them. There are, of course, reasons other than privacy and anti-spam rules for using phone recruitment (and Polimetrix uses non-phone recruitment methods as well, but no unsolicited email).

Can anyone explain \*why\* the standards are so different for Internet research? I don't think it's because an email contact is more intrusive than a phone call or a visit to one's home (in fact, the reverse is probably true). One might argue that unsolicited emails are so cheap (relative to phone calls or in-person contacts) that they are more open to abuse (but that could be addressed by limiting the number of unsolicited emails; and the same objection would apply to robo-surveys).

Doug Rivers

=20  
=20

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Diane Bowers  
Sent: Friday, September 24, 2004 7:13 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Informed consent language for online study

Joel: Here is (scroll down) the section of CASRO's Code that addresses Internet Research, requiring prior opt-in to email contact for research. Also, I have included the model opt-in, opt-out language from CASRO's Privacy Protection Program. Keep in mind that your stated Privacy

Policy must conform with your internet research practices.  
Hope this is helpful. Diane Bowers, CASRO

The unique characteristics of internet research require specific notice that the principle of respondent privacy applies to this new technology and data collection methodology. The general principle of this section of the Code is that survey research organizations will not use unsolicited emails to recruit respondents for surveys.

1. Research organizations are required to verify that individuals contacted for research by email have a reasonable expectation that they will receive email contact for research. Such agreement can be assumed when ALL of the following conditions exist:

a. A substantive pre-existing relationship exists between the individuals contacted and the research organization, the client or the list owners contracting the research (the latter being so identified);

b. Individuals have a reasonable expectation, based on the pre-existing relationship, that they may be contacted for research;

c. Individuals are offered the choice to be removed from future email contact in each invitation; and,

d. The invitation list excludes all individuals who have previously taken the appropriate and timely steps to request the list owner to remove them.

2. Research organizations are prohibited from using any subterfuge in obtaining email addresses of potential respondents, such as collecting email addresses from public domains, using technologies or techniques to collect email addresses without individuals' awareness, and collecting email addresses under the guise of some other activity.

3. Research organizations are prohibited from using false or misleading return email addresses when recruiting respondents over the Internet.



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

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

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

---

Date: Fri, 24 Sep 2004 14:48:25 -0400  
Reply-To: dick halpern <[dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET](mailto:dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: dick halpern <[dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET](mailto:dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET)>  
Subject: Polling -- science or art -- or combination?  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: multipart/mixed; x-avg-checked=avg-ok-388F68B4;  
boundary="Boundary\_(ID\_NJ9TAU6kRx1qfuhPKoVqYw)"

--Boundary\_(ID\_NJ9TAU6kRx1qfuhPKoVqYw)  
Content-type: text/plain; x-avg-checked=avg-ok-388F68B4; charset=us-ascii;  
format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8bit

More from the WSJ re polling:

Wall Street Journal, September 24, 2004

By SHARON BEGLEY

Public-Opinion Polls  
Diverge Because They  
Are Still Partly an Art  
September 24, 2004; Page B1

It is enough to bring tears to the eyes of researchers who labor mightily to put public-opinion polling on a scientific footing: Last week, the Gallup Organization had President Bush up by 13 percentage points, while the Pew Research Center had him and Sen. John Kerry dead even.

Time, then, to check in with the scientists who probe the arcana of random-digit dialing and demographic weighting, yet who wrestle with the fact that their work is as much art as science.

"There is no god-given right way to do a survey," says sociologist Stanley



Presser of the University of Maryland, College Park. "Lots of decisions, made at every step, can influence the results."

First, let's puncture the myth that the growing number of people who tell the poll taker to buzz off results in polls missing a certain kind of voter. (Curmudgeons for Kerry, perhaps?) Recent studies show no difference between cooperators and non-cooperators, says sociologist Robert Groves of the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. In large part, that's because people refuse to cooperate for what he calls "shallow reasons" -- their favorite show is on, the kid is screaming -- that have nothing to do with political leanings.

People not reached at all are more problematic. Phone polls are conducted with random-digit dialing, which theoretically gives every phone the same statistical chance of being rung. But cellphone numbers are not included. As a result, an estimated 3% of mostly under-30 U.S. households have no chance of being polled.

An undercount of young voters is easy to spot and easy to fix, recent fulminating by political pundits notwithstanding. Poll takers always adjust raw results so their sample matches the demographic profile of eligible voters, says Nancy Belden, a partner in the survey firm Belden, Russonello & Stewart, Washington, D.C., and the president of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, or AAPOR. If the sample has only half the percentage of young people that the voting-age population does, for example, you count each of their responses double. Poll takers do the same for sex, education and income.

But adjusting for age may not capture the cell-only crowd. "My sense is that those with only cellphones are different from those in the same age group with land lines," says Cliff Zukin, professor of public policy at Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J. "They're "probably more mobile, more urban." A straightforward age adjustment may not capture this, but no one is sure what else to do.

Do you perform a similar adjustment for party affiliation? As my colleague John Harwood reported on Monday, the Gallup poll showing the Bush surge reflected a sample consisting of seven percentage points more Republicans than Democrats.

Gallup does not adjust for party self-identification, and neither do many other major polls. Zogby International, however, treats party affiliation, as given by voters in exit polls in 2000 and other recent elections, much like age or sex, increasing the weight of whichever party is undersampled.

But every scientist I asked has grave qualms about that. Party affiliation can change in four years, or even overnight, as Prof. Zukin found in a 2003 study: When people lean toward, say, a Republican, they then tell poll takers they are Republican. If more self-identified Republicans make the cut of "likely voters," then that reflects that more of the former are likely to vote.

Adjusting the results to make party representation "even" will then make the poll less accurate.

Which brings us to the challenge of determining who's a likely voter. Gallup uses seven questions, says Senior Gallup Poll Editor David Moore: How much thought have you given to the upcoming election for president? Do you know where people in your neighborhood go to vote? Have you ever voted in your election district? Do you vote always, nearly always, part of the time, or seldom? Do you plan to vote in November? In the 2000 election, did you vote for Bush or Gore, or not at all? On a numerical scale, how likely are you to vote?

Respondents can score up to seven. But the determination of who's a likely voter isn't based on raw score. Instead, Gallup notes the percentage of eligible voters who cast a ballot in 2000, roughly 55%, and takes the top 55% of scores. The responses of the bottom 45% don't count.

"When you see big changes week to week [in the horse-race polls] it's not necessarily that views of the candidates are changing," says Prof. Presser. What is changing, he and everyone else I spoke to suspects, is who makes the "likely" cutoff. "Someone who got all steamed up by the convention and said they were going to vote for Bush could easily have moved into the 'likely voter' group," says Prof. Presser, displacing someone leaning toward Kerry.

How? By getting more points for Gallup's questions on how much thought they've given to the race and how likely they are to vote.

You'd think that poll takers could validate their model of who's a likely voter by, basically, calling people back on Nov. 3 and asking, did you vote? "No one to my knowledge has ever done a validation study of a poll seven weeks out, and never a presidential poll," says Prof. Presser.

As I said, art as much as science.

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

--Boundary\_(ID\_NJ9TAU6kRx1qfuhPKoVqYw)  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-avg=cert;  
x-avg-checked=avg-ok-388F68B4  
Content-disposition: inline

---  
Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.  
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).  
Version: 6.0.752 / Virus Database: 503 - Release Date: 9/3/2004

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

On your return send: set aapornet mail

--Boundary\_(ID\_NJ9TAU6kRx1qfuhPKoVqYw)--

---

Date: Fri, 24 Sep 2004 12:06:27 -0700  
Reply-To: jdrovers@sfsu.edu  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: John Rogers <jdrovers@SFSU.EDU>  
Organization: Public Research Institute  
Subject: Re: Lots of names I recognize  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <0I4K00GKB25OB5@chimmx03.algx.net>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

So how do we reconcile post-stratification with the published "margin of error"? It would seem that the pollsters believe that it is a non-issue, but I am having great difficulty understanding the logic. If nonresponse was ignorable we wouldn't need to post-stratify in the first place. I am concerned because exaggerated claims of precision are bad for the credibility of all survey researchers in the long run. =20

John=20

-----  
John Rogers, PhD  
Associate Director  
Public Research Institute  
San Francisco State University  
jdrovers@sfsu.edu  
(415)405-3800  
<http://pri.sfsu.edu>=20

-----Original Message-----  
From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta  
Sent: Friday, September 24, 2004 9:03 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Lots of names I recognize

I was deeply tempted to include it all . . .

Public-opinion polls still partly an art

SHARON BEGLEY, The Wall Street Journal  
Friday, September 24, 2004

<http://online.wsj.com/public/article/0,,SB109597804433626536,00.html?mod=3D=>

to  
days\_free\_feature

(09-24) 06:32 PDT (AP) --

SNIP

An undercount of young voters is easy to spot and easy to fix, recent  
fulminating by political pundits notwithstanding. Poll takers always =  
adjust  
raw results so their sample matches the demographic profile of eligible  
voters, says Nancy Belden, a partner in the survey firm Belden, =  
Russonello &  
Stewart, Washington, D.C., and the president of the American Association =  
for  
Public Opinion Research, or AAPOR. If the sample has only half the  
percentage of young people that the voting-age population does, for =  
example,  
you count each of their responses double. Poll takers do the same for =  
sex,  
education and income.

SNIP

As I said, art as much as science.

--

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](mailto: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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Fri, 24 Sep 2004 15:23:00 -0400  
Reply-To: Diane Bowers <[dbowers@casro.org](mailto:dbowers@casro.org)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Diane Bowers <[dbowers@CASRO.ORG](mailto:dbowers@CASRO.ORG)>  
Organization: CASRO  
Subject: Re: Informed consent language for online study  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Doug: My simplistic explanation of "why" the rules are different for Internet research is that the Internet communication channel emerged through the evolution and the inter-networking of other networks such as ARPANET, USENET and BITNET. This communication channel developed its own set of accepted practices and behaviors that were set/driven by its "leadership" and the requirements of the channel (for example, it's easier to mask your identity, spam, etc.) These accepted practices and behaviors can basically be described as a permission-based approach with privacy rules that aim to protect privacy and prevent misrepresentation and fraud. The issue for researchers is that these practices are applied to online survey invitations.

The Internet and the privacy issues it raised have driven federal, state, and local government to take action. Telephone use for surveys was firmly entrenched before the Internet and the recent heightened concerns about privacy, misrepresentation and fraud. CASRO's Code on Internet Research when passed in 2000 became a threshold of acknowledgement of Internet users rights, ISP intervention, and, importantly, a recognition that government would be "stepping in" and regulating "spam." Now, 4 years later, the survey research industry not only is able to SUPPORT existing government regulation of SPAM (because we don't spam), but also we have strengthened the government's view of us as "self-regulatory."

Hope this helps. Diane

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

From: "Doug Rivers" <doug@POLIMETRIX.COM>  
To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
Sent: Friday, September 24, 2004 12:26 PM  
Subject: Re: Informed consent language for online study

It is interesting to note the differences between our standards for email-based contact and phone or in-person contact. Telephone and in-person surveys would be impossible if we required a "substantive pre-existing relationship between the individuals contacted and the research organization." I don't think anyone doing refusal conversion for a non-internet survey complies with 1(c) or (d).

But these are certainly the standards for Internet research. I'm struck by the irony that at both the companies I am associated with, Knowledge Networks and Polimetrix, we make unsolicited phone calls to establish the required relationship with the respondent before emailing them. There are, of course, reasons other than privacy and anti-spam rules for using phone recruitment (and Polimetrix uses non-phone recruitment methods as well, but no unsolicited email).

Can anyone explain *\*why\** the standards are so different for Internet research? I don't think it's because an email contact is more intrusive than a phone call or a visit to one's home (in fact, the reverse is

probably true). One might argue that unsolicited emails are so cheap (relative to phone calls or in-person contacts) that they are more open to abuse (but that could be addressed by limiting the number of unsolicited emails; and the same objection would apply to robo-surveys).

Doug Rivers

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Diane Bowers

Sent: Friday, September 24, 2004 7:13 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: Informed consent language for online study

Joel: Here is (scroll down) the section of CASRO's Code that addresses Internet Research, requiring prior opt-in to email contact for research. Also, I have included the model opt-in, opt-out language from CASRO's Privacy Protection Program. Keep in mind that your stated Privacy Policy must conform with your internet research practices. Hope this is helpful. Diane Bowers, CASRO

The unique characteristics of internet research require specific notice that the principle of respondent privacy applies to this new technology and data collection methodology. The general principle of this section of the Code is that survey research organizations will not use unsolicited emails to recruit respondents for surveys.

1. Research organizations are required to verify that individuals contacted for research by email have a reasonable expectation that they will receive email contact for research. Such agreement can be assumed when ALL of the following conditions exist:

a. A substantive pre-existing relationship exists between the individuals contacted and the research organization, the client or the list owners contracting the research (the latter being so identified);

b. Individuals have a reasonable expectation, based on the pre-existing relationship, that they may be contacted for research;

c. Individuals are offered the choice to be removed from future email contact in each invitation; and,

d. The invitation list excludes all individuals who have previously taken the appropriate and timely steps to request the list owner to remove them.

2. Research organizations are prohibited from using any subterfuge in obtaining email addresses of potential respondents, such as collecting email addresses from public domains, using technologies or techniques to collect email addresses without individuals' awareness, and collecting email addresses under the guise of some other activity.

3. Research organizations are prohibited from using false or misleading return email addresses when recruiting respondents over the Internet.

4. When receiving email lists from clients or list owners, research organizations are required to have the client or list provider verify that individuals listed have a reasonable expectation that they will receive email contact, as defined, in (1) above.

#### Model Language Opt-in, Opt-out

"Research Company" must confirm that you are willing (or unwilling) to be contacted for participation in survey research prior to our receipt and use of any personal, demographic, or operating information (as defined in our Privacy Policy and Statement) that you provide to us.

"Research Company" complies with all applicable privacy laws, regulations, and Industry Codes of Conduct as described specifically in our Privacy Policy and Statement (available from "address" or on our website at "website address").

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

From: "Joel Moskowitz" <jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU>  
To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
Sent: Thursday, September 23, 2004 3:54 PM  
Subject: Informed consent language for online study

> I would be grateful if someone was willing to share with me the  
> informed consent language and consent procedures employed in a survey

> or cohort study that was administered over the Internet.  
>  
>  
> =====  
> Joel M. Moskowitz, Ph.D.  
> Director  
> Center for Family and Community Health School of Public Health  
> University of California, Berkeley  
> WWW: <http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~sph/CFCH>  
> =====  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
> [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

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

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

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

-----  
Date: Fri, 24 Sep 2004 15:30:28 -0400  
Reply-To: Mike Margolis <[Michael.Margolis@UC.EDU](mailto:Michael.Margolis@UC.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mike Margolis <[Michael.Margolis@UC.EDU](mailto:Michael.Margolis@UC.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Weighting Election Polls & Pew vs Gallup  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
In-Reply-To: <[200409220520.AWN00687@mprelay2.uc.edu](mailto:200409220520.AWN00687@mprelay2.uc.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" ; format="flowed"

### A Pollster's Song

(with apologies to Maxwell Anderson & Kurt Weill)

When I was a young man a-pollin' for views,  
I never played a weightin' game;  
If someone refused me and said "no" like a churl,  
I'd let the ol' world take a couple of twirls,  
And I'd try them again but never by phone,  
And as time came around they came my way,



As time came around, they came.

Now the campaigns all run from March to November,  
And the time grows short when you reach September;  
When attack adverts make opinions inflame,  
Pollsters have no choice but the weighting game.  
Oh, the days dwindle down to a hurried few...  
Sep-tem-ber...No-vem-ber...  
And these few hurried days I'll poll your view,  
These hurried days  
I'll weight it too.

--

Michael Margolis                      Tel: 513-556-3310  
Department of Political Science      Fax: 513-556-2314  
University of Cincinnati  
P.O. Box 210375  
Cincinnati, OH 45221-0375

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

=====  
Date:      Fri, 24 Sep 2004 16:15:59 -0400  
Reply-To:   MMBlum@AOL.COM  
Sender:     AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From:      Mark Blumenthal <MMBlum@AOL.COM>  
Subject:    Annoucing Mystery Pollster  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="UTF-8"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Colleagues,

For those of you who don't know me, I am an active AAPOR member  
and  
a  
political pollster for the Democratic firm of Bennett, Petts &  
Blumenthal.  
I  
wanted to let you know that I have launched a personal Weblog (a  
blog) devoted to  
an ongoing discussion of the science and art of political polling. It is  
called Mystery Pollster and the full URL (for now) is  
\_http://mysterypollster.typepad.com\_ (<http://mysterypollster.typepad.com>)  
.  
=

At the most basic level, I am hoping to help political junkies who  
frequent  
the various political blogs on the Internet do a better job of reading and

evaluating political surveys. As the recent discussion here has shown, political polls have never been more ubiquitous, yet never more challenged.

On the

Internet, hundreds of thousands of bloggers read and debate each new poll and

speculate about the meaning of issues like weighting, non-response, cell phones, likely voter screens, yet I am struck by the pervasive lack of knowledge

in the blogosphere of the most basic concepts of survey research. It has never

been more important for those of us who poll for a living to do a better job

of explaining what we do.

I have written a somewhat longer mission statement of sorts that appears on

the blog at this link:

[http://mysterypollster.typepad.com/main/2004/09/in\\_medias\\_res.html](http://mysterypollster.typepad.com/main/2004/09/in_medias_res.html)  
([http://mysterypollster.typepad.com/main/2004/09/in\\_medias\\_res.html](http://mysterypollster.typepad.com/main/2004/09/in_medias_res.html))

I would highly value comments, suggestions, corrections and criticisms on the material I have posted on the site. Please feel to email me at [mdblum@aol.com](mailto:mdblum@aol.com)

Also, I know what I don't know, so I will surely want to draw upon the

unparalleled expertise of the members of AAPORNet from time to time to help fill

in gaps in my own personal knowledge or perhaps contribute something to the

site.

Thank you & best regards,

Mark Blumenthal

P.S. The mystery is in name only. I fully disclose my identity on the blog. If you're curious about why I've named it as I have, it's all explained

here: [http://mysterypollster.typepad.com/main/2004/09/no\\_mystery\\_.html](http://mysterypollster.typepad.com/main/2004/09/no_mystery_.html)  
([http://mysterypollster.typepad.com/main/2004/09/no\\_mystery\\_.html](http://mysterypollster.typepad.com/main/2004/09/no_mystery_.html))

---

Mark M. Blumenthal  
Bennett, Petts & Blumenthal  
1010 Wisconsin NW, Suite 208  
Washington, DC 20007  
202-342-0700  
202-342-0330 (fax)  
[mdblum@aol.com](mailto:mdblum@aol.com)

-----

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

Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Fri, 24 Sep 2004 13:20:01 -0700  
Reply-To: Hank Zucker <[hank@surveysystem.com](mailto:hank@surveysystem.com)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Hank Zucker <[hank@SURVEYSYSTEM.COM](mailto:hank@SURVEYSYSTEM.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Informed consent language for online study  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The CASRO position might be justifiable on the basis of PR for the research industry, but not on the basis of the cost or burden to a recipient of an email invitation vs. a phone call. The incremental cost of one more email is essentially zero. The burden of glancing at the title and/or sender of an email message is far less than the burden of answering a phone call.

When you get a call, you usually have to get up, often go to a different room, pick up the phone, listen to a sentence or two, and give a reply. All this requires far, far more time and effort than deciding whether to delete one more email message.

I certainly do not minimize the aggregate burden of SPAM. It wastes my time, too - every day. But survey research is not responsible for a significant fraction of it.

In this era of rising refusal rates, PR is probably a sufficient reason to adopt the CASRO position, but I can't think of any other reason that an email invitation without a prior relationship is worse than a phone call.

Hank Zucker

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

From: "Trussell, Norman" <[Norman.Trussell@NIELSENMEDIA.COM](mailto:Norman.Trussell@NIELSENMEDIA.COM)>  
To: <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
Sent: Friday, September 24, 2004 11:10 AM  
Subject: Re: Informed consent language for online study

I understand your frustration Doug, and personally agree with you. However, as Jim Bason pointed out in a thread earlier this year, the real cost of an email is mainly borne by the recipient. Whereas with a phone call or mail piece the sender has a real cost and has to send them one at a time, with email they can send thousands at once.

Recipients of email also have the additional burden of sorting through all the junk email they receive to find their important mail while running the risk of getting a virus or worm from the unsolicited mail. I was recently forced to change my primary home email address when it

got to the point where 99% of my mail was spam. Until the nearly impossible task of implementing an effective means of controlling spam can be implemented, I wouldn't image that CASRO will bend on this.

Norm Trussell

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Doug Rivers  
Sent: Friday, September 24, 2004 12:26 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Informed consent language for online study

It is interesting to note the differences between our standards for email-based contact and phone or in-person contact. Telephone and in-person surveys would be impossible if we required a "substantive pre-existing relationship between the individuals contacted and the research organization." I don't think anyone doing refusal conversion for a non-internet survey complies with 1(c) or (d).

But these are certainly the standards for Internet research. I'm struck by the irony that at both the companies I am associated with, Knowledge Networks and Polimetrix, we make unsolicited phone calls to establish the required relationship with the respondent before emailing them. There are, of course, reasons other than privacy and anti-spam rules for using phone recruitment (and Polimetrix uses non-phone recruitment methods as well, but no unsolicited email).

Can anyone explain *\*why\** the standards are so different for Internet research? I don't think it's because an email contact is more intrusive than a phone call or a visit to one's home (in fact, the reverse is probably true). One might argue that unsolicited emails are so cheap (relative to phone calls or in-person contacts) that they are more open to abuse (but that could be addressed by limiting the number of unsolicited emails; and the same objection would apply to robo-surveys).

Doug Rivers

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Diane Bowers  
Sent: Friday, September 24, 2004 7:13 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Informed consent language for online study

Joel: Here is (scroll down) the section of CASRO's Code that addresses Internet Research, requiring prior opt-in to email contact for research. Also, I have included the model opt-in, opt-out language from CASRO's Privacy Protection Program. Keep in mind that your stated Privacy Policy must conform with your internet research practices. Hope this is helpful. Diane Bowers, CASRO

The unique characteristics of internet research require specific notice that the principle of respondent privacy applies to this new technology and data collection methodology. The general principle of this section of the Code is that survey research organizations will not use unsolicited emails to recruit respondents for surveys.

1. Research organizations are required to verify that individuals contacted for research by email have a reasonable expectation that they will receive email contact for research. Such agreement can be assumed when ALL of the following conditions exist:

a. A substantive pre-existing relationship exists between the individuals contacted and the research organization, the client or the list owners contracting the research (the latter being so identified);

b. Individuals have a reasonable expectation, based on the pre-existing relationship, that they may be contacted for research;

c. Individuals are offered the choice to be removed from future email contact in each invitation; and,

d. The invitation list excludes all individuals who have previously taken the appropriate and timely steps to request the list owner to remove them.

2. Research organizations are prohibited from using any subterfuge in obtaining email addresses of potential respondents, such as collecting email addresses from public domains, using technologies or techniques to collect email addresses without individuals' awareness, and collecting email addresses under the guise of some other activity.

3. Research organizations are prohibited from using false or misleading return email addresses when recruiting respondents over the Internet.

4. When receiving email lists from clients or list owners, research organizations are required to have the client or list provider verify

that individuals listed have a reasonable expectation that they will receive email contact, as defined, in (1) above.

## Model Language Opt-in, Opt-out

"Research Company" must confirm that you are willing (or unwilling) to be contacted for participation in survey research prior to our receipt and use of any personal, demographic, or operating information (as defined in our Privacy Policy and Statement) that you provide to us.

"Research Company" complies with all applicable privacy laws, regulations, and Industry Codes of Conduct as described specifically in our Privacy Policy and Statement (available from "address" or on our website at "website address").

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

From: "Joel Moskowitz" <jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU>

To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Sent: Thursday, September 23, 2004 3:54 PM

Subject: Informed consent language for online study

> I would be grateful if someone was willing to share with me the  
> informed consent language and consent procedures employed in a survey  
> or cohort study that was administered over the Internet.

>

>

> =====

> Joel M. Moskowitz, Ph.D.

> Director

> Center for Family and Community Health School of Public Health

> University of California, Berkeley

> WWW: <http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~sph/CFCH>

> =====

>

> -----

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

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

> [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

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

Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

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

Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

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

---

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

---

Date: Fri, 24 Sep 2004 23:10:20 -0700  
Reply-To: [phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU](mailto:phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Phillip J. Trounstine" <[phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU](mailto:phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU)>  
Subject: cellphones  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Isn't it clear that the problem posed by cell-phone-olnies (are they CPOs??) is simply not addressable by weighting because this distinct population is not represented in our RDD samples at all (unless respondents call forward to their cell phones)? CPOs can't be weighted up to their demographic proportion because they aren't there to be weighted in the first place. In my family, two our five 20-something children are CPOs. They can't be surveyed, unless a pollster is willing to call them on their cellphones which could catch them when they are driving (raising ghastly liability issues) and which would cause them to have to pay for the minutes on their phones (is that even legal)? I know this was discussed in detail at Phoenix. But has anyone brainstormed an approach that can address what looks to be a growing problem? It may not happen this year, but at some point the failure to include CPOs in polling will certainly cause a disconnection between surveys and an election outcome. We've already seen what absentees can do to exit polling. It's just a matter of time before our inability to survey CPOs will have an effect.

Phil Trounstine  
Survey and Policy Research Institute  
at San Jose State University  
408-924-6993  
[phil.trounstine@sjsu.edu](mailto:phil.trounstine@sjsu.edu)

Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>

Sent by: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
09/24/2004 10:02 AM  
Please respond to Leo Simonetta

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
cc:  
Subject: Lots of names I recognize

I was deeply tempted to include it all . . .

Public-opinion polls still partly an art

SHARON BEGLEY, The Wall Street Journal  
Friday, September 24, 2004

[http://online.wsj.com/public/article/0,,SB109597804433626536,00.html?mod=to\\_days\\_free\\_feature](http://online.wsj.com/public/article/0,,SB109597804433626536,00.html?mod=to_days_free_feature)

(09-24) 06:32 PDT (AP) --

It is enough to bring tears to the eyes of researchers who labor mightily to put public-opinion polling on a scientific footing: Last week, the Gallup Organization had President Bush up by 13 percentage points, while the Pew Research Center had him and Sen. John Kerry dead even.

Time, then, to check in with the scientists who probe the arcana of random-digit dialing and demographic weighting, yet who wrestle with the fact that their work is as much art as science. "There is no god-given right way to do a survey," says sociologist Stanley Presser of the University of Maryland, College Park. "Lots of decisions, made at every step, can influence the results."

First, let's puncture the myth that the growing number of people who tell the poll taker to buzz off results in polls missing a certain kind of voter. (Curmudgeons for Kerry, perhaps?) Recent studies show no difference between cooperators and noncooperators, says sociologist Robert Groves of the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. In large part, that's because people refuse to cooperate for what he calls "shallow reasons" -- their favorite show is on, the kid is screaming -- that have nothing to do with political leanings.

People not reached at all are more problematic. Phone polls are conducted with random-digit dialing, which theoretically gives every phone the same statistical chance of being rung. But cellphone numbers are not included. As a result, an estimated 3 percent of mostly under-30 U.S. households have no chance of being polled.

An undercount of young voters is easy to spot and easy to fix, recent fulminating by political pundits notwithstanding. Poll takers always



adjust

raw results so their sample matches the demographic profile of eligible voters, says Nancy Belden, a partner in the survey firm Belden, Russonello & Stewart, Washington, D.C., and the president of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, or AAPOR. If the sample has only half the percentage of young people that the voting-age population does, for example, you count each of their responses double. Poll takers do the same for sex, education and income.

But adjusting for age may not capture the cell-only crowd. "My sense is that those with only cellphones are different from those in the same age group with land lines," says Cliff Zukin, professor of public policy at Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J. "They're "probably more mobile, more urban." A straightforward age adjustment may not capture this, but no one is sure what else to do.

SNIP

As I said, art as much as science.

--

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](mailto: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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Fri, 24 Sep 2004 23:42:37 -0700  
Reply-To: Jerold Pearson <[jpearson@STANFORD.EDU](mailto:jpearson@STANFORD.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jerold Pearson <[jpearson@STANFORD.EDU](mailto:jpearson@STANFORD.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: cellphones  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[OF10260922.732BE109-ON88256F1A.001F87AA-88256F1A.0021B929@sjsu.edu](mailto:OF10260922.732BE109-ON88256F1A.001F87AA-88256F1A.0021B929@sjsu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

>It may not happen this year, but at some point the failure to include CPOs

>in polling will

>certainly cause a disconnection between surveys and an election outcome.

I, for one, am willing to go on the record and say it WILL happen this year. That combined with all the hundreds of thousands (or more) of newly registered voters who are not being included. Combined also with likely voter models that underestimate a tidal wave of anti-Bush sentiment among first-time voters, and are flat out are wrong. I don't do political polling, and I'm sure the heavyweights in the business are smarter than I am. But I think there is major coverage error that they are in denial about. Statistical sleight of hand will not pull their chestnuts out of the metaphorical fire.

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>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Sat, 25 Sep 2004 21:45:50 -0400  
Reply-To: [MMBlum@AOL.COM](mailto:MMBlum@AOL.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mark Blumenthal <[MMBlum@AOL.COM](mailto:MMBlum@AOL.COM)>  
Subject: Announcing Mystery Pollster (Text only)  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8bit

Apologies for the garbled formatting - resending a clear copy below:  
-----

Colleagues,

For those of you who don't know me, I am an active AAPOR member and a political pollster for the Democratic firm of Bennett, Petts & Blumenthal. I wanted to let you know that I have launched a personal Weblog ("blog") devoted to an ongoing discussion of the science and art of political polling. It is called Mystery Pollster and the full URL (for now) is <http://mysterypollster.typepad.com>.

At the most basic level, I am hoping to help political junkies who frequent the various political blogs on the Internet do a better job of reading and evaluating political surveys. As the recent discussion here has shown, political polls have never been more ubiquitous, yet never more challenged. On the Internet, hundreds of thousands of bloggers read and debate each new poll

and speculate about the meaning of issues like weighting, non-response, cell phones, likely voter screens, yet I am struck by the pervasive lack of knowledge in the blogosphere of the most basic concepts of survey research. It has never been more important for those of us who poll for a living to do a better job of explaining what we do.

I have written a somewhat longer mission statement of sorts that appears on the blog at this link:

[http://mysterypollster.typepad.com/main/2004/09/in\\_medias\\_res.html](http://mysterypollster.typepad.com/main/2004/09/in_medias_res.html)

I would highly value comments, suggestions, corrections and criticisms on the material I have posted on the site. Please feel to email me at [mdblum@aol.com](mailto:mdblum@aol.com)

Also, I know what I don't know, so I will surely want to draw upon the unparalleled expertise of the members of AAPORNet from time to time to help fill in gaps in my own personal knowledge or perhaps contribute something to the site.

Thank you & best regards,

Mark Blumenthal

P.S. The mystery is in name only. I fully disclose my identity on the blog.

If you're curious about why I've named it as I have, it's all explained here:

[http://mysterypollster.typepad.com/main/2004/09/no\\_mystery\\_.html](http://mysterypollster.typepad.com/main/2004/09/no_mystery_.html)

---

Mark M. Blumenthal  
Bennett, Petts & Blumenthal  
1010 Wisconsin NW, Suite 208  
Washington, DC 20007  
202-342-0700  
202-342-0330 (fax)  
[mdblum@aol.com](mailto:mdblum@aol.com)

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

Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Sun, 26 Sep 2004 07:42:09 -0400  
Reply-To: [jtanur@NOTES.CC.SUNYSB.EDU](mailto:jtanur@NOTES.CC.SUNYSB.EDU)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Judith Tanur <[jtanur@NOTES.CC.SUNYSB.EDU](mailto:jtanur@NOTES.CC.SUNYSB.EDU)>  
Subject: Job posting  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
Comments: cc: [glenzer@brooklyn.cuny.edu](mailto:glenzer@brooklyn.cuny.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

CHILDREN'S STUDIES

Assistant/Associate Professor to teach child-centered courses and study the experience and outcomes for children and youth of the New York Child

Welfare System. This position provides the opportunity of breaking new ground in urban child policy research. Must be familiar with policy research experience in the child welfare sector and relevant major ongoing child research in the social sciences.

Here is the official full description of the position as it is posted on the CUNY as well as Brooklyn College websites.

<http://portal.cuny.edu/cms/id/cuny/documents/jobposting/008277.htm>

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

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Sun, 26 Sep 2004 11:27:34 -0400  
Reply-To: "Eyerman, Joe D." <[eyerman@RTI.ORG](mailto:eyerman@RTI.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Eyerman, Joe D." <[eyerman@RTI.ORG](mailto:eyerman@RTI.ORG)>  
Subject: SAPOR Conference Program is available  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

The program for 2004 SAPOR annual conference is available at <http://www.irss.unc.edu/irss/sapor/2004/ConferenceInfo.html>. The conference will be held on October 7-8 in Raleigh, NC. There is still time to register and participate. =20

The keynote address will be "Paying the Human Costs of War: American Public Opinion and the War in Iraq" by Dr. Christopher F. Gelpi.=20

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).  
=20

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

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Mon, 27 Sep 2004 09:29:54 -0400  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Subject: Polling put to court test  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Unsnipped article at:  
[http://www.usatoday.com/money/2004-09-26-harris\\_x.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/money/2004-09-26-harris_x.htm)

Polling put to court test  
By Leslie Cauley, USA TODAY

NEW YORK - It's the Harris Poll question you'll never see: Does Harris bend its research to favor clients?

In January, Verizon sued archrival Yellow Book, accusing the company of using skewed research - conducted by Harris Interactive - to convince advertisers that Yellow Book is more popular than the Verizon SuperPages. The SuperPages directories claim a circulation of about 111 million; Yellow Book has a circulation of about 71 million. The two compete head-on for advertising dollars in 120 markets across the USA.

In an evidentiary hearing to determine liability, Harris acknowledged that it changed its methodology after Yellow Book complained that its early findings on household usage were too low. After the changes, Yellow Book's usage numbers rose.

SNIP

As part of its defense, Yellow Book tried to show that Gallup, which does market research for Verizon, also altered its methods.

Scott Ahlstrand, a principal consultant with Gallup, says the difference is that Gallup didn't make changes to favor Verizon.

"We would never change methodology to achieve better results," says Ahlstrand, who testified for Verizon. Moreover, he adds, "We would step away from a project if we thought we were being forced into a certain set of results."

SNIP

Research professionals recoil at the idea of pollsters doctoring methodology to suit clients.

"Public polling is a public trust," says Mark Schulman, the chairman of standards for the Council of American Survey Research Organizations. As such, he says impartiality is critical.

Nancy Belden, president of the American Association For Public Opinion Research, agrees. "Survey researchers' first priority is to find the truth."

SNIP

Yellow Book's own expert witness, Samuel Popkin, testified that the shift favored Yellow Book. But he also criticized Gallup's work.

By the end of the hearing, Yellow Book appeared to be breaking ranks with Harris.

SNIP

The parties are girding for round two. Weinstein recently issued a preliminary decision on liability, but it remains under seal. A jury trial to determine damages - assuming the parties don't settle first - is set for Dec. 13.

--

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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Mon, 27 Sep 2004 12:49:01 -0400  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Polls Are Wrong, Plus Or Minus  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Normally I'd have saved this for the VOX BOX but since it need registration I thought I'd send it to the list.

Polls Are Wrong, Plus Or Minus  
Surveys Miss Part Of Under-30 Crowd, But Significance Uncertain

September 27, 2004  
By TARA WEISS, Courant Staff Writer  
<http://www.ctnow.com/news/politics/hc-poll.artsep27,1,4630276.story?coll=hc-headlines-politics>  
(REQUIRES REGISTRATION)

As a self-appointed cheerleader for John Kerry's presidential campaign, filmmaker Michael Moore implored Democrats last week not to throw in the

towel.

The polls are wrong, Moore wrote on his website.

"They are polling 'likely voters,'" he wrote. "'Likely' means those who have consistently voted in the past few elections. So that cuts out young people who are voting for the first time. ... Second, they are not polling people who use their cellphone as their primary phone. Again, that means they are not talking to young people."

Moore isn't exactly right. But he isn't exactly wrong.

Pollsters agree that it's tough to get the under-30 crowd because they're transient and many have only cellphones, which pollsters are not allowed to call. Some pollsters are anticipating a changed polling landscape in the future as more people use only cellphones and the Internet to communicate.

SNIP

"The question is, do I not include them [in a mathematical formula] and underrepresent them, or include them and overrepresent them," said Chris Barnes, associate director of the Center for Survey Research and Analysis at the University of Connecticut. "It's a balance. They don't show up to vote. We say every election year that this will be the year for the younger voter, but it hasn't been the year, ever. If they do, they could cause a big problem. No one would expect them."

SNIP

It's a sensitive issue for pollsters.

In an interview with Newsday columnist Jimmy Breslin, John Zogby, head of the polling firm Zogby International, said that people who use land lines for surveys are "in denial."

Through a publicist, Zogby hedged his earlier contention, saying that he "sees it growing to be an issue, but by no way is it a crisis."

SNIP

Some pollsters are trying to find under-30s where they live - the Internet. The biweekly poll Zogby International and The Wall Street Journal Online invites 18- to 25-year-olds in the 16 battleground states to participate in an online survey. They place ads for the poll on websites they are likely to visit and have a vetting process that allows users to participate only once. But even that's not going to provide an accurate sampling.

"If you want to include young people without access to a computer, it's a problem," said Donovan.

Even if the youth vote increases, Jeff Jones, managing editor of the Gallup Poll, said it's unlikely to seriously affect the election. Voter turnout was highest - 55 percent - in 1972, the first election after the voting age was lowered, and 1992. That's what Gallup is predicting for this election.

"A lot of people who criticize the poll expect turnout to increase by nine points over what it was in 2000," said Jones. "I would love it if that were the case, but I'm skeptical that that many more people will turn out to vote than they did last time. I ran some computer models and for every 1 percent increase in turnout, that means an extra 4 million people come out as compared to the 2000 election. It's easy to toss around numbers, but they don't realize how many more people are necessary to change an election."

--

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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Mon, 27 Sep 2004 15:43:29 -0400  
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <[mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Warren Mitofsky <[mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Polls Are Wrong, Plus Or Minus  
Comments: To: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <[0I4P00LQWLJ4Y7@chimmx05.algx.net](mailto:0I4P00LQWLJ4Y7@chimmx05.algx.net)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

A 1 percent increase in national presidential turnout is closer to 2 million people, not 4 million as the quote from Jeff Jones, editor of the Gallup Poll says.

At 12:49 PM 9/27/2004, Leo Simonetta wrote:

>for every 1  
>percent increase in turnout, that means an extra 4 million people come out  
>as compared to the 2000 election. It's easy to toss around numbers, but  
>they don't realize how many more people are necessary to change an  
>election."

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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Mon, 27 Sep 2004 18:12:30 -0500  
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Subject: Job Announcement  
Comments: To: [AAPORNet@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Please respond directly to the individual below.=20

=20

=20

Democratic public opinion firm seeks Executive Assistant to the President for immediate hire. Primary responsibilities include coordinating materials between staff and the President, keeping track of a busy schedule, updating and assisting with presentations, reimbursements, and multiple administrative tasks. Must be extremely detail oriented and able to multitask in a rapidly moving environment. Previous admin experience, college degree, and proficiency with Microsoft Office a must.

=20

Email resume and cover letter to [info@lspa.com](mailto:info@lspa.com) <<mailto:info@lspa.com>>  
Attn: COO

or=20

Fax resume and cover letter 202-776-9074 Attn: COO

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

---

Date: Mon, 27 Sep 2004 18:17:25 -0500  
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>

Subject: Second Job Announcement  
Comments: To: AAPORNet@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Please respond directly to the Individual below:=20

=20

=20

Mid-level Analyst / Project Manager

=20

Mid- level analyst/project manager position available for national public opinion research company. Current project involves SPSS data analysis of five large, national population-based studies involving transportation and occupant safety issues. Other projects may include telephone, mail, Internet and in-person national and state studies on public health, customer satisfaction, and government policy. Responsibilities will include all aspects of management of study activities on survey research projects, including working with clients and investigators to develop protocols, sampling plans, questionnaires, testing CATI programs, documenting study procedures, developing and implementing quality control procedures, abstracting and synthesizing data using SPSS, oversight of study and sample databases, and preparing and editing study materials such as reports, PowerPoint presentations and proposals.=20

=20

Qualifications: 3 + years experience in survey research. BA in social science or related field. Advance degree preferred. Excellent SPSS skills. Ability to write and communicate well and to manage multiple projects. Requires excellent attention to detail.=20

=20

Organization Description: Schulman, Ronca & Bucuvalas, Inc. (SRBI) is a full-service global strategy and research organization specializing in public policy and opinion surveys, banking and finance, telecommunications, media, energy, transportation, insurance and health care. Quantitative and qualitative research studies are conducted by Internet, mail, in-person and by telephone from our four interviewing centers with over 300 CATI stations. Clients include major financial institutions, Fortune 500 companies, federal, state and local governments, foundations and universities. SRBI has an established track record of providing high quality, timely and cost effective research and analysis. In addition to its headquarters in New York City, SRBI has offices in Washington D.C., Florida, New Jersey, Tennessee and Nova Scotia. Excellent benefits include medical and dental, flex spending accounts, 401K. We are located in downtown Silver Spring, convenient to the red line metro.=20

=20

Contact Name: Julie McCormack, Analyst=20

Contact Location: SRBI, 8403 Colesville Road, Silver Spring MD 20910=20

Contact Email: mdjobs@srbi.com=20

Web Address: <http://www.srbi.com>=20

How to Apply: E-mail resume and cover letter to [mdjob@srbi.com](mailto:mdjob@srbi.com). Please include job code MD60901 on subject line.=20

No calls please.=20

Additional Information: For more information about SRBI visit our website at [www.srbi.com](http://www.srbi.com)=20

=20

=20

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

=====  
Date: Tue, 28 Sep 2004 09:20:40 -0400  
Reply-To: Frank Rusciano <[rusciano@RIDER.EDU](mailto:rusciano@RIDER.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Frank Rusciano <[rusciano@RIDER.EDU](mailto:rusciano@RIDER.EDU)>  
Subject: The MoveOn.org ad in the New York Times  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <6.1.1.1.2.20040917230713.01efcab0@pop.mindspring.com>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; format=flowed; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Dear fellow AAPORneters,

I assume that many of you have already read the full-page ad in the New York Times by MoveOn.org criticizing Gallup's results on the Presidential election survey and casting suspicion on the motives of its current leader. While I often sympathize with MoveOn's causes, I don't feel comfortable with this kind of attack, for three reasons. First, it criticizes Gallup out of context-- that is, without describing the polling methods of other survey organizations. Second, it includes a personal attack by innuendo, suggesting that a pollster would deliberately slant results to fit their ideological bent. Morally, this is wrong; practically, if MoveOn plays this game, they will find the other side is much more adept at it than they are. Finally, I don't find the problem so much with the Gallup polls as with the news coverage on them. I respect Bill Schneider a great deal, but I noticed last

night in his report to Paula Zahn that neither of them discussed one important aspect of the results-- Bush's support has declined by five points in the last week or so; that corresponds with the Time magazine poll (also an outlier) which showed an eight-point drop in Bush's lead in the past two weeks. Instead, Zahn said "Didn't the Kerry campaign think they had a good week, and why were they wrong?" In fact, the results, taken as in trend terms, show they were not wrong-- a five point change in your favor in a week suggests the strategy is working very well. Perhaps instead of killing the messenger, MoveOn.org should concentrate on telling the reporters to get the message of the data right--something we have discussed endlessly in this space.

Frank Rusciano

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

=====

Date: Tue, 28 Sep 2004 14:16:07 -0400  
Reply-To: martin plissner <[plissner@VERIZON.NET](mailto:plissner@VERIZON.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: martin plissner <[plissner@VERIZON.NET](mailto:plissner@VERIZON.NET)>  
Subject: Gallup Selection of "soft" Bush and Kerry supporters for  
October

8 debate.

Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

=20

The Memorandum of Understanding between the Bush and Kerry campaigns =  
which  
the Commission on Presidential Debates has said it will apply over the =  
next  
few weeks

assigns a key role to survey research. For the October 8 debate at  
Washington University in Saint Louis, questions will be posed by between =  
100  
and 150 voters in the St. Louis area who will be "nationally =  
demographically  
representative" and composed equally of "soft Bush" and "soft Kerry"  
supporters. The "Gallup Organization" is tasked by name with this  
assignment and is called upon by September 24 (last Friday) to "provide =  
a  
comprehensive briefing on the methodology to the campaigns" and secure  
their approval. Could someone from Gallup advise whether this has been  
done, or when it will be?

=20

Marty Plissner

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

---

Date: Tue, 28 Sep 2004 19:18:44 -0700  
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <[lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM](mailto:lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leora Lawton <[lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM](mailto:lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM)>  
Subject: Re: The MoveOn.org ad in the New York Times  
Comments: To: Frank Rusciano <[rusciano@RIDER.EDU](mailto:rusciano@RIDER.EDU)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[41596528.6030400@rider.edu](mailto:41596528.6030400@rider.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

MoveOn did exactly what Frank thought they should do, and they apologized for its shooting the messenger.

leora lawton

On Tue, 28 Sep 2004, Frank Rusciano wrote:

> Date: Tue, 28 Sep 2004 09:20:40 -0400  
> From: Frank Rusciano <[rusciano@RIDER.EDU](mailto:rusciano@RIDER.EDU)>  
> To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
> Subject: [AAPORNET] The MoveOn.org ad in the New York Times  
>  
> Dear fellow AAPORneters,  
>  
> I assume that many of you have already read the full-page ad in the New  
> York Times by MoveOn.org criticizing Gallup's results on the  
> Presidential election survey and casting suspicion on the motives of its  
> current leader. While I often sympathize with MoveOn's causes, I don't  
> feel comfortable with this kind of attack, for three reasons. First, it  
> criticizes Gallup out of context-- that is, without describing the  
> polling methods of other survey organizations. Second, it includes a  
> personal attack by innuendo, suggesting that a pollster would  
> deliberately slant results to fit their ideological bent. Morally, this  
> is wrong; practically, if MoveOn plays this game, they will find the  
> other side is much more adept at it than they are. Finally, I don't  
> find the problem so much with the Gallup polls as with the news coverage  
> on them. I respect Bill Schneider a great deal, but I noticed last  
> night in his report to Paula Zahn that neither of them discussed one  
> important aspect of the results-- Bush's support has declined by five  
> points in the last week or so; that corresponds with the Time magazine  
> poll (also an outlier) which showed an eight-point drop in Bush's lead  
> in the past two weeks. Instead, Zahn said "Didn't the Kerry campaign  
> think they had a good week, and why were they wrong?" In fact, the

> results, taken as in trend terms, show they were not wrong-- a five  
> point change in your favor in a week suggests the strategy is working  
> very well. Perhaps instead of killing the messenger, MoveOn.org should  
> concentrate on telling the reporters to get the message of the data  
> right--something we have discussed endlessly in this space.

>  
> Frank Rusciano

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

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

---

Date: Wed, 29 Sep 2004 10:49:45 +0800  
Reply-To: Mahar Mangahas <[mahar.mangahas@SWS.ORG.PH](mailto:mahar.mangahas@SWS.ORG.PH)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mahar Mangahas <[mahar.mangahas@SWS.ORG.PH](mailto:mahar.mangahas@SWS.ORG.PH)>  
Subject: request to be listed  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Dear AAPOR,

I'm an AAPOR member (ID # 10892, exp 12/31/04), and would like to be included in the AAPORNET. Thank you --

Mahar Mangahas

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

---

Date: Wed, 29 Sep 2004 09:18:31 -0400  
Reply-To: "Featherston, Fran A." <[ffeather@NSF.GOV](mailto:ffeather@NSF.GOV)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Featherston, Fran A." <[ffeather@NSF.GOV](mailto:ffeather@NSF.GOV)>  
Subject: AAPORNET and my office's spam filters  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

I apologize for bothering all of you, but Mike Flanagan and Monica Frihart are both "out of office" and I need something today if possible.

Has anyone else had AAPORNET messages bounce back due to your office's spam filters? If so, please send me a copy of the title of the message so that I can send to our network people. Please send back to me and NOT the entire list. I will put a message back out if I learn anything significant about this issue.

Thanks,  
(fran)

Fran Featherston  
National Science Foundation  
4201 Wilson Blvd.  
Arlington, VA 22230  
703-292-4221  
ffeather@nsf.gov

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

Date: Wed, 29 Sep 2004 09:23:33 -0400  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: A Request to Partisans: Don't Shoot the Pollster  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

#### ADVERTISING

A Request to Partisans: Don't Shoot the Pollster  
By JIM RUTENBERG  
<http://www.nytimes.com/2004/09/29/politics/campaign/29poll.html>  
Published: September 29, 2004

WASHINGTON, Sept. 28 - There has been no shortage of targets for partisans of all persuasions this election season. But one group has come under fire from all sides: pollsters, who in these polarized times have become the political equivalent of lawyers.

The latest attack came Tuesday from the liberal activist group MoveOn.org, which ran a full-page advertisement in The New York Times criticizing the Gallup Organization for polling that showed President Bush comfortably ahead of Senator John Kerry, the Democratic presidential nominee. Saying that the polling is biased toward Republicans, the advertisement implies the reason is that George Gallup Jr., the son of the poll's founder, is an evangelical Christian.

Several other organizations, including The New York Times and The Los Angeles Times, had come under criticism earlier when one campaign or the other has been displeased with the results of their polls.

SNIP

--

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>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Wed, 29 Sep 2004 11:11:52 -0500  
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Organization: Market Shares Corporation  
Subject: Re: Gallup Selection of "soft" Bush and Kerry supporters for  
October 8 debate.  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <000001c4a587\$7c8893b0\$6600a8c0@marty>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=windows-1252; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

I copied and pasted the section from the Memorandum of Understanding related to the Town Forum after Marty's message below. The agreement is 32 pages long.

From paragraph 7(f). "At least fourteen (14) days prior to October 8, Gallup shall provide a comprehensive briefing on the selection methodology to the campaigns, and both the Kerry-Edwards Campaign and the Bush-Cheney Campaign shall approve the methodology. Either campaign may raise objections on the methodology to Gallup and to the Commission within twenty-four (24) hours of the briefing."

In the passage above, the campaigns are allowed 24 hours to raise objections. Perhaps objections are in the process of being negotiated.

Also from paragraph 7(f) "The moderator shall ensure that an \*equal number\* of "soft" Bush supporters and "soft" Kerry supporters pose questions to the candidates. These participants will be selected by the Gallup Organization ("Gallup"). Gallup shall have responsibility for selecting the nationally demographically representative group of voters."

Moreover, there is no requirement for public release of methodology perhaps because doing so would alert "hard" candidate supporters on how to evade the selection process, a concern raised on this listserve before.

Re: "nationally demographically representative group of voters" above. At first glance I thought this meant a national group of voters. I think "a group of voters demographically representative of the nation" is what was intended. By necessity, they must surely all reside in or near



theSt. Louis Metro.

Nick

martin plissner wrote:

>  
>  
>The Memorandum of Understanding between the Bush and Kerry campaigns which  
>the Commission on Presidential Debates has said it will apply over the next  
>few weeks  
>  
>assigns a key role to survey research. For the October 8 debate at  
>Washington University in Saint Louis, questions will be posed by between 100  
>and 150 voters in the St. Louis area who will be "nationally demographically  
>representative" and composed equally of "soft Bush" and "soft Kerry"  
>supporters. The "Gallup Organization" is tasked by name with this  
>assignment and is called upon by September 24 (last Friday) to "provide a  
>comprehensive briefing on the methodology to the campaigns" and secure  
>their approval. Could someone from Gallup advise whether this has been  
>done, or when it will be?  
>  
>  
>  
>Marty Plissner  
>  
>  
>

#### MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (RE: October 8 Town Forum)

##### 7. Additional Rules Applicable to October 8 Debate

The October 8 debate will be conducted in an audience participation ("town hall") format. This debate shall be governed by the rules set forth in section 5 and the following additional rules:

(a) There shall be no audience participation in the October 8 debate other than as described below. Other than an audience member asking a question as permitted by this section, at the start of the October 8 debate and in the event of and in each instance whereby an audience member(s) attempts to participate in the debate by any means thereafter, the moderator shall instruct the audience to refrain from any participation in the debate as described in section 9(a) (viii) below. The moderator shall facilitate audience members in asking questions to each of the candidates, beginning with the candidate determined by the procedure set forth in subparagraph 5(h). The candidate to whom the question is initially directed shall have up to two (2) minutes to respond, after which the other candidate shall have up to one and one-half minutes to respond to the question and/or to comment on the first candidate's answer. Thereafter, the moderator, in his or her discretion, may extend the/discussion of that question for sixty (60) seconds, but the moderator shall begin each such discussion by calling

upon the candidate who first received the question. The moderator shall balance additional discussion of the question with the interest in addressing a wide range of topics during the debate. To the extent that the moderator opens extended discussion; the moderator shall use best efforts to ensure that each candidate has a maximum of approximately thirty (30) seconds to comment in the extended discussion period.

(b) After completion of the discussion of the first question, the moderator shall call upon an audience member to direct a question to the candidate to whom the first question was not directed, and follow the procedure outlined in paragraph 7(a) above. Thereafter, the moderator shall follow the procedures in this paragraph by calling upon another audience member to ask a question of the first candidate and shall continue facilitating questions of the candidates in rotation until the time for closing statements occurs.

(c) During the extended discussion of a question, no candidate may speak for more than thirty (30) seconds.

(d) The audience members shall not ask follow-up questions or otherwise participate in the extended discussion, and the audience member's microphone shall be turned off after he or she completes asking the question.

(e) Prior to the start of the debate, audience members will be asked to submit their questions in writing to the moderator. No third party, including both the Commission and the campaigns, shall be permitted to see the questions. The moderator shall approve and select all questions to be posed by the audience members to the candidates. The moderator shall ensure that the audience members pose to the candidates an equal number of questions on foreign policy and homeland security on the one hand and economic and domestic policy on the other. The moderator will further review the questions and eliminate any questions that the moderator deems inappropriate. At least seven (7) days before the October 8 debate the moderator shall develop, and describe to the campaigns, a method for selecting questions at random while assuring that questions are reasonably well balanced in terms of addressing a wide range of issues of major public interest facing the United States and the world. Each question selected will be asked by the audience member submitting that question. If any audience member poses a question or makes a statement that is in any material way different than the question that the audience member earlier submitted to the moderator for review, the moderator will cut-off the questioner and advise the audience that such nonreviewed questions are not permitted. Moreover, the Commission shall take appropriate steps to cut-off the microphone of any such audience member that attempts to pose any question or statement different than that previously posed to the moderator for review.

(f) The debate will take place before a live audience of between 100 and 150 persons who shall be seated and who describe themselves as likely voters who are "soft" Bush supporters or "soft" Kerry supporters as to their 2004 presidential vote. The number of "soft" Bush supporters shall equal the number of "soft" Kerry supporters in the audience. The moderator shall ensure that an equal number of "soft" Bush supporters

and "soft" Kerry supporters pose questions to the candidates. These participants will be selected by the Gallup Organization ("Gallup"). Gallup shall have responsibility for selecting the nationally demographically representative group of voters. At least fourteen (14) days prior to October 8, Gallup shall provide a comprehensive briefing on the selection methodology to the campaigns, and both the Kerry-Edwards Campaign and the Bush-Cheney Campaign shall approve the methodology. Either campaign may raise objections on the methodology to Gallup and to the Commission within twenty-four (24) hours of the briefing.

(g) Participants selected shall not be contacted directly or indirectly by the campaigns before the debate. The Commission shall not contact the participants before the debate other than for logistical purposes.

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

Date: Wed, 29 Sep 2004 14:04:53 -0400  
Reply-To: "Featherston, Fran A." <[ffeather@NSF.GOV](mailto:ffeather@NSF.GOV)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Featherston, Fran A." <[ffeather@NSF.GOV](mailto:ffeather@NSF.GOV)>  
Subject: The hypotheses so far on the spam filter  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Thanks to those of you who replied on my problems with the SPAM filters at NSF. Basically, our computer people won't be able to solve the problem until I get better information on the exact time of the rejected message and/or its content. Thanks to those of you who reminded me that AAPORNET includes the word, "porn." I passed that along, too.

Many messages ARE getting through, so I haven't noticed that I'm missing anything.

If you have other ideas, please send along.

(fran)

Fran Featherston  
National Science Foundation  
4201 Wilson Blvd.  
Arlington, VA 22230  
703-292-4221  
[ffeather@nsf.gov](mailto:ffeather@nsf.gov)

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

From: Featherston, Fran A. [<mailto:ffeather@NSF.GOV>]  
Sent: Wednesday, September 29, 2004 9:19 AM  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Subject: AAPORNET and my office's spam filters

I apologize for bothering all of you, but Mike Flanagan and Monica Frihart are both "out of office" and I need something today if possible.  
Has anyone else had AAPORNET messages bounce back due to your office's spam

filters? If so, please send me a copy of the title of the message so that I can send to our network people. Please send back to me and NOT the entire list. I will put a message back out if I learn anything significant about this issue.

Thanks,  
(fran)

Fran Featherston  
National Science Foundation  
4201 Wilson Blvd.  
Arlington, VA 22230  
703-292-4221  
ffeather@nsf.gov

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

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

=====  
Date: Wed, 29 Sep 2004 10:36:51 -0700  
Reply-To: Doug Strand <[dstrand@CSM.BERKELEY.EDU](mailto:dstrand@CSM.BERKELEY.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Doug Strand <[dstrand@CSM.BERKELEY.EDU](mailto:dstrand@CSM.BERKELEY.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: The MoveOn.org ad in the New York Times  
Comments: To: Leora Lawton <[lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM](mailto:lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[20040928191802.K87701@synergy.transbay.net](mailto:20040928191802.K87701@synergy.transbay.net)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Leora,

Where is such an apology? I don't find it on the moveon.org website or mentioned in a news search.

-Doug Strand  
-----

Douglas Strand, Ph.D.  
Project Director  
Public Agendas and Citizen Engagement Survey (PACES)  
Survey Research Center  
UC Berkeley  
354 Barrows Hall  
Tel: 510-642-0508  
Fax: 510-642-9665

At 07:18 PM 9/28/2004 -0700, Leora Lawton wrote:

>MoveOn did exactly what Frank thought they should do, and they apologized  
>for its shooting the messenger.

>  
>leora lawton  
>  
>On Tue, 28 Sep 2004, Frank Rusciano wrote:  
>  
>> Date: Tue, 28 Sep 2004 09:20:40 -0400  
>> From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>  
>> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>> Subject: [AAPORNET] The MoveOn.org ad in the New York Times  
>>  
>> Dear fellow AAPORneters,  
>>  
>> I assume that many of you have already read the full-page ad in the New  
>> York Times by MoveOn.org criticizing Gallup's results on the  
>> Presidential election survey and casting suspicion on the motives of its  
>> current leader. While I often sympathize with MoveOn's causes, I don't  
>> feel comfortable with this kind of attack, for three reasons. First, it  
>> criticizes Gallup out of context-- that is, without describing the  
>> polling methods of other survey organizations. Second, it includes a  
>> personal attack by innuendo, suggesting that a pollster would  
>> deliberately slant results to fit their ideological bent. Morally, this  
>> is wrong; practically, if MoveOn plays this game, they will find the  
>> other side is much more adept at it than they are. Finally, I don't  
>> find the problem so much with the Gallup polls as with the news coverage  
>> on them. I respect Bill Schneider a great deal, but I noticed last  
>> night in his report to Paula Zahn that neither of them discussed one  
>> important aspect of the results-- Bush's support has declined by five  
>> points in the last week or so; that corresponds with the Time magazine  
>> poll (also an outlier) which showed an eight-point drop in Bush's lead  
>> in the past two weeks. Instead, Zahn said "Didn't the Kerry campaign  
>> think they had a good week, and why were they wrong?" In fact, the  
>> results, taken as in trend terms, show they were not wrong-- a five  
>> point change in your favor in a week suggests the strategy is working  
>> very well. Perhaps instead of killing the messenger, MoveOn.org should  
>> concentrate on telling the reporters to get the message of the data  
>> right--something we have discussed endlessly in this space.

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

>  
>-----  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>set aapornet nomail  
>On your return send: 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, 29 Sep 2004 11:44:08 -0700  
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>  
Subject: Re: The MoveOn.org ad in the New York Times  
Comments: To: Doug Strand <dstrand@CSM.BERKELEY.EDU>  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <5.2.1.1.2.20040929103618.02488528@csm.berkeley.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

I had received an email from MoveOn, perhaps Monday, perhaps yesterday morning (sorry, juggling a lot on my mind these days) saying that they regretted the ad for shooting the messenger. Now I've deleted the email so I can't be sure about its details. There is no mention on the website of it. I just emailed them about it, and recommended they speak with cmor and/or aapor about it, so if/when they respond I'll let you all know. my apologies for contributing to the confusion.

Leora Lawton

On Wed, 29 Sep 2004, Doug Strand wrote:

> Date: Wed, 29 Sep 2004 10:36:51 -0700  
> From: Doug Strand <dstrand@CSM.BERKELEY.EDU>  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: Re: [AAPORNET] The MoveOn.org ad in the New York Times  
>  
> Leora,  
>  
> Where is such an apology? I don't find it on the moveon.org website or  
> mentioned in a news search.  
>  
> -Doug Strand  
> -----  
>  
> Douglas Strand, Ph.D.  
> Project Director  
> Public Agendas and Citizen Engagement Survey (PACES)  
> Survey Research Center  
> UC Berkeley  
> 354 Barrows Hall  
> Tel: 510-642-0508  
> Fax: 510-642-9665  
>  
>  
> At 07:18 PM 9/28/2004 -0700, Leora Lawton wrote:  
>> MoveOn did exactly what Frank thought they should do, and they apologized  
>> for its shooting the messenger.

>>  
>>leora lawton  
>>  
>>On Tue, 28 Sep 2004, Frank Rusciano wrote:  
>>  
>>> Date: Tue, 28 Sep 2004 09:20:40 -0400  
>>> From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>  
>>> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>>> Subject: [AAPORNET] The MoveOn.org ad in the New York Times  
>>>  
>>> Dear fellow AAPORneters,  
>>>  
>>> I assume that many of you have already read the full-page ad in the New  
>>> York Times by MoveOn.org criticizing Gallup's results on the  
>>> Presidential election survey and casting suspicion on the motives of its  
>>> current leader. While I often sympathize with MoveOn's causes, I don't  
>>> feel comfortable with this kind of attack, for three reasons. First, it  
>>> criticizes Gallup out of context-- that is, without describing the  
>>> polling methods of other survey organizations. Second, it includes a  
>>> personal attack by innuendo, suggesting that a pollster would  
>>> deliberately slant results to fit their ideological bent. Morally, this  
>>> is wrong; practically, if MoveOn plays this game, they will find the  
>>> other side is much more adept at it than they are. Finally, I don't  
>>> find the problem so much with the Gallup polls as with the news coverage  
>>> on them. I respect Bill Schneider a great deal, but I noticed last  
>>> night in his report to Paula Zahn that neither of them discussed one  
>>> important aspect of the results-- Bush's support has declined by five  
>>> points in the last week or so; that corresponds with the Time magazine  
>>> poll (also an outlier) which showed an eight-point drop in Bush's lead  
>>> in the past two weeks. Instead, Zahn said "Didn't the Kerry campaign  
>>> think they had a good week, and why were they wrong?" In fact, the  
>>> results, taken as in trend terms, show they were not wrong-- a five  
>>> point change in your favor in a week suggests the strategy is working  
>>> very well. Perhaps instead of killing the messenger, MoveOn.org should  
>>> concentrate on telling the reporters to get the message of the data  
>>> right--something we have discussed endlessly in this space.  
>>>  
>>> Frank Rusciano  
>>>  
>>> -----  
>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>>> Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>>> set aapornet nomail  
>>> On your return send: set aapornet mail  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> -----  
>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>>> Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>>> set aapornet nomail  
>>> On your return send: 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: Wed, 29 Sep 2004 15:20:19 -0400  
Reply-To: Brian Dautch <bdautch@CMOR.ORG>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Brian Dautch <bdautch@CMOR.ORG>  
Subject: Re: The MoveOn.org ad in the New York Times  
Comments: To: Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <20040929114130.Q51888@synergy.transbay.net>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

On CMOR's behalf, I have sent an e-mail to MoveOn demanding an explanation for their ad. I also urged them to apologize for laying the blame at Gallup's door for polling results that MoveOn simply didn't want to hear.

As soon as MoveOn responds, I'll let you know what they say.

--Brian

Brian Dautch  
Director of Government Affairs

CMOR  
Promoting and Advocating Survey Research  
7475 Wisconsin Ave., Suite 300  
Bethesda, MD 20814  
ph: (301) 654-6601  
fax: (208) 693-0564  
bdautch@cmor.org <mailto:bdautch@cmor.org>

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leora Lawton  
Sent: Wednesday, September 29, 2004 2:44 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: The MoveOn.org ad in the New York Times

I had received an email from MoveOn, perhaps Monday, perhaps yesterday morning (sorry, juggling a lot on my mind these days) saying that they regretted the ad for shooting the messenger. Now I've deleted the email so I can't be sure about its details. There is no mention on the website of it. I just emailed them about it, and recommended they speak with cmor and/or aapor about it, so if/when they respond I'll let you all know. my apologies for contributing to the confusion.

Leora Lawton



On Wed, 29 Sep 2004, Doug Strand wrote:

> Date: Wed, 29 Sep 2004 10:36:51 -0700  
> From: Doug Strand <dstrand@CSM.BERKELEY.EDU>  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: Re: [AAPORNET] The MoveOn.org ad in the New York Times

>  
> Leora,  
>  
> Where is such an apology? I don't find it on the moveon.org website or  
> mentioned in a news search.

>  
> -Doug Strand  
> -----

>  
> Douglas Strand, Ph.D.  
> Project Director  
> Public Agendas and Citizen Engagement Survey (PACES)  
> Survey Research Center  
> UC Berkeley  
> 354 Barrows Hall  
> Tel: 510-642-0508  
> Fax: 510-642-9665

>  
>  
>  
> At 07:18 PM 9/28/2004 -0700, Leora Lawton wrote:  
>> MoveOn did exactly what Frank thought they should do, and they apologized  
>> for its shooting the messenger.

>>  
>> leora lawton

>>  
>> On Tue, 28 Sep 2004, Frank Rusciano wrote:

>>  
>>> Date: Tue, 28 Sep 2004 09:20:40 -0400  
>>> From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>  
>>> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>>> Subject: [AAPORNET] The MoveOn.org ad in the New York Times

>>>  
>>> Dear fellow AAPORneters,  
>>>  
>>> I assume that many of you have already read the full-page ad in the  
New  
>>> York Times by MoveOn.org criticizing Gallup's results on the  
>>> Presidential election survey and casting suspicion on the motives of  
its  
>>> current leader. While I often sympathize with MoveOn's causes, I  
don't  
>>> feel comfortable with this kind of attack, for three reasons. First,  
it  
>>> criticizes Gallup out of context-- that is, without describing the

>>> polling methods of other survey organizations. Second, it includes a  
>>> personal attack by innuendo, suggesting that a pollster would  
>>> deliberately slant results to fit their ideological bent. Morally,  
this  
>>> is wrong; practically, if MoveOn plays this game, they will find the  
>>> other side is much more adept at it than they are. Finally, I don't  
>>> find the problem so much with the Gallup polls as with the news  
coverage  
>>> on them. I respect Bill Schneider a great deal, but I noticed last  
>>> night in his report to Paula Zahn that neither of them discussed one  
>>> important aspect of the results-- Bush's support has declined by five  
>>> points in the last week or so; that corresponds with the Time magazine  
>>> poll (also an outlier) which showed an eight-point drop in Bush's lead  
>>> in the past two weeks. Instead, Zahn said "Didn't the Kerry campaign  
>>> think they had a good week, and why were they wrong?" In fact, the  
>>> results, taken as in trend terms, show they were not wrong-- a five  
>>> point change in your favor in a week suggests the strategy is working  
>>> very well. Perhaps instead of killing the messenger, MoveOn.org  
should  
>>> concentrate on telling the reporters to get the message of the data  
>>> right--something we have discussed endlessly in this space.  
>>>  
>>> Frank Rusciano  
>>>  
>>> -----  
>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>>> Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>>> set aapornet nomail  
>>> On your return send: set aapornet mail  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> -----  
>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>>> Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>>> set aapornet nomail  
>>> On your return send: set aapornet mail  
>>>  
>>> -----  
>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>>>

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

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

=====  
Date: Wed, 29 Sep 2004 15:43:35 -0400  
Reply-To: Jason Boxt <[jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM](mailto:jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jason Boxt <[jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM](mailto:jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM)>

Subject: While we're on the subject of lefties...  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

This made its way to me recently. I'm somewhat disappointed (though certainly not surprised) by Michael Moore's evaluation of the polling industry. Seems if he were truly an aspiring reporter of fact, he would have taken the time to, I don't know, ask someone about the dueling polls, rather than just blinding striking out at all of them....Pardon the overtly political nature of this post--the bit about polling is about halfway down.

--Jason

Monday, September 20th, 2004  
Put Away Your Hankies...a message from Michael Moore

9/20/04

Dear Friends,

Enough of the handwringing! Enough of the doomsaying! Do I have to come there and personally calm you down? Stop with all the defeatism, OK? Bush IS a goner -- IF we all just quit our whining and bellyaching and stop shaking like a bunch of nervous ninnies. Geez, this is embarrassing! The Republicans are laughing at us. Do you ever see them cry, "Oh, it's all over! We are finished! Bush can't win! Waaaaaa!"=20

Hell no. It's never over for them until the last ballot is shredded. They are never finished -- they just keeping moving forward like sharks that never sleep, always pushing, pulling, kicking, blocking, lying.=20

They are relentless and that is why we secretly admire them -- they just simply never, ever give up. Only 30% of the country calls itself "Republican," yet the Republicans own it all -- the White House, both houses of Congress, the Supreme Court and the majority of the governorships. How do you think they've been able to pull that off considering they are a minority? It's because they eat you and me and every other liberal for breakfast and then spend the rest of the day wreaking havoc on the planet.

Look at us -- what a bunch of crybabies. Bush gets a bounce after his convention and you would have thought the Germans had run through Poland again. The Bushies are coming, the Bushies are coming! Yes, they caught Kerry asleep on the Swift Boat thing. Yes, they found the frequency in Dan Rather and ran with it. Suddenly it's like, "THE END IS NEAR! THE SKY IS FALLING!"=20

No, it is not. If I hear one more person tell me how lousy a candidate

Kerry is and how he can't win... Dammit, of COURSE he's a lousy candidate -- he's a Democrat, for heavens sake! That party is so pathetic, they even lose the elections they win! What were you expecting, Bruce Springsteen heading up the ticket? Bruce would make a helluva president, but guys like him don't run -- and neither do you or I. People like Kerry run.

Yes, OF COURSE any of us would have run a better, smarter, kick-ass campaign. Of course we would have smacked each and every one of those phony swifty boaty bastards down. But WE are not running for president -- Kerry is. So quit complaining and work with what we have. Oprah just gave 300 women a... Pontiac! Did you see any of them frowning and moaning and screaming, "Oh God, NOT a friggin' Pontiac!" Of course not, they were happy. The Pontiacs all had four wheels, an engine and a gas pedal. You want more than that, well, I can't help you. I had a Pontiac once and it lasted a good year. And it was a VERY good year.

My friends, it is time for a reality check.

1. The polls are wrong. They are all over the map like diarrhea. On Friday, one poll had Bush 13 points ahead -- and another poll had them both tied. There are three reasons why the polls are b.s.: One, they are polling "likely voters." "Likely" means those who have consistently voted in the past few elections. So that cuts out young people who are voting for the first time and a ton of non-voters who are definitely going to vote in THIS election. Second, they are not polling people who use their cell phone as their primary phone. Again, that means they are not talking to young people. Finally, most of the polls are weighted with too many Republicans, as pollster John Zogby revealed last week. You are being snookered if you believe any of these polls.
2. Kerry has brought in the Clinton A-team. Instead of shunning Clinton (as Gore did), Kerry has decided to not make that mistake.
3. Traveling around the country, as I've been doing, I gotta tell ya, there is a hell of a lot of unrest out there. Much of it is not being captured by the mainstream press. But it is simmering and it is real. Do not let those well-produced Bush rallies of angry white people scare you. Turn off the TV! (Except Jon Stewart and Bill Moyers -- everything else is just a sugar-coated lie).
4. Conventional wisdom says if the election is decided on "9/11" (the fear of terrorism), Bush wins. But if it is decided on the job we are doing in Iraq, then Bush loses. And folks, that "job," you might have noticed, has descended into the third level of a hell we used to call Vietnam. There is no way out. It is a full-blown mess of a quagmire and the body bags will sadly only mount higher. Regardless of what Kerry meant by his original war vote, he ain't the one who sent those kids to their deaths -- and Mr. and Mrs. Middle America knows it. Had Bush bothered to show up when he was in the "service" he might have somewhat of a clue as to how to recognize an immoral war that cannot be "won." All he has delivered to Iraq was that plasticized turkey last Thanksgiving. It is this failure of monumental proportions that is going to cook his goose come this November.

So, do not despair. All is not over. Far from it. The Bush people need you to believe that it is over. They need you to slump back into your easy chair and feel that sick pain in your gut as you contemplate another four years of George W. Bush. They need you to wish we had a candidate who didn't windsurf and who was just as smart as we were when WE knew Bush was lying about WMD and Saddam planning 9/11. It's like Karl Rove is hypnotizing you -- "Kerry voted for the war...Kerry voted for the war...Kerrrrrrryyy vooootted foooooor theeee warrrrrrrrrr..."=20

Yes...Yes...Yesssss....He did! HE DID! No sense in fighting now...what I need is sleep...sleep...sleeeeepppppp...

WAKE UP! The majority are with us! More than half of all Americans are pro-choice, want stronger environmental laws, are appalled that assault weapons are back on the street -- and 54% now believe the war is wrong. YOU DON'T EVEN HAVE TO CONVINCING THEM OF ANY OF THIS -- YOU JUST HAVE TO GIVE THEM A RAY OF HOPE AND A RIDE TO THE POLLS. CAN YOU DO THAT? WILL YOU DO THAT?

Just for me, please? Buck up. The country is almost back in our hands. Not another negative word until Nov. 3rd! Then you can bitch all you want about how you wish Kerry was still that long-haired kid who once had the courage to stand up for something. Personally, I think that kid is still inside him. Instead of the wailing and gnashing of your teeth, why not hold out a hand to him and help the inner soldier/protester come out and defeat the forces of evil we now so desperately face. Do we have any other choice?

Yours,

Michael Moore

[www.michaelmoore.com](http://www.michaelmoore.com)

mmflint@aol.com-----Original Message-----

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Brian Dautch

Sent: Wednesday, September 29, 2004 3:20 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: The MoveOn.org ad in the New York Times

On CMOR's behalf, I have sent an e-mail to MoveOn demanding an explanation for their ad. I also urged them to apologize for laying the blame at Gallup's door for polling results that MoveOn simply didn't want to hear.

As soon as MoveOn responds, I'll let you know what they say.

--Brian

Brian Dautch

Director of Government Affairs

CMOR

Promoting and Advocating Survey Research

7475 Wisconsin Ave., Suite 300  
Bethesda, MD 20814  
ph: (301) 654-6601  
fax: (208) 693-0564  
bdautch@cmor.org <mailto:bdautch@cmor.org>

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leora Lawton  
Sent: Wednesday, September 29, 2004 2:44 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: The MoveOn.org ad in the New York Times

I had received an email from MoveOn, perhaps Monday, perhaps yesterday morning (sorry, juggling a lot on my mind these days) saying that they regretted the ad for shooting the messenger. Now I've deleted the email so

I can't be sure about its details. There is no mention on the website of it. I just emailed them about it, and recommended they speak with cmor and/or aapor about it, so if/when they respond I'll let you all know. my apologies for contributing to the confusion.

Leora Lawton

On Wed, 29 Sep 2004, Doug Strand wrote:

> Date: Wed, 29 Sep 2004 10:36:51 -0700  
> From: Doug Strand <dstrand@CSM.BERKELEY.EDU>  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: Re: [AAPORNET] The MoveOn.org ad in the New York Times

>  
> Leora,  
>  
> Where is such an apology? I don't find it on the moveon.org website  
or  
> mentioned in a news search.

>  
> -Doug Strand  
> -----

>  
> Douglas Strand, Ph.D.  
> Project Director  
> Public Agendas and Citizen Engagement Survey (PACES)  
> Survey Research Center  
> UC Berkeley  
> 354 Barrows Hall  
> Tel: 510-642-0508  
> Fax: 510-642-9665

>  
>  
>

> At 07:18 PM 9/28/2004 -0700, Leora Lawton wrote:  
>> MoveOn did exactly what Frank thought they should do, and they  
apologized  
>> for its shooting the messenger.  
>>  
>> leora lawton  
>>  
>> On Tue, 28 Sep 2004, Frank Rusciano wrote:  
>>  
>>> Date: Tue, 28 Sep 2004 09:20:40 -0400  
>>> From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>  
>>> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>>> Subject: [AAPORNET] The MoveOn.org ad in the New York Times  
>>>  
>>> Dear fellow AAPORneters,  
>>>  
>>> I assume that many of you have already read the full-page ad in  
the  
New  
>>> York Times by MoveOn.org criticizing Gallup's results on the  
>>> Presidential election survey and casting suspicion on the motives  
of  
its  
>>> current leader. While I often sympathize with MoveOn's causes, I  
don't  
>>> feel comfortable with this kind of attack, for three reasons.  
First,  
it  
>>> criticizes Gallup out of context-- that is, without describing the  
>>> polling methods of other survey organizations. Second, it  
includes a  
>>> personal attack by innuendo, suggesting that a pollster would  
>>> deliberately slant results to fit their ideological bent.  
Morally,  
this  
>>> is wrong; practically, if MoveOn plays this game, they will find  
the  
>>> other side is much more adept at it than they are. Finally, I  
don't  
>>> find the problem so much with the Gallup polls as with the news  
coverage  
>>> on them. I respect Bill Schneider a great deal, but I noticed  
last  
>>> night in his report to Paula Zahn that neither of them discussed  
one  
>>> important aspect of the results-- Bush's support has declined by  
five  
>>> points in the last week or so; that corresponds with the Time  
magazine  
>>> poll (also an outlier) which showed an eight-point drop in Bush's  
lead  
>>> in the past two weeks. Instead, Zahn said "Didn't the Kerry  
campaign  
>>> think they had a good week, and why were they wrong?" In fact,

the  
>>> results, taken as in trend terms, show they were not wrong-- a  
five  
>>> point change in your favor in a week suggests the strategy is  
working  
>>> very well. Perhaps instead of killing the messenger, MoveOn.org  
should  
>>> concentrate on telling the reporters to get the message of the  
data  
>>> right--something we have discussed endlessly in this space.  
>>>  
>>> Frank Rusciano  
>>>  
>>> -----  
>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>>> Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>>> set aapornet nomail  
>>> On your return send: set aapornet mail  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> -----  
>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>>> Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>>> set aapornet nomail  
>>> On your return send: set aapornet mail  
>>>  
>>> -----  
>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
[aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>>>

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

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

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

---

Date: Wed, 29 Sep 2004 17:17:06 -0400  
Reply-To: "Safir, Adam" <[ASafir@UI.URBAN.ORG](mailto:ASafir@UI.URBAN.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Safir, Adam" <[ASafir@UI.URBAN.ORG](mailto:ASafir@UI.URBAN.ORG)>  
Subject: Re: While we're on the subject of lefties...  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1



Michael Moore and MoveOn.org are not alone in the ferocity of their attacks on Gallup in particular and the polling industry in general.

See the contents of today's Progress Report from the (left of) Center for American Progress,  
<http://www.americanprogressaction.org/site/pp.asp?c=klLWJcP7H&b=100480#2>,  
under the heading "Public Opinion, Distorting the Horse Race."

It makes me very sad to see the results of objective, scientific research come under such heavy fire from the partisan cannons. No doubt our industry has weathered times like this before, but I for one will be glad to see this storm pass. Kudos to Brian Dautch and others for working to defend the integrity of the profession.

Adam Safir  
The Urban Institute

\*\*\*\*\*

The Progress Report  
by Christy Harvey, Judd Legum and Jonathan Baskin  
[www.progressreport.org](http://www.progressreport.org)  
9/29/2004

PUBLIC OPINION  
Distorting the Horse Race

Media coverage of the Presidential horserace  
(<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2004/01/27/DDGRU4H96M1.DTL>  
) -- a story that, since the media insists on devoting so much coverage to it, unfortunately ends up influencing how people view the candidates -- is being distorted by inaccurate and irresponsible polling by the Gallup organization. Gallup has consistently reported much larger nationwide leads for Bush than all other polls. There are two primary reasons:  
(<http://www.emergingdemocraticmajorityweblog.com/donkeyrising/archives/000663.php>) 1) Gallup's sample routinely includes far too many Republicans than are in the electorate, 2) Gallup uses a fundamentally flawed system to identify "likely voters." As a result, suspect large leads for Bush reported by the Gallup organization draw attention away from critical policy issues and to endless speculation about what Bush is doing right and Senator Kerry is doing wrong.

GALLUP OVER-SAMPLES REPUBLICANS: In 2000, exit polls showed that Democratic turnout exceeded Republican turnout by four percentage points  
(<http://www.emergingdemocraticmajorityweblog.com/donkeyrising/archives/000663.php>) . In 1996, Democratic turnout was five percentage points greater. There were also more Democrats voting in 1992 and 1988. A study by the Pew Research Center found that party registration is about the same  
(<http://people-press.org/commentary/display.php3?AnalysisID=95>) as in 2000. But Gallup's most recent survey of 1006 registered voters included 40

percent Republicans and 31 percent Democrats (<http://www.theleftcoaster.com/archives/002886.html>) . Not surprisingly, the same survey showed Bush with a 13 point lead. Meanwhile polls by Investor's Business Daily, Zogby, and George Washington University conducted in the same week showed the Presidential race in a statistical dead head (<http://www.pollingreport.com/>) .

**GALLUP USES BOGUS LIKELY VOTER MODEL:** Gallup also results for "likely voters." What is a Gallup likely voter? Gallup asks a series of seven questions. For example: Do you happen to know where people who live in your neighborhood go to vote?

(<http://www.emergingdemocraticmajorityweblog.com/donkeyrising/archives/000725.php>) Also: Have you ever voted in your precinct or election district?

Gallup then gives higher weight to registered voters who answer yes to these questions. Instead of predicting who is likely to show up at the polls, Gallup's methodology systematically undervalues young voters, transient voters, immigrant voters and other groups likely to vote democratic. Not surprisingly, a recent Gallup poll of likely voters showed Bush with a 14-point lead. Headline blazed across the country: Poll Finds Bush Lead Surging Among Likely Voters

(<http://www.reuters.com/newsArticle.jhtml?type=topNews&storyID=6261711>) .

Meanwhile, excluding Gallup, 14 national polls of likely voters released in the last two weeks show Bush with an average lead of about three percent

(<http://www.emergingdemocraticmajorityweblog.com/donkeyrising/archives/000731.php>) . In an interview with CNN, Gallup editor-in-chief Frank Newport

ignored the data, and inaccurately claimed

(<http://www.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0409/28/ip.00.html>) "most observers now say it's a six to eight-point lead. That's what recent polls are showing."

**GALLUP INSULTS CRITICS:** Newport told USA Today that critics of Gallup's methods " don't understand the science behind the polls

([http://www.usatoday.com/news/politicselections/nation/president/2004-09-28-gallup-defense\\_x.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/news/politicselections/nation/president/2004-09-28-gallup-defense_x.htm)) ." But respected pollster John Zogby -- who

understands the science as well as anyone -- disagrees with Gallup's methods. Specifically, Zogby says that "there are variations in people's party affiliations, but they aren't changing much daily, weekly or even

monthly." American Progress Senior Fellow and polling expert Ruy Teixeira says, "Frank Newport at Gallup insists this is a 'scientific' approach to take to polling. Sounds more like dogma to me.

(<http://www.emergingdemocraticmajorityweblog.com/donkeyrising/archives/000725.php>) " For a daily dose of the truth behind the polling number's check out

Teixiera's blog

(<http://www.emergingdemocraticmajorityweblog.com/donkeyrising/archives/000725.php>) .

**MORE REPUBLICAN POLLSTER BIAS:** Gallup is not alone is skewing polling data to the advantage of Republicans. MSNBC has regularly included Republican pollster Frank Luntz -- without mentioning his partisan ties -- in it's election coverage. Luntz has freely admitted he skews data to match his view point. He once said "Say you poll on an environmental issue, and on eight of the 10 questions the numbers are in your favor. Why release the other

two?  
(<http://dir.salon.com/politics/feature/2000/05/26/luntz/index.html?pn=2>) "  
In 1997 he was reprimanded for his unethical conduct  
(<http://dir.salon.com/politics/feature/2000/05/26/luntz/index.html?pn=1>)  
"in 1997 by the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) for  
his work polling for the Republican Party's 1994 'Contract with America.'"  
Media Matters for America has written a letter to MSNBC  
(<http://mediamatters.org/items/200409280002>) asking that Luntz not be  
included in coverage or, at the very least, properly identified as a  
partisan republican. Tell MSNBC (<mailto:viewerservices@msnbc.com>) and  
Luntz (<http://www.luntz.com/contactus.htm>) what you think.

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

From: Jason Boxt [<mailto:jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM>]  
Sent: Wednesday, September 29, 2004 3:44 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: While we're on the subject of lefties...

This made its way to me recently. I'm somewhat disappointed (though certainly not surprised) by Michael Moore's evaluation of the polling industry. Seems if he were truly an aspiring reporter of fact, he would have taken the time to, I don't know, ask someone about the dueling polls, rather than just blinding striking out at all of them....Pardon the overtly political nature of this post--the bit about polling is about halfway down.

--Jason

Monday, September 20th, 2004  
Put Away Your Hankies...a message from Michael Moore

9/20/04

Dear Friends,

1. The polls are wrong. They are all over the map like diarrhea. On Friday, one poll had Bush 13 points ahead -- and another poll had them both tied. There are three reasons why the polls are b.s.: One, they are polling "likely voters." "Likely" means those who have consistently voted in the past few elections. So that cuts out young people who are voting for the first time and a ton of non-voters who are definitely going to vote in THIS election. Second, they are not polling people who use their cell phone as their primary phone. Again, that means they are not talking to young people. Finally, most of the polls are weighted with too many Republicans, as pollster John Zogby revealed last week. You are being snookered if you believe any of these polls.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Brian Dautch

Sent: Wednesday, September 29, 2004 3:20 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: The MoveOn.org ad in the New York Times

On CMOR's behalf, I have sent an e-mail to MoveOn demanding an explanation for their ad. I also urged them to apologize for laying the blame at Gallup's door for polling results that MoveOn simply didn't want to hear.

As soon as MoveOn responds, I'll let you know what they say.

--Brian

Brian Dautch  
Director of Government Affairs

CMOR

>>On Tue, 28 Sep 2004, Frank Rusciano wrote:

>>

>>> Date: Tue, 28 Sep 2004 09:20:40 -0400

>>> From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>

>>> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>>> Subject: [AAPORNET] The MoveOn.org ad in the New York Times

>>>

>>> Dear fellow AAPORneters,

>>>

>>> I assume that many of you have already read the full-page ad in the New

>>> York Times by MoveOn.org criticizing Gallup's results on the Presidential election survey and casting suspicion on the motives of its

>>> current leader. While I often sympathize with MoveOn's causes, I don't

>>> feel comfortable with this kind of attack, for three reasons.

First,  
it

>>> criticizes Gallup out of context-- that is, without describing the

>>> polling methods of other survey organizations. Second, it includes a

>>> personal attack by innuendo, suggesting that a pollster would

>>> deliberately slant results to fit their ideological bent.

Morally,  
this

>>> is wrong; practically, if MoveOn plays this game, they will find the

>>> other side is much more adept at it than they are. Finally, I don't

>>> find the problem so much with the Gallup polls as with the news

coverage  
>>> on them.

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

Date: Wed, 29 Sep 2004 18:02:19 -0400  
Reply-To: dick halpern <[dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET](mailto:dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: dick halpern <[dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET](mailto:dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET)>  
Subject: The New York Times : A Request to Partisans: Don't Shoot the  
Pollster  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu), [Media-PublicOpinion-Polls-1@usc.edu](mailto:Media-PublicOpinion-Polls-1@usc.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: multipart/mixed; x-avg-checked=avg-ok-6F0747CB;  
boundary="Boundary\_(ID\_SoFhLuZz7aQ8dABJTY9iTQ)"

--Boundary\_(ID\_SoFhLuZz7aQ8dABJTY9iTQ)  
Content-type: text/plain; x-avg-checked=avg-ok-6F0747CB; charset=us-ascii;  
format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8bit

More about the Gallup controversy.....

NY Times, September 29, 2004

## ADVERTISING

A Request to Partisans: Don't Shoot the Pollster

By JIM RUTENBERG

WASHINGTON, Sept. 28 - There has been no shortage of targets for partisans of all persuasions this election season. But one group has come under fire from all sides: pollsters, who in these polarized times have become the political equivalent of lawyers.

The latest attack came Tuesday from the liberal activist group Move

On.org, which ran a full-page advertisement in The New York Times criticizing the Gallup Organization for polling that showed  
<<http://www.nytimes.com/top/news/washington/campaign2004/candidates/georgewbus h/index.html?inline=nyt-per-pol>>President  
Bush comfortably ahead of  
<<http://www.nytimes.com/top/news/washington/campaign2004/candidates/johnfkerry /index.html?inline=nyt-per-pol>>Senator  
John Kerry, the Democratic presidential nominee. Saying that the polling is biased toward Republicans, the advertisement implies the reason is that George Gallup Jr., the son of the poll's founder, is an evangelical Christian.

Several other organizations, including The New York Times and The Los Angeles Times, had come under criticism earlier when one campaign or the

other has been displeased with the results of their polls.

Those making the charges say they are simply trying to counter the powerful news media when they believe it is presenting inaccurate pictures of the electorate that could demoralize - or galvanize - voters.

But pollsters, many of whom see themselves as above-the-fray numbers crunchers, say the attacks are a product of intense national partisanship in the age of the Weblog and 24-hour cable news channels.

Many pollsters interviewed Tuesday, while not claiming to be perfect, said their more vociferous critics were often trying to shout down messengers delivering news that runs counter to the version of reality they want to see presented.

The criticism, many pollsters said, has been particularly personal and vicious.

"I can never remember an election where we've had such contentious responses to what we've found," said Andrew Kohut, director of the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press. "People really have their guns drawn, and they shoot the messenger with them."

Mr. Kohut added, "The nasty mail we've gotten this month has been from Republicans," because of a recent Pew poll that showed the race to be closer than many others showing Mr. Bush comfortably ahead. Pew released a poll on Tuesday showing Mr. Bush with an eight-point lead.

Susan Pinkus, director of polling for The Los Angeles Times, said she was deluged with angry calls and e-mail messages after her newspaper produced a poll in June showing Mr. Kerry with a comfortable lead over Mr. Bush. "It's really, really bad out there," Ms. Pinkus said. "They say these horrible things about you: that I'm in the pocket of the Democrats, that I'm lying, that I have no clue what I'm doing."

The criticisms of Ms. Pinkus originated in a very prominent place - Mr. Bush's campaign headquarters, where the chief campaign strategist, Matthew Dowd, called the poll "a mess." Mr. Dowd said at the time he was particularly peeved that the poll was taken among a considerably higher number of people who identified themselves as Democrats than Republicans, a complaint he had about several other polls as well. But other polls that followed in the summer showed Mr. Kerry ahead by a similar margin.

Now, with most polls showing his man ahead, Mr. Dowd is a much less vocal critic. Many of the complaints now are coming from liberals and Democrats who say many polls include a disproportionate number of Republicans.

In both cases, pollsters said, the differences reflected shifts in how people identify themselves, shifts that are inevitable and not necessarily meaningful. When Mr. Bush gains in popularity, for instance, more people are likely to identify themselves as Republicans.

MoveOn.org said there were too many Republicans surveyed in the Gallup poll, which showed Mr. Bush with a 13-point lead over Mr. Kerry among

likely voters the week before last, when other polls taken around the same time, including those of the Pew Center and Harris Interactive, showed the race to be a tie. The most recent Gallup poll showed Mr. Bush with an eight-point lead.

The group's advertisement said that George Gallup Jr., whose father, George Gallup Sr., founded Gallup, "is a devout evangelical Christian" who recently said, "The most profound purpose of polls is to see how people are responding to God."

What the advertisement did not say was that Mr. Gallup, who retired in May, is not involved in the company's political polling and made those comments in reference to his specialty and main interest - polling people on their religious beliefs.

"We're simply pointing out that there are problems with Gallup's methodology," said Peter Schurman, executive director of MoveOn, "that their numbers can't be relied on and it's coincidentally also the case that George Gallup Jr. has said some things that could raise questions."

Frank Newport, the editor in chief of the Gallup Organization, said of MoveOn.org, "We have a group that doesn't like that their candidate is behind in most polling, if not all polling, and therefore they're shooting out at the messenger."

Mr. Newport said that the newspaper advertisement incorrectly asserted that Gallup had stated that its findings were predictive of what would happen on Election Day, when the organization actually takes pains to make it clear that its findings only reflect the electorate's mood at the time the poll was taken. He rejected the contention that Gallup had any methodological flaws.

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

--Boundary\_(ID\_SoFhLuZz7aQ8dABJTY9iTQ)  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-avg=cert;  
x-avg-checked=avg-ok-6F0747CB  
Content-disposition: inline

---  
Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.  
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).  
Version: 6.0.752 / Virus Database: 503 - Release Date: 9/3/2004

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

--Boundary\_(ID\_SoFhLuZz7aQ8dABJTY9iTQ)--

=====  
Date: Wed, 29 Sep 2004 15:55:36 -0700

Reply-To: Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>  
Subject: Annual Meeting of the Society for Applied Sociology  
Comments: To: soc\_practice-announce@listserv.asanet.org  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>, methods@mail.unm.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

22nd Annual Meeting of the Society for Applied Sociology,  
"Application is the Future of Sociology"  
November 4-6, 2004  
Hyatt Regency Hotel, One Bethesda Metro Center, Bethesda, Maryland

Individuals with backgrounds in the social and behavioral sciences, related fields, and disciplines who share an interest in applying knowledge to solving social problems are invited to participate. SAS offers a special 'Student Problem Solving Exercise Competition' in addition to program offerings for established and beginning professionals.

For additional information about the Program, how to register, and the conference hotel, visit the SAS website, <http://www.appliedsoc.org> (where you may register online)

Or contact Peter Iadicola, <iadicola@ipfw.edu>, Department of Sociology, Indiana - Purdue University, 2102 Coliseum Blvd., Fort Wayne, IN 46105 (219-481-6842; fax 219-481-6985).

For all other questions, contact Dean Purdy, Executive Officer, [info@appliedsoc.org](mailto:info@appliedsoc.org), Office - 419-372-2217 or fax 419-372-8306.

~~~~~  
Dean A. Purdy, Ph.D.  
Executive Officer  
Society for Applied Sociology (SAS)  
Department of Sociology  
Bowling Green State University  
Bowling Green, OH 43403  
phone: 419-372-2217  
fax: 419-372-8306  
email: [dpurdy@bgnet.bgsu.edu](mailto:dpurdy@bgnet.bgsu.edu)

-----  
ps: apologies for multiple listings!

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

Date: Wed, 29 Sep 2004 17:06:28 -0700  
Reply-To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>  
Subject: Re: While we're on the subject of lefties...



Comments: To: "Safir, Adam" <ASafir@UI.URBAN.ORG>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <4CD371A22A53D411B60F00508B6F39B0086F418C@UINT4>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Although Michael Moore uses his standard populist shlock style in the piece I'm not sure that what he wrote is a whole lot different in its actual substance from some of the concerns and criticisms that I've seen on this list serve. It's obvious he's just trying to "rally the troops" for his side, and uses some hyperbole to weight it, but there is no unified agreement here about why the polls have recently been so divergent and whether we are in a "typical" pre-election volatility period or whether what we are seeing reflects potential methodologic problems, if not bias. The issue of likely voters is fascinating. Besides what is already on the table one could ask the question whether narrow definitions of likely voters might tend to hold down the actual vote totals-i.e.make predictions come true. There is no question that human behavior can be modified by lowering expectations. That's a given.

I kind of regret that this list is being used to tar and feather Moore for his non-academic approach without really taking him on regarding substance. I find troubling the notion of AAPOR as a club of folks who are urged to stand up for each other in some generic sense. I see a difference between the egregious out of context and personal attack by Moveon.org re Gallup Jr. and what Moore said. He's become a favorite target these days. One is tempted to ask each Moore critic sticking it to him whether they are voting for Bush. I don't know how many saw the youngest Bush brother on CNN with Larry King during the Convention inserting a remarkable piece of name calling (totally out of the blue and out of the context of discussion) against Moore. Moore is hardly the first, nor is he the most reputable American character to suffer such slings and arrows of the crowd that likes to target individuals. They did it to Richard Clark, to O'Neill, to Wilson to neutralize them. They'll do it to anyone regardless of their credentials. It's called intimidation and it undermines democracy and the willingness to be frank and honest. Move on shouldn't do it either. I think we should just let Moore be Moore unless he does something like Move on did. His comment like his film isn't perfect but also like the film it has points in it that most are pondering. And there are good reasons why he won that award for Bowling for Columbine. He ought to be handled with a little more respect.

Marc Sapir MD, MPH  
Executive Director  
Retro Poll  
[www.retropoll.org](http://www.retropoll.org)

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Safir, Adam  
Sent: Wednesday, September 29, 2004 1:17 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: While we're on the subject of lefties...

Michael Moore and MoveOn.org are not alone in the ferocity of their attacks on Gallup in particular and the polling industry in general.

See the contents of today's Progress Report from the (left of) Center for American Progress, <http://www.americanprogressaction.org/site/pp.asp?c=kLWJcP7H&b=100480#2>, under the heading "Public Opinion, Distorting the Horse Race."

It makes me very sad to see the results of objective, scientific research come under such heavy fire from the partisan cannons. No doubt our industry has weathered times like this before, but I for one will be glad to see this storm pass. Kudos to Brian Dautch and others for working to defend the integrity of the profession.

Adam Safir  
The Urban Institute

\*\*\*\*\*

The Progress Report  
by Christy Harvey, Judd Legum and Jonathan Baskin  
[www.progressreport.org](http://www.progressreport.org)  
9/29/2004

PUBLIC OPINION  
Distorting the Horse Race

Media coverage of the Presidential horserace  
(<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2004/01/27/DDGRU4H96M1.DTL>

) -- a story that, since the media insists on devoting so much coverage to it, unfortunately ends up influencing how people view the candidates -- is being distorted by inaccurate and irresponsible polling by the Gallup organization. Gallup has consistently reported much larger nationwide leads

for Bush than all other polls. There are two primary reasons: (<http://www.emergingdemocraticmajorityweblog.com/donkeyrising/archives/000663.php>)

1) Gallup's sample routinely includes far too many Republicans than are in the electorate, 2) Gallup uses a fundamentally flawed system to identify "likely voters." As a result, suspect large leads for Bush

reported  
by the Gallup organization draw attention away from critical policy  
issues  
and to endless speculation about what Bush is doing right and Senator  
Kerry  
is doing wrong.

GALLUP OVER-SAMPLES REPUBLICANS: In 2000, exit polls showed that  
Democratic  
turnout exceeded Republican turnout by four percentage points  
(<http://www.emergingdemocraticmajorityweblog.com/donkeyrising/archives/000663.php>) . In 1996, Democratic turnout was five percentage points greater.  
There were also more Democrats voting in 1992 and 1988. A study by the  
Pew  
Research Center found that party registration is about the same  
(<http://people-press.org/commentary/display.php3?AnalysisID=95>) as in  
2000.  
But Gallup's most recent survey of 1006 registered voters included 40  
percent Republicans and 31 percent Democrats  
(<http://www.theleftcoaster.com/archives/002886.html>) . Not surprisingly,  
the  
same survey showed Bush with a 13 point lead. Meanwhile polls by  
Investor's  
Business Daily, Zogby, and George Washington University conducted in the  
same week showed the Presidential race in a statistical dead head  
(<http://www.pollingreport.com/>) .

GALLUP USES BOGUS LIKELY VOTER MODEL: Gallup also results for "likely  
voters." What is a Gallup likely voter? Gallup asks a series of seven  
questions. For example: Do you happen to know where people who live in  
your  
neighborhood go to vote?  
(<http://www.emergingdemocraticmajorityweblog.com/donkeyrising/archives/000725.php>) Also: Have you ever voted in your precinct or election district?  
Gallup then gives higher weight to registered voters who answer yes to  
these  
questions. Instead of predicting who is likely to show up at the polls,  
Gallup's methodology systematically undervalues young voters, transient  
voters, immigrant voters and other groups likely to vote democratic. Not  
surprisingly, a recent Gallup poll of likely voters showed Bush with a  
14-point lead. Headline blazed across the country: Poll Finds Bush Lead  
Surging Among Likely Voters  
(<http://www.reuters.com/newsArticle.jhtml?type=topNews&storyID=6261711>)  
.  
Meanwhile, excluding Gallup, 14 national polls of likely voters released  
in  
the last two weeks show Bush with an average lead of about three  
percent  
(<http://www.emergingdemocraticmajorityweblog.com/donkeyrising/archives/000730>)

1.php) . In an interview with CNN, Gallup editor-in-chief Frank Newport ignored the data, and inaccurately claimed (<http://www.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0409/28/ip.00.html>) "most observers now say it's a six to eight-point lead. That's what recent polls are showing."

GALLUP INSULTS CRITICS: Newport told USA Today that critics of Gallup's methods " don't understand the science behind the polls

([http://www.usatoday.com/news/politicselections/nation/president/2004-09-28-](http://www.usatoday.com/news/politicselections/nation/president/2004-09-28-gallup-defense_x.htm)

[gallup-defense\\_x.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/news/politicselections/nation/president/2004-09-28-gallup-defense_x.htm)) . " But respected pollster John Zogby -- who understands the science as well as anyone -- disagrees with Gallup's methods. Specifically, Zogby says that "there are variations in people's party affiliations, but they aren't changing much daily, weekly or even monthly." American Progress Senior Fellow and polling expert Ruy Teixiera

says, "Frank Newport at Gallup insists this is a 'scientific' approach to

take to polling. Sounds more like dogma to me.

([http://www.emergingdemocraticmajorityweblog.com/donkeyrising/archives/00072](http://www.emergingdemocraticmajorityweblog.com/donkeyrising/archives/000725.php)

[5.php](http://www.emergingdemocraticmajorityweblog.com/donkeyrising/archives/000725.php)) " For a daily dose of the truth behind the polling number's check out

Teixiera's blog

([http://www.emergingdemocraticmajorityweblog.com/donkeyrising/archives/00072](http://www.emergingdemocraticmajorityweblog.com/donkeyrising/archives/000725.php)

[5.php](http://www.emergingdemocraticmajorityweblog.com/donkeyrising/archives/000725.php)) .

MORE REPUBLICAN POLLSTER BIAS: Gallup is not alone is skewing polling data

to the advantage of Republicans. MSNBC has regularly included Republican pollster Frank Luntz -- without mentioning his partisan ties -- in it's election coverage. Luntz has freely admitted he skews data to match his view

point. He once said "Say you poll on an environmental issue, and on eight

of the 10 questions the numbers are in your favor. Why release the other two?

(<http://dir.salon.com/politics/feature/2000/05/26/luntz/index.html?pn=2>)

" In 1997 he was reprimanded for his unethical conduct

(<http://dir.salon.com/politics/feature/2000/05/26/luntz/index.html?pn=1>)

"in 1997 by the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) for

his work polling for the Republican Party's 1994 'Contract with America.'"

Media Matters for America has written a letter to MSNBC

(<http://mediamatters.org/items/200409280002>) asking that Luntz not be included in coverage or, at the very least, properly identified as a

partisan republican. Tell MSNBC (<mailto:viewerservices@msnbc.com>) and Luntz (<http://www.luntz.com/contactus.htm>) what you think.

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

From: Jason Boxt [mailto:jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM]

Sent: Wednesday, September 29, 2004 3:44 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: While we're on the subject of lefties...

This made its way to me recently. I'm somewhat disappointed (though certainly not surprised) by Michael Moore's evaluation of the polling industry. Seems if he were truly an aspiring reporter of fact, he would have taken the time to, I don't know, ask someone about the dueling polls, rather than just blinding striking out at all of them....Pardon the overtly political nature of this post--the bit about polling is about halfway down.

--Jason

Monday, September 20th, 2004

Put Away Your Hankies...a message from Michael Moore

9/20/04

Dear Friends,

1. The polls are wrong. They are all over the map like diarrhea. On Friday, one poll had Bush 13 points ahead -- and another poll had them both tied. There are three reasons why the polls are b.s.: One, they are polling "likely voters." "Likely" means those who have consistently voted in the past few elections. So that cuts out young people who are voting for the first time and a ton of non-voters who are definitely going to vote in THIS election. Second, they are not polling people who use their cell phone as their primary phone. Again, that means they are not talking to young people. Finally, most of the polls are weighted with too many Republicans, as pollster John Zogby revealed last week. You are being snookered if you believe any of these polls.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Brian Dautch

Sent: Wednesday, September 29, 2004 3:20 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: The MoveOn.org ad in the New York Times

On CMOR's behalf, I have sent an e-mail to MoveOn demanding an explanation for their ad. I also urged them to apologize for laying the blame at Gallup's door for polling results that MoveOn simply didn't want to hear.

As soon as MoveOn responds, I'll let you know what they say.

--Brian

Brian Dautch  
Director of Government Affairs

CMOR

>> On Tue, 28 Sep 2004, Frank Rusciano wrote:

>>

>>> Date: Tue, 28 Sep 2004 09:20:40 -0400

>>> From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>

>>> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>>> Subject: [AAPORNET] The MoveOn.org ad in the New York Times

>>>

>>> Dear fellow AAPORneters,

>>>

>>> I assume that many of you have already read the full-page ad in

the

New

>>> York Times by MoveOn.org criticizing Gallup's results on the

>>> Presidential election survey and casting suspicion on the motives

of

its

>>> current leader. While I often sympathize with MoveOn's causes, I

don't

>>> feel comfortable with this kind of attack, for three reasons.

First,

it

>>> criticizes Gallup out of context-- that is, without describing the

>>> polling methods of other survey organizations. Second, it

includes a

>>> personal attack by innuendo, suggesting that a pollster would

>>> deliberately slant results to fit their ideological bent.

Morally,

this

>>> is wrong; practically, if MoveOn plays this game, they will find

the

>>> other side is much more adept at it than they are. Finally, I

don't

>>> find the problem so much with the Gallup polls as with the news

coverage

>>> on them.

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

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

[aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

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

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====

Date: Wed, 29 Sep 2004 21:25:30 -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: Pew v. Gallup revisited (now that the polls converge)  
Comments: To: AAPORnet List server <aapornet@asu.edu>  
Comments: cc: whl@virginia.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit  
Content-disposition: inline

The latest news on the national political polls has three major polls in substantial agreement with respect to the percentage-point margin between Messrs. Bush and Kerry. (Washington Post/ABC 51-44 RV; USA Today/CNN/Gallup 53-42 RV; Pew 48-40 RV.)

This suggests to me that the reason for the extraordinary divergence in the polls observed just a few days ago was: a true statistical fluke. Let's recall that our margin of error calculations allow one poll in 20 or so to be outside the margin of error, deviating more than 3% from the population proportion of interest. It seems to me most likely that the divergence observed in the last round of Pew polling was because they had the bad luck to draw a sample that did not look as much like the population as most samples of that size do.

I find this easier to believe than the alternatives, which are: (1) Pew changed its methodology and didn't tell us or (2) there were huge broad shifts in the electorate that only some polls picked up or (3) respondents are 'unsettled,' measurement error is too high, etc.

Or, to put it in Survey 101 terms: if the four main types of survey error come from problems in sample, coverage, non-response, and measurement, I think the most parsimonious explanation of the divergence seen in the prior round is simple, pure sampling error. Why: because (given that each survey house uses consistent methods in sampling, call-backs, and questions asked) errors due to the other factors would be more systematic and slower to fluctuate, and thus would consistently separate the results from different polling houses.

Is this the conclusion that others would draw?

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>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Thu, 30 Sep 2004 07:40:05 -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: Pew v. Gallup revisited (now that the polls converge)  
Comments: To: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmg1p@cms.mail.virginia.edu>,  
AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain

Measurement theory is built around the concept of identifying the sources of error when measuring a fixed quantity. Thus, we can pinpoint the source of the error of a scale used to measure the weight of a reference object, or set of reference objects, by observing the size and pattern of deviations of measurements from the true score.

When we look at the difference between results obtained by three separate organizations using somewhat disparate procedural protocols, testing different samples, using different questions and different human interviewers, we could make an educated guess as to which of the disparate factors contributes most heavily to the error score IFF [meaning if, and only if] the quantity being measured were fixed and knowable. It is trivially true that the quantity being measured is neither fixed nor knowable. All polls are then equally accurate.

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: Thomas M. Guterbock [mailto:tmg1p@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU]  
Sent: Wednesday, September 29, 2004 8:26 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Pew v. Gallup revisited (now that the polls converge)

The latest news on the national political polls has three major polls in substantial agreement with respect to the percentage-point margin between Messrs. Bush and Kerry. (Washington Post/ABC 51-44 RV; USA Today/CNN/Gallup 53-42 RV; Pew 48-40 RV.)

This suggests to me that the reason for the extraordinary divergence in the polls observed just a few days ago was: a true statistical fluke. Let's recall that our margin of error calculations allow one poll in 20 or so to be outside the margin of error, deviating more than 3% from the population proportion of interest. It seems to me most likely that the divergence observed in the last round of Pew polling was because they had the bad luck to draw a sample that did not look as much like the population as most samples of that size do.

I find this easier to believe than the alternatives, which are: (1) Pew changed its methodology and didn't tell us or (2) there were huge broad shifts in the electorate that only some polls picked up or (3) respondents



are 'unsettled,' measurement error is too high, etc.

Or, to put it in Survey 101 terms: if the four main types of survey error come from problems in sample, coverage, non-response, and measurement, I think the most parsimonious explanation of the divergence seen in the prior round is simple, pure sampling error. Why: because (given that each survey house uses consistent methods in sampling, call-backs, and questions asked) errors due to the other factors would be more systematic and slower to fluctuate, and thus would consistently separate the results from different polling houses.

Is this the conclusion that others would draw?

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

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

-----  
Date: Thu, 30 Sep 2004 10:33:38 -0400  
Reply-To: Richard Morin <[morinr@WASHPOST.COM](mailto:morinr@WASHPOST.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Richard Morin <[morinr@WASHPOST.COM](mailto:morinr@WASHPOST.COM)>  
Subject: New Poll Watchers column on washingtonpost.com: The Enthusiasm  
Gap, Other Gaps, and a Hurricane Tip from Gallup  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Here is the link to today's Poll Watchers column at washingtonpost.com:

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A61725-2004Sep30.html>

In this column:

The Enthusiasm Gap--Bush voters are enthused about their candidate, Kerry voters are not and the result is a 23-point gap in levels of enthusiasm that Kerry must begin to close in tonight's presidential debate.

The Great Divides--From the Gender Gap to the Grad School Gap, the other great divides in current presidential voting patterns

## The Poll Vault--Hurricane tip from Gallup: Buy a Pet

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

Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====

Date: Thu, 30 Sep 2004 09:53:12 -0500

Reply-To: "Steen, Bob" <[steenb@FLEISHMAN.COM](mailto:steenb@FLEISHMAN.COM)>

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

From: "Steen, Bob" <[steenb@FLEISHMAN.COM](mailto:steenb@FLEISHMAN.COM)>

Subject: Re: While we're on the subject of lefties...

Comments: To: "AAPORNET@asu.edu" <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain

I agree. I'm interested in the research issues more than the partisan sallies.

(Even so, one is tempted to ask each critic/defender whether they are advocates for Bush or Kerry. But frankly, it is like asking a gender question in a face-to-face interview. One could make an incorrect assumption, but...)

The partisan discourse on this Listserv following the last Presidential election was passionate, if not reasoned. I was impressed (depressed?) by how many of our commentators held up the rationale that in a democracy the person with the most votes should win. Our country's founders designed a republic of united states, based on representation of the states more than representation of the people. With this reality in mind, I get the greatest benefit from the discussions of polls that evaluate the issues and the electorate at the state level and how that ultimately defines the election outcome. All the focus on the nationwide likely-voter profile downplays the dynamics of our state-based, electoral college system. In a close presidential election, the focus on the snapshots of the national electorate is potentially misleading in terms of the outcome, even if it is an accurate portrayal of the national vote.

I'd be interested in seeing the samples for the "national" polls oversample the number of interviews in the swing states and weight the findings to reflect the electoral college. I see the media present their analysis this way. I believe the quick-call models are developed using this approach. I don't hear much about the national polls being conducted this way.

Bob Steen

Vice President

Fleishman-Hillard Knowledge Solutions

200 North Broadway

St. Louis, MO 63102

314-982-1752

steenb@fleishman.com <mailto:steenb@fleishman.com>

Fax: 314-982-9105

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

From: Marc Sapir [mailto:marcsapir@COMCAST.NET  
<mailto:marcsapir@COMCAST.NET> ]  
Sent: Wednesday, September 29, 2004 8:06 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: While we're on the subject of lefties...

Although Michael Moore uses his standard populist shlock style in the piece I'm not sure that what he wrote is a whole lot different in its actual substance from some of the concerns and criticisms that I've seen on this list serve. It's obvious he's just trying to "rally the troops" for his side, and uses some hyperbole to weight it, but there is no unified agreement here about why the polls have recently been so divergent and whether we are in a "typical" pre-election volatility period or whether what we are seeing reflects potential methodologic problems, if not bias. The issue of likely voters is fascinating. Besides what is already on the table one could ask the question whether narrow definitions of likely voters might tend to hold down the actual vote totals-i.e.make predictions come true. There is no question that human behavior can be modified by lowering expectations. That's a given.

I kind of regret that this list is being used to tar and feather Moore for his non-academic approach without really taking him on regarding substance. I find troubling the notion of AAPOR as a club of folks who are urged to stand up for each other in some generic sense. I see a difference between the egregious out of context and personal attack by Moveon.org re Gallup Jr. and what Moore said. He's become a favorite target these days. One is tempted to ask each Moore critic sticking it to him whether they are voting for Bush. I don't know how many saw the youngest Bush brother on CNN with Larry King during the Convention inserting a remarkable piece of name calling (totally out of the blue and out of the context of discussion) against Moore. Moore is hardly the first, nor is he the most reputable American character to suffer such slings and arrows of the crowd that likes to target individuals. They did it to Richard Clark, to O'Neill, to Wilson to neutralize them. They'll do it to anyone regardless of their credentials. It's called intimidation and it undermines democracy and the willingness to be frank and honest. Move on shouldn't do it either. I think we should just let Moore be Moore unless he does something like Move on did. His comment like his film isn't perfect but also like the film it has points in it that most are pondering. And there are good reasons why he won that award for Bowling for Columbine. He ought to be handled with a little more respect.

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

-request@asu.edu

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

Date: Thu, 30 Sep 2004 11:57:37 -0400  
Reply-To: "Sand Mountain Comm." <[sandmtn@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:sandmtn@MINDSPRING.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Sand Mountain Comm." <[sandmtn@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:sandmtn@MINDSPRING.COM)>  
Subject: Post-election analysis of "likely voters"  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I wonder if Gallup or anyone else has ever done a post-election analysis by getting results from the state elections office on which respondents actually voted and how that compares to the results of their "likely voter" screening.

Is anyone aware of any studies like this?

Todd Rehm

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

Date: Thu, 30 Sep 2004 12:22:16 -0500  
Reply-To: Rob Daves <[daves@STARTRIBUNE.COM](mailto:daves@STARTRIBUNE.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Rob Daves <[daves@STARTRIBUNE.COM](mailto:daves@STARTRIBUNE.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Post-election analysis of "likely voters"  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu), [sandmtn@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:sandmtn@MINDSPRING.COM)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit  
Content-disposition: inline

There have been a number of studies that have done this.

One is a 2001 AAPOR paper by Mike Dimock and others and is based on the 1999 Philadelphia mayoral election. It's quite well done, and offers some interesting conclusions about which and how many likely voter questions to ask.

But I can speak more cogently about ours. With the exception of one

election, after every election since the early 1990s we've gone back when the Secretary of State compiles her voting records and verified whether the respondents in our last polls before the election voted. I've presented several papers at AAPOR based on these findings, and have used them to test a number of likely voter models based on different methodologies: screens, index cutoffs (the Gallup and Pew method), ratio weights, and logistical regression weights.

This has allowed me to fine tune our modeling of the likely electorate and speak with some authority to critics who feel the need to pummel the poll and pollster, but are ignorant of methodological issues and just parrot what the partisan critics are saying. (Not that partisan critics are that well versed about it either.) Sadly, this doesn't cut down on the pummeling; it does, however, make me feel quite confident about our likely voter model.

Rob Daves, director  
The Minnesota Poll

>>> "Sand Mountain Comm." <sandmtn@MINDSPRING.COM> 09/30/04 10:57AM  
>>>

I wonder if Gallup or anyone else has ever done a post-election analysis by getting results from the state elections office on which respondents actually voted and how that compares to the results of their "likely voter" screening.

Is anyone aware of any studies like this?

Todd Rehm

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

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

=====

Date: Thu, 30 Sep 2004 13:24:21 -0400  
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
Subject: more on Gallup  
Comments: To: aapornet <aapornet@asu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

[Campaign Desk is a project of the Columbia Journalism Review.]

<<http://www.campaigndesk.org/archives/000963.asp>>

Distortion

September 28, 2004

## CNN Circles the Wagons on Polling

Disputes over polling techniques, once the exclusive province of statistic geeks and partisan bloggers, heated up and spilled over to the public domain today.

The well-financed liberal advocacy group, MoveOn.org, inserted the issue into the campaign by taking out a full-page ad in The New York Times which accuses Gallup of "refusing to fix a longstanding problem with their [sic] likely voter methodology," and criticized two media outlets, CNN and USA Today, each of which pays Gallup for the polls and the right to release the results.

MoveOn's ad argues: "Gallup's methodology has predicted lately that Republican turnout on Election Day is likely to exceed Democrats' by six to eight percentage points. But exit polls show otherwise: in each of the last two Presidential elections, Democratic turnout exceeded Republican by four to five points. That discrepancy alone can account for nearly all of Bush's phantom 14-point lead," reported by Gallup a couple of weeks ago.

Often, CNN covers contentious issues like this with sound bites from both sides, treating both positions roughly equally. But not this time. After all, a blow to Gallup's reputation as a reliable polling service is also a blow to CNN. So, on the network's "Inside Politics" this afternoon, it dealt with the issue this way:

Anchor Judy Woodruff began by briefly outlining MoveOn's complaint: "[R]ecent polls have shown George W. Bush leading John Kerry and MoveOn.org claims Gallup's polling techniques exaggerate Republican support." Woodruff then gave Gallup editor-in-chief Frank Newport almost three minutes to respond, uninterrupted, to the charges. Naturally, Newport defended Gallup's methodology, but essentially asked viewers to take it on faith that he knows what he's doing.

End of segment.

With that nifty sign-off, CNN implicitly confirmed a criticism of itself that was leveled in the MoveOn ad: the charge that CNN winds up "acting as unquestioning promotional partners [with Gallup], rather than as critical journalists." For this was not the journalism of a disinterested party with no ax to grind. This was PR. Had it been journalism, it would have gone something like this:

1 - CNN takes note of the MoveOn.org advertisement and the argument that it contains.

2 - A Gallup official responds with the organization's defense.

3 - A third party -- perhaps another establishment pollster -- explains that there is more than one school of thought on the issue of weighting polls.

4 - A reporter steps in to remind viewers that Gallup took some similar heat in the year 2000 when its poll results swung erratically from day to day, sometimes by as much as 10 points.

5 - A CNN decision-maker is interviewed and asked if the network is comfortable with Gallup's work and if it will continue to rely upon it -- or not.

End of segment.

But don't look to see that script unfold on CNN anytime soon.

Meantime, Campaign Desk is told, USA Today, the other co-sponsor of the Gallup poll, is working on its own story on the issue. We'll be curious to see it.

--Zachary Roth

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

=====  
Date: Thu, 30 Sep 2004 10:39:53 -0700  
Reply-To: Dean Bonner <[debonner@UNO.EDU](mailto:debonner@UNO.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Dean Bonner <[debonner@UNO.EDU](mailto:debonner@UNO.EDU)>  
Subject: The Uselessness Presidential Horserace Polls  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I just wanted to make a quick comment concerning the debate over national horserace polls. Considering that the popular vote will not decide who our next president will be, is it useful to analyze, critique and obsess over the plethora of national polls that are being released on a daily basis? Wouldn't it be more useful to discuss the state polls, especially those being done in the battleground states? For example, a new Gallup poll has Kerry ahead in Ohio by 3 points in a three-way race. This is especially interesting because for the better part of the last month and a half, Kerry has been behind in almost every poll coming out of Ohio.

I know that part of our debate is of a methodological nature, however it seems to me that the national media is obsessed with these national polls and that we as public opinion researchers should attempt to somehow put out information that is focused on the importance of looking at the state polls as well. What are others' thoughts on this?

Dean Bonner  
Research Associate  
Survey Research Center  
University of New Orleans  
2000 Lakeshore Drive  
New Orleans, LA 70148  
504-280-7379  
debonner@uno.edu

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

Date: Thu, 30 Sep 2004 14:22:34 -0400  
Reply-To: "Andrew E. Smith" <[andrew.smith@UNH.EDU](mailto:andrew.smith@UNH.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Andrew E. Smith" <[andrew.smith@UNH.EDU](mailto:andrew.smith@UNH.EDU)>  
Subject: New Controversy!!!!  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[LISTSERV%2004093010395372@LISTS.ASU.EDU](mailto:LISTSERV%2004093010395372@LISTS.ASU.EDU)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

I've been following with great interest the controversy over Gallup's poll numbers in the presidential race. But after looking at today's edition of [www.realclearpolitics.com](http://www.realclearpolitics.com) (which has a nicely updated series of polls), I think there's a new target for us to go after - the Investor's Business Daily/TIPP survey!

Why is the IBD/TIPP poll SO out of line with the rest of the polling community? Are they cooking their figures? Are their methods biased? Does IBD have secret pro-Kerry sympathies?

I'm sure Moveon.org must working hard to get to the bottom of this. I expect we'll see another full-page ad in the Times soon.

And where does Gallup go to get their reputation back?

|                                      |       |       |      |           |
|--------------------------------------|-------|-------|------|-----------|
| RCP Average 9/20 - 9/28              | 49.5% | 43.5% | 1.9% | Bush +6.0 |
| LA Times (1100 LV) 9/25 - 9/28       | 51%   | 45%   | 2%   | Bush +6   |
| CNN/USAT/Gallup (758 LV) 9/24 - 9/26 | 52%   | 44%   | 3%   | Bush +8   |
| IBD/TIPP (649 LV) 9/22 - 9/27        | 45%   | 45%   | 2%   | TIE       |
| ABC News/WP (810 LV) 9/23 - 9/26     | 51%   | 45%   | 1%   | Bush +6   |
| Pew Research (948 RV) 9/22 - 9/26    | 48%   | 40%   | 2%   | Bush +8   |
| Time (877 LV) 9/21 - 9/23            | 48%   | 42%   | 5%   | Bush +6   |
| FOX News (1000 LV) 9/21 - 9/22       | 46%   | 42%   | 1%   | Bush +4   |
| Battleground (1000 LV) 9/20 - 9/23   | 50%   | 45%   | 0%   | Bush +5   |
| Marist (630 LV) 9/20 - 9/22          | 50%   | 44%   | 2%   | Bush +6   |
| CBS News (931 LV) 9/20 - 9/22        | 51%   | 42%   | 2%   | Bush +9   |
| AP/Ipsos (931 LV) 9/20 - 9/22        | 52%   | 45%   | 1%   | Bush +7   |



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

Date: Thu, 30 Sep 2004 11:54:53 -0700  
Reply-To: John Nienstedt <[john@CERC.NET](mailto:john@CERC.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: John Nienstedt <[john@CERC.NET](mailto:john@CERC.NET)>  
Organization: CERC  
Subject: Write-in Candidates  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I wonder if anyone out there has had experience doing horserace questions involving write-in candidates at the local level. I'm not talking about those random people that get less than one percent of the vote or candidates with little name recognition. In our case we may be faced with a relatively well-known write-in candidate.

Specifically, do I ask a separate question seeking to gauge their propensity to write in the candidate's name? We're talking about a phone poll so we can't show them the ballot.

Do I simply ask the ballot question and let them volunteer if they would write-in the candidate? Do I then follow-up the initial ballot question with, if candidate X was running as a write-in would you vote for him/her?

Any data out there on how much of a negative effect, if any, the write-in aspect of a candidacy has? I'm conceiving that the effect would be measured by:

vote preference % in a pre-election poll minus actual vote % in the election where vote preference % is calculated w/o unswers.

Thanks in advance for any assistance.

John E. Nienstedt, Sr.

<mailto:john@cerc.net> john@cerc.net

Get the edge at <http://www.cerc.net/> www.cerc.net

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

---

Date: Thu, 30 Sep 2004 13:26:12 -0700  
Reply-To: Hank Zucker <[hank@surveysystem.com](mailto:hank@surveysystem.com)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Hank Zucker <[hank@SURVEYSYSTEM.COM](mailto:hank@SURVEYSYSTEM.COM)>  
Subject: Overseas voters  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Does anyone have any data on the number of overseas voters?

I have heard that overseas eligibles might cast votes in higher-than-usual numbers this year. This seems logical. It also seems logical that they would tend to lean more toward Kerry than voters in the US, since most overseas media are far more critical of Bush than are American media.

I wonder if there will be enough of this group, which is left out of the polls, to make a difference in some very close state. Does anyone have any data or any thoughts?

Hank

Hank Zucker, Ph.D.  
Creative Research Systems  
[www.surveysystem.com](http://www.surveysystem.com)  
(707) 765-1001

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

---

Date: Thu, 30 Sep 2004 13:46:11 -0700  
Reply-To: Dean Bonner <[debonner@UNO.EDU](mailto:debonner@UNO.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Dean Bonner <[debonner@UNO.EDU](mailto:debonner@UNO.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: The Uselessness Presidential Horserace Polls

I must clarify a point that I made. Due to mixed information I reported that Kerry was ahead in Ohio, however Bush still leads 49-47, a margin that is considerably smaller than in recent weeks. My overall point still holds, but I wanted to make this correction.

dean

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

---

---

Date: Thu, 30 Sep 2004 16:46:26 -0400  
Reply-To: "Raghavan K. Mayur" <[mayur@TECHNOMETRICA.COM](mailto:mayur@TECHNOMETRICA.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Raghavan K. Mayur" <[mayur@TECHNOMETRICA.COM](mailto:mayur@TECHNOMETRICA.COM)>  
Subject: Re: New Controversy!!!!  
Comments: To: "Andrew E. Smith" <[andrew.smith@UNH.EDU](mailto:andrew.smith@UNH.EDU)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[5.1.0.14.0.20040930141139.01641008@cisunix.unh.edu](mailto:5.1.0.14.0.20040930141139.01641008@cisunix.unh.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I direct the IBD/TIPP Poll. To briefly answer your question, our methodology is given in the story that IBD ran today (see below). We have been using the same method for the past 6 months and simply report the #s -- we have no hidden agendas or ulterior motives to make the #s swing one way or the other. They are what they are -- and we simply report the findings. And do our best to interpret them in light of current events.=20

FYI: To answer your question "Are they cooking their figures?" -- Absolutely not, "Does IBD have secret pro-Kerry sympathies?" -- Again no.

You may go back to [RealClearPolitics.com](http://RealClearPolitics.com) and look over this year's election polling since the beginning and make your own conclusions.

Raghavan Mayur  
President, TechnoMetrica Market Intelligence

IBD Story ---  
-----

Who's Leading Presidential Vote? This Time, Polls Offer Little Help  
By: Staff

Investors Business Daily

The race is dead even. No, it's Bush in a cakewalk.=20

Americans have been bombarded and bewildered by a blizzard of reputable

polls showing very different results. What's going on? =20

IBD/TIPP's latest poll shows President Bush and Sen. John Kerry all tied at 45%, with Ralph Nader taking 2%. Head to head, Kerry actually leads, 46%-45%. =20

But several other surveys show Bush with a tidy lead. =20

Gallup's most recent poll for CNN and USA Today gives Bush an eight-point lead (52% vs. 44%), while ABC News and Time magazine show six-point advantages. =20

Why the difference between these other polls and IBD/TIPP? =20

Methodological differences =97 such as likely voter screens, weighting = for party affiliation, timing of polls and allocation of undecided voters = =97 are key factors that contribute to the differences. =20

With the election looming, most polls now focus on likely voters. Pollsters want to weed out people who won't vote, but don't want to screen out those who likely will. =20

Most observers think turnout will rise from 2000 because the race is close and so important. But no one knows how much. =20

"Obviously there is more intensity and engagement by voters this election," said Carroll Doherty, editor at the Pew Research Center. "The challenge to pollsters is to tease out that higher turnout in their surveys." =20

IBD/TIPP defines likely voters as adults who say they're very likely to vote in November, have a high level of interest in the election and have voted in every or nearly every presidential election or are eligible for the first time. =20

Pollsters also are having more trouble reaching people. Cell phones and answering machines are a big reason. Polling firms call back several times to reach people. IBD/TIPP calls four times. =20

Even when someone answers, fewer take part. So the overall response rate is just 30%. =20

So IBD/TIPP weights poll results to account for demographic variations based on census proportions for age, gender and race. =20

Most other surveys do this. But pollsters are divided over weighting for political party identification. =20

"There are two schools of thought. The first one says that party ID varies from poll to poll, while the second school believes it's relatively stable and changes over several years," said Raghavan Mayur, president of TIPP, a unit of Technometrica Market Intelligence, IBD's

pollster.=20

IBD/TIPP takes the latter view, weighting surveys to a benchmark of party composition based on a profile of voting-age Americans polled over five to six months. The latest IBD poll considers voting-age Americans to be 37% Democratic, 35% Republican and 26% independent.=20

John Zogby, whose election eve polls were very accurate in 1996 and 2000, uses a party weight of 39% Democrat, 35% GOP and 26% independent, based on 2000 exit polls.=20

Other pollsters say party weighting is a bad idea overall.=20  
"The problem is that party ID is an attitude," said Mark Blumenthal, a Democratic pollster who runs MysteryPollster.com. "The reality is a lot of people change their affiliations over a short period of time."=20

The latest Gallup poll, which doesn't weight for party, has 43% Republicans, 31% Democrats and 25% independents.=20

Roughly 90% of Republicans and Democrats vote for their party's candidate, so a poll's makeup has a huge impact on final results. Not surprisingly, IBD shows an even race; Gallup gives Bush a nine-point edge.=20

Scott Rasmussen, whose daily tracking poll has shown Bush with a one- to four-point lead over the past month, says weighting party ID on past results gives you a "plausible starting point."=20

"That may change a bit, but it's highly unlikely we'll see more (self-described) Republicans than Democrats," he said.=20

IBD's poll stands out right now because others showing a closer race haven't released fresh results lately.=20

Zogby's most recent poll, taken Sept. 17-19, showed Bush with a three-point lead. Over those same dates, the Wall Street Journal/NBC poll, which adjusts for party ID, showed a four-point Bush lead.=20

Also, there has been a downward shift in Bush's lead the past 10 days or so. IBD's poll has gone from Bush up three to even. Gallup says his lead has shrunk from +14 to +8. Time says it's fallen from +11 to +6.=20

However, Pew Research Center's newly released Sept. 22-26 poll shows Bush with a 48%-40% lead among registered voters. A Sept. 11-14 poll had the race tied.=20

Pew's new "unweighted" poll included 33% Democrats, 32% Republicans and 30% independents.=20

In a recent paper, Pew compared how several major polls changed from early August to early September. In all, voters' GOP ties rose from one to 10 percentage points.=20

Weighting has problems, too.=20

Republicans fumed this summer when a Los Angeles Times poll showed a sudden shift in party ID, with 38% Democrats and 25% GOP. Not surprisingly, Kerry had a seven-point lead. Other surveys didn't confirm those results.=20

"I understand the confusion and strong reaction when a poll shows a 10-point GOP or Democrat advantage at a time when we are saying the nation is evenly divided," said Pew's Doherty.=20

Pollsters agree you shouldn't rely on a single poll. A rough and ready solution is to average out recent surveys. Real Clear Politics' average shows Bush with a 5.9-point lead over Kerry in a three-way race.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Andrew E. Smith  
Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2004 14:23  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: New Controversy!!!!

I've been following with great interest the controversy over Gallup's poll numbers in the presidential race. But after looking at today's edition of [www.realclearpolitics.com](http://www.realclearpolitics.com) (which has a nicely updated series of polls), I think there's a new target for us to go after - the Investor's Business Daily/TIPP survey!

Why is the IBD/TIPP poll SO out of line with the rest of the polling community? Are they cooking their figures? Are their methods biased? Does IBD have secret pro-Kerry sympathies?

I'm sure Moveon.org must working hard to get to the bottom of this. I expect we'll see another full-page ad in the Times soon.

And where does Gallup go to get their reputation back?

|                                      |       |       |      |         |
|--------------------------------------|-------|-------|------|---------|
| RCP Average 9/20 - 9/28              | 49.5% | 43.5% | 1.9% | Bush    |
| +6.0                                 |       |       |      |         |
| LA Times (1100 LV) 9/25 - 9/28       | 51%   | 45%   | 2%   | Bush +6 |
| CNN/USAT/Gallup (758 LV) 9/24 - 9/26 | 52%   | 44%   | 3%   | Bush +8 |
| IBD/TIPP (649 LV) 9/22 - 9/27        | 45%   | 45%   | 2%   | TIE     |
| ABC News/WP (810 LV) 9/23 - 9/26     | 51%   | 45%   | 1%   | Bush +6 |
| Pew Research (948 RV) 9/22 - 9/26    | 48%   | 40%   | 2%   | Bush +8 |
| Time (877 LV) 9/21 - 9/23            | 48%   | 42%   | 5%   | Bush +6 |
| FOX News (1000 LV) 9/21 - 9/22       | 46%   | 42%   | 1%   | Bush +4 |
| Battleground (1000 LV) 9/20 - 9/23   | 50%   | 45%   | 0%   | Bush +5 |
| Marist (630 LV) 9/20 - 9/22          | 50%   | 44%   | 2%   | Bush +6 |
| CBS News (931 LV) 9/20 - 9/22        | 51%   | 42%   | 2%   | Bush +9 |
| AP/Ipsos (931 LV) 9/20 - 9/22        | 52%   | 45%   | 1%   | Bush +7 |

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

Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

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

=====  
Date: Thu, 30 Sep 2004 13:26:18 -0700  
Reply-To: Doug Strand <[dstrand@CSM.BERKELEY.EDU](mailto:dstrand@CSM.BERKELEY.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Doug Strand <[dstrand@CSM.BERKELEY.EDU](mailto:dstrand@CSM.BERKELEY.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: New Controversy!!!!  
Comments: To: "Andrew E. Smith" <[andrew.smith@UNH.EDU](mailto:andrew.smith@UNH.EDU)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[5.1.0.14.0.20040930141139.01641008@cisunix.unh.edu](mailto:5.1.0.14.0.20040930141139.01641008@cisunix.unh.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

And, FYI, here is Investor's Business Daily's defense of their TIPP survey:  
<http://www.investors.com/editorial/general.asp?v=9/30>

Best,  
Doug Strand

-----  
Douglas Strand, Ph.D.  
Project Director  
Public Agendas and Citizen Engagement Survey (PACES)  
Survey Research Center  
UC Berkeley  
354 Barrows Hall  
Tel: 510-642-0508  
Fax: 510-642-9665

At 02:22 PM 9/30/2004 -0400, Andrew E. Smith wrote:  
>I've been following with great interest the controversy over Gallup's poll  
>numbers in the presidential race. But after looking at today's edition  
>of [www.realclearpolitics.com](http://www.realclearpolitics.com) (which has a nicely updated series of polls),  
>I think there's a new target for us to go after - the Investor's Business  
>Daily/TIPP survey!  
>  
>Why is the IBD/TIPP poll SO out of line with the rest of the polling  
>community? Are they cooking their figures? Are their methods  
>biased? Does IBD have secret pro-Kerry sympathies?  
>  
>I'm sure Moveon.org must working hard to get to the bottom of this. I  
>expect we'll see another full-page ad in the Times soon.  
>  
>And where does Gallup go to get their reputation back?  
>

>RCP Average 9/20 - 9/28 49.5% 43.5% 1.9% Bush +6.0  
>LA Times (1100 LV) 9/25 - 9/28 51% 45% 2% Bush +6  
>CNN/USAT/Gallup (758 LV) 9/24 - 9/26 52% 44% 3% Bush +8  
>IBD/TIPP (649 LV) 9/22 - 9/27 45% 45% 2% TIE  
>ABC News/WP (810 LV) 9/23 - 9/26 51% 45% 1% Bush +6  
>Pew Research (948 RV) 9/22 - 9/26 48% 40% 2% Bush +8  
>Time (877 LV) 9/21 - 9/23 48% 42% 5% Bush +6  
>FOX News (1000 LV) 9/21 - 9/22 46% 42% 1% Bush +4  
>Battleground (1000 LV) 9/20 - 9/23 50% 45% 0% Bush +5  
>Marist (630 LV) 9/20 - 9/22 50% 44% 2% Bush +6  
>CBS News (931 LV) 9/20 - 9/22 51% 42% 2% Bush +9  
>AP/Ipsos (931 LV) 9/20 - 9/22 52% 45% 1% Bush +7

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

>Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

>set aapornet nomail

>On your return send: set aapornet mail

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

Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Thu, 30 Sep 2004 17:57:35 -0400

Reply-To: "Raghavan K. Mayur" <[mayur@TECHNOMETRICA.COM](mailto:mayur@TECHNOMETRICA.COM)>

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

From: "Raghavan K. Mayur" <[mayur@TECHNOMETRICA.COM](mailto:mayur@TECHNOMETRICA.COM)>

Subject: Re: New Controversy!!!!

Comments: To: Howard Schuman <[hschuman@umich.edu](mailto:hschuman@umich.edu)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

In-Reply-To: <[415C7A9C.30500@umich.edu](mailto:415C7A9C.30500@umich.edu)>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Rewind 2 weeks back. We were the first polling organization that pointed out that the race was deadlocked It was corroborated by Pew and Harris polls the next day. Here's a clip from a TV show.

THE MCLAUGHLIN GROUP

DATE: FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2004

HOST: JOHN MCLAUGHLINMR. MCLAUGHLIN: Issue one: Cliffhanger.

Bulletin: Most recent numbers: Pew, Bush 46 percent, Kerry 46, Nader 1. Another survey, Tipp: Bush 46, Kerry 46, Nader 3. Another survey, Harris: Kerry 48, Bush 47, Nader 2.

With the election six weeks from Tuesday, it's a dead heat. Another survey, Gallup: Bush 55, Kerry 42.

Last week, we showed Bush ahead by 3-points. This was corroborated by Zogby's poll (+3) and Fox News (+4).



This week, using the same methods our poll showed a tie and we put that out. We were corroborated by 2 other polls yesterday -- a Harris Interactive poll that shows Bush ahead (+2) and The Economist's poll (+2).

I will send under a separate email -- a spreadsheet that shows tracking of our poll's internals (since you can't post it here in AAPOR NET).

Our likely voter screen typically yields a pass rate of 66%. Please see the IBD story where it is described.=20

Here's the sequence of data I had in my hand for the most recent poll:

- a) Raw marginal: 44% Kerry, 48% Bush, 2% Nader, 7% Not sure (Bush +4).
- b) After weighting for age, gender, race, and region: 45% Kerry, 46% Bush, 2% Nader, 8% Nader(Bush +1). =20
- c) After party weighting: 45% Bush, 45% Kerry, 2% Nader, 8% Not sure (even).=20

I will be pleased to discuss with you any other information you are interested in or even share my dataset.

=20  
Mayur  
=20

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

From: Howard Schuman [mailto:hschuman@umich.edu]=20  
Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2004 17:29  
To: Raghavan K. Mayur  
Subject: Re: New Controversy!!!!

I don't question the integrity of your poll at all, but would be=20 interested (a) in your trends over the past year, and (b) wht your own=20 interpretation is of why your results differ from most polls (e.g.,=20 different assumptions in screening? or what?).

Raghavan K. Mayur wrote:

>I direct the IBD/TIPP Poll. To briefly answer your question, our  
>methodology is given in the story that IBD ran today (see below). We  
>have been using the same method for the past 6 months and simply report  
>the #s -- we have no hidden agendas or ulterior motives to make the #s  
>swing one way or the other. They are what they are -- and we simply  
>report the findings. And do our best to interpret them in light of  
>current events.=20

>  
>FYI: To answer your question "Are they cooking their figures?" --  
>Absolutely not, "Does IBD have secret pro-Kerry sympathies?" -- Again  
>no.

>  
>You may go back to RealClearPolitcs.com and look over this year's  
>election polling since the beginning and make your own conclusions.

>  
>

>Raghavan Mayur  
>President, TechnoMetrica Market Intelligence  
>  
>  
>IBD Story ---  
>-----  
>Who's Leading Presidential Vote? This Time, Polls Offer Little Help  
>By: Staff  
>  
>Investors Business Daily  
>  
>The race is dead even. No, it's Bush in a cakewalk.=20  
>  
>Americans have been bombarded and bewildered by a blizzard of reputable  
>polls showing very different results. What's going on?=20  
>  
>IBD/TIPP's latest poll shows President Bush and Sen. John Kerry all  
tied  
>at 45%, with Ralph Nader taking 2%. Head to head, Kerry actually leads,  
>46%-45%.=20  
>  
>But several other surveys show Bush with a tidy lead.=20  
>  
>Gallup's most recent poll for CNN and USA Today gives Bush an  
>eight-point lead (52% vs. 44%), while ABC News and Time magazine show  
>six-point advantages.=20  
>  
>Why the difference between these other polls and IBD/TIPP?=20  
>  
>Methodological differences =97 such as likely voter screens, weighting  
for  
>party affiliation, timing of polls and allocation of undecided voters =  
=97  
>are key factors that contribute to the differences.=20  
>  
>With the election looming, most polls now focus on likely voters.  
>Pollsters want to weed out people who won't vote, but don't want to  
>screen out those who likely will.=20  
>  
>Most observers think turnout will rise from 2000 because the race is  
>close and so important. But no one knows how much.=20  
>  
>"Obviously there is more intensity and engagement by voters this  
>election," said Carroll Doherty, editor at the Pew Research Center.  
"The  
>challenge to pollsters is to tease out that higher turnout in their  
>surveys."=20  
>  
>IBD/TIPP defines likely voters as adults who say they're very likely to  
>vote in November, have a high level of interest in the election and  
have  
>voted in every or nearly every presidential election or are eligible  
for  
>the first time.=20

>  
>Pollsters also are having more trouble reaching people. Cell phones and  
>answering machines are a big reason. Polling firms call back several  
>times to reach people. IBD/TIPP calls four times.=20  
>  
>Even when someone answers, fewer take part. So the overall response  
rate  
>is just 30%.=20  
>  
>So IBD/TIPP weights poll results to account for demographic variations  
>based on census proportions for age, gender and race.=20  
>  
>Most other surveys do this. But pollsters are divided over weighting  
for  
>political party identification.=20  
>  
>"There are two schools of thought. The first one says that party ID  
>varies from poll to poll, while the second school believes it's  
>relatively stable and changes over several years," said Raghavan Mayur,  
>president of TIPP, a unit of TechnoMetrica Market Intelligence, IBD's  
>pollster.=20  
>  
>IBD/TIPP takes the latter view, weighting surveys to a benchmark of  
>party composition based on a profile of voting-age Americans polled  
over  
>five to six months. The latest IBD poll considers voting-age Americans  
>to be 37% Democratic, 35% Republican and 26% independent.=20  
>  
>John Zogby, whose election eve polls were very accurate in 1996 and  
>2000, uses a party weight of 39% Democrat, 35% GOP and 26% independent,  
>based on 2000 exit polls.=20  
>  
>Other pollsters say party weighting is a bad idea overall.=20  
>"The problem is that party ID is an attitude," said Mark Blumenthal, a  
>Democratic pollster who runs MysteryPollster.com. "The reality is a lot  
>of people change their affiliations over a short period of time."=20  
>  
>The latest Gallup poll, which doesn't weight for party, has 43%  
>Republicans, 31% Democrats and 25% independents.=20  
>  
>Roughly 90% of Republicans and Democrats vote for their party's  
>candidate, so a poll's makeup has a huge impact on final results. Not  
>surprisingly, IBD shows an even race; Gallup gives Bush a nine-point  
>edge.=20  
>  
>Scott Rasmussen, whose daily tracking poll has shown Bush with a one-  
to  
>four-point lead over the past month, says weighting party ID on past  
>results gives you a "plausible starting point."=20  
>  
>"That may change a bit, but it's highly unlikely we'll see more  
>(self-described) Republicans than Democrats," he said.=20  
>  
>IBD's poll stands out right now because others showing a closer race

>haven't released fresh results lately.=20

>

>Zogby's most recent poll, taken Sept. 17-19, showed Bush with a  
>three-point lead. Over those same dates, the Wall Street Journal/NBC  
>poll, which adjusts for party ID, showed a four-point Bush lead.=20

>

>Also, there has been a downward shift in Bush's lead the past 10 days  
or

>so. IBD's poll has gone from Bush up three to even. Gallup says his  
lead

>has shrunk from +14 to +8. Time says it's fallen from +11 to +6.=20

>

>However, Pew Research Center's newly released Sept. 22-26 poll shows  
>Bush with a 48%-40% lead among registered voters. A Sept. 11- 14 poll  
>had the race tied.=20

>

>Pew's new "unweighted" poll included 33% Democrats, 32% Republicans and  
>30% independents.=20

>

>In a recent paper, Pew compared how several major polls changed from  
>early August to early September. In all, voters' GOP ties rose from one  
>to 10 percentage points.=20

>

>Weighting has problems, too.=20

>

>Republicans fumed this summer when a Los Angeles Times poll showed a  
>sudden shift in party ID, with 38% Democrats and 25% GOP. Not  
>surprisingly, Kerry had a seven-point lead. Other surveys didn't  
confirm

>those results.=20

>

>"I understand the confusion and strong reaction when a poll shows a  
>10-point GOP or Democrat advantage at a time when we are saying the  
>nation is evenly divided," said Pew's Doherty.=20

>

>Pollsters agree you shouldn't rely on a single poll. A rough and ready  
>solution is to average out recent surveys. Real Clear Politics' average  
>shows Bush with a 5.9-point lead over Kerry in a three-way race.

>

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

>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Andrew E. Smith

>Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2004 14:23

>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>Subject: New Controversy!!!!

>

>I've been following with great interest the controversy over Gallup's  
>poll

>numbers in the presidential race. But after looking at today's edition  
>of [www.realclearpolitics.com](http://www.realclearpolitics.com) (which has a nicely updated series of  
>polls),

>I think there's a new target for us to go after - the Investor's

>Business

>Daily/TIPP survey!

>

>Why is the IBD/TIPP poll SO out of line with the rest of the polling  
>community? Are they cooking their figures? Are their methods  
>biased? Does IBD have secret pro-Kerry sympathies?  
>  
>I'm sure Moveon.org must working hard to get to the bottom of this. I  
>expect we'll see another full-page ad in the Times soon.  
>  
>And where does Gallup go to get their reputation back?  
>  
>RCP Average 9/20 - 9/28           49.5% 43.5% 1.9% Bush  
>+6.0  
>LA Times (1100 LV) 9/25 - 9/28 51% 45% 2% Bush +6  
>CNN/USAT/Gallup (758 LV) 9/24 - 9/26 52% 44% 3% Bush +8  
>IBD/TIPP (649 LV) 9/22 - 9/27 45% 45% 2% TIE  
>ABC News/WP (810 LV) 9/23 - 9/26 51% 45% 1% Bush +6  
>Pew Research (948 RV) 9/22 - 9/26 48% 40% 2% Bush +8  
>Time (877 LV) 9/21 - 9/23 48% 42% 5% Bush +6  
>FOX News (1000 LV) 9/21 - 9/22 46% 42% 1% Bush +4  
>Battleground (1000 LV) 9/20 - 9/23 50% 45% 0% Bush +5  
>Marist (630 LV) 9/20 - 9/22 50% 44% 2% Bush +6  
>CBS News (931 LV) 9/20 - 9/22 51% 42% 2% Bush +9  
>AP/Ipsos (931 LV) 9/20 - 9/22 52% 45% 1% Bush +7  
>

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

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

>=20  
>

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

Date: Thu, 30 Sep 2004 18:08:31 -0400  
Reply-To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jan Werner <[jwerner@JWDP.COM](mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM)>  
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing  
Subject: Re: The Uselessness Presidential Horserace Polls  
Comments: To: Dean Bonner <[debonner@UNO.EDU](mailto:debonner@UNO.EDU)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[LISTSERV%2004093013461138@LISTS.ASU.EDU](mailto:LISTSERV%2004093013461138@LISTS.ASU.EDU)>

MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Actually, the latest Gallup results for Ohio (Sept. 25-28, as posted by Polling Report) show a 49-47 Bush lead among likely voters and a 49-46 Kerry lead among registered voters in a 3-way race (including Nader).

Ralph Nader was knocked off the Ohio ballot yesterday, so the relevant figures are those asked for a 2-way race in the same poll ("if Ralph Nader is not on the ballot in your state..."). These show Bush by 50-48 among likely voters and Kerry by 50-46 among registered voters.

This is indeed good news for Kerry if you believe that Gallup's likely voter screen may not be good predictor in this year's election.

Jan Werner

---

Dean Bonner wrote:

> I must clarify a point that I made. Due to mixed information I reported  
> that Kerry was ahead in Ohio, however Bush still leads 49-47, a margin  
> that is considerably smaller than in recent weeks. My overall point still  
> holds, but I wanted to make this correction.

>  
> dean

>

> -----

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

>

>

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

=====  
Date: Thu, 30 Sep 2004 15:22:57 -0700  
Reply-To: Fred Solop <[Fred.Solop@NAU.EDU](mailto:Fred.Solop@NAU.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Fred Solop <[Fred.Solop@NAU.EDU](mailto:Fred.Solop@NAU.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Overseas voters  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

I'm in Spain right now and I can tell you that its not easy to vote from overseas. State laws are inconsistent on the process of applying for ballots. Some states allow you to request a

ballot via the internet, others will only accept an application through the mail. Some votes encourage early voting and other states discourage it. Ballots get printed rather late, they are sent through the mail to Americans living abroad and may take a while to arrive. Overseas voters have a narrow window to return the ballot and insure that it arrives by election day (if you live in Arizona,) or on the previous Friday (if you live in some other states.) In addition, the burden is on overseas voters to pay for postage.

Given what I've seen in Europe, I don't expect the overseas vote to play a significant role in this election.

Fred

>===== Original Message From Hank Zucker <hank@SURVEYSYSTEM.COM> =====

>Does anyone have any data on the number of overseas voters?

>

>I have heard that overseas eligibles might cast votes in higher-than-usual numbers this year. This seems logical. It also seems logical that they would tend to lean more toward Kerry than voters in the US, since most overseas media are far more critical of Bush than are American media.

>

>I wonder if there will be enough of this group, which is left out of the polls, to make a difference in some very close state. Does anyone have any data or any thoughts?

>

>Hank

>

>Hank Zucker, Ph.D.

Frederic I. Solop, Ph.D.  
Professor  
Department of Political Science  
PO Box 15036  
Northern Arizona University  
Flagstaff, AZ 86011  
(928) 523-3135 - office  
(928) 607-0488 - cell  
(928) 523-6777 - fax

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

---

Date: Thu, 30 Sep 2004 19:18:43 -0400  
Reply-To: Andrew A Beveridge <[andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU](mailto:andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Andrew A Beveridge <[andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU](mailto:andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU)>  
Subject: A blast from the

Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Four years ago, on October 27, 2000, a mere week and a half before the election, CNN said that polls from six major news sources -- CNN, USA Today, Gallup, ABC News and the Washington Post -- all found that George W. Bush was ahead in the popular vote. Some polls said Bush was substantially ahead.

"WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Republican presidential nominee George W. Bush holds a 49-to-43 percent edge over Democratic rival Al Gore in the latest CNN/Time poll, conducted Wednesday and Thursday.

The poll of 2,060 adult Americans, including 1,076 likely voters, has a margin of error of plus or minus three percentage points and is thus in essential agreement with a CNN/USA Today/Gallup tracking poll also released Friday. That poll gives Bush a 52 percent [to] 39 percent edge over Gore. More important, both polls show the same snapshot of the current state of the presidential campaign: a solid advantage for Bush.

ABC News and The Washington Post both have daily tracking polls today putting the race at 48 percent for Bush and 45 percent for Gore."

[at:

<http://www.cnn.com/2000/ALLPOLITICS/stories/10/27/cnntime.poll/index.html>

---

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

Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Thu, 30 Sep 2004 15:13:42 -0700

Reply-To: Hank Zucker <[hank@surveysystem.com](mailto:hank@surveysystem.com)>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Hank Zucker <[hank@SURVEYSYSTEM.COM](mailto:hank@SURVEYSYSTEM.COM)>

Subject: Re: Overseas voters

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

A number of people have mentioned the excellent point that many overseas voters will be in the military and presumed Bush supporters.

But how many military overseas voters are there compared with the number of civilian overseas voters? I have heard the figure of 200,000 eligible civilian voters in France and Germany alone, but I do not know if that figure is accurate. If it is, the civilian vote could be much larger than the military vote. That's one reason I asked if anyone knows the real numbers.

Hank



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

From: "Hank Zucker" <hank@SURVEYSYSTEM.COM>

To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2004 1:26 PM

Subject: Overseas voters

> Does anyone have any data on the number of overseas voters?

>

> I have heard that overseas eligibles might cast votes in higher-than-usual

> numbers this year. This seems logical. It also seems logical that they

> would tend to lean more toward Kerry than voters in the US, since most

> overseas media are far more critical of Bush than are American media.

>

> I wonder if there will be enough of this group, which is left out of the

> polls, to make a difference in some very close state. Does anyone have

any

> data or any thoughts?

>

> Hank

>

> Hank Zucker, Ph.D.

> Creative Research Systems

> www.surveysystem.com

> (707) 765-1001

>

> -----

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

> Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

> set aapornet nomail

> On your return send: set aapornet mail

>

>

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

Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Thu, 30 Sep 2004 19:20:20 -0400

Reply-To: Frank Rusciano <[rusciano@RIDER.EDU](mailto:rusciano@RIDER.EDU)>

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

From: Frank Rusciano <[rusciano@RIDER.EDU](mailto:rusciano@RIDER.EDU)>

Subject: Re: New Controversy!!!!

Comments: To: "Raghavan K. Mayur" <[mayur@TECHNOMETRICA.COM](mailto:mayur@TECHNOMETRICA.COM)>

Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

In-Reply-To: <000401c4a738\$85f43dc0\$3f01010a@d0q2u4>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Dear Fellow AAPORneters,

At the risk of being shut out of all future AAPOR discussions, conferences, etc. due to ignorance, I have a question. How does can both measure and weight for partisanship? (Please keep in mind that sampling is in no way my forte, and I am asking this in the spirit that I always encourage what may be considered "silly" questions by others from my students).

Raghavan K. Mayur wrote:

>Rewind 2 weeks back. We were the first polling organization that  
>pointed out that the race was deadlocked It was corroborated by Pew and  
>Harris polls the next day. Here's a clip from a TV show.

>

> THE MCLAUGHLIN GROUP

> DATE: FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2004

> HOST: JOHN MCLAUGHLINMR. MCLAUGHLIN: Issue one: Cliffhanger.

>

> Bulletin: Most recent numbers: Pew, Bush 46 percent, Kerry 46,

>Nader 1. Another survey, Tipp: Bush 46, Kerry 46, Nader 3. Another

>survey, Harris: Kerry 48, Bush 47, Nader 2.

>

> With the election six weeks from Tuesday, it's a dead heat.

>Another survey, Gallup: Bush 55, Kerry 42.

>

>Last week, we showed Bush ahead by 3-points. This was corroborated by

>Zogby's poll (+3) and Fox News (+4).

>

>This week, using the same methods our poll showed a tie and we put that

>out. We were corroborated by 2 other polls yesterday -- a Harris

>Interactive poll that shows Bush ahead (+2) and The Economist's poll

>(+2).

>

>I will send under a separate email -- a spreadsheet that shows tracking

>of our poll's internals (since you can't post it here in AAPOR NET).

>

>Our likely voter screen typically yields a pass rate of 66%. Please see

>the IBD story where it is described.

>

>Here's the sequence of data I had in my hand for the most recent poll:

>

>a) Raw marginal: 44% Kerry, 48% Bush, 2% Nader, 7% Not sure (Bush +4).

>b) After weighting for age, gender, race, and region: 45% Kerry, 46%

>Bush, 2% Nader, 8% Nader(Bush +1).

>c) After party weighting: 45% Bush, 45% Kerry, 2% Nader, 8% Not sure

>(even).

>

>I will be pleased to discuss with you any other information you are

>interested in or even share my dataset.

>

>Mayur

>  
>  
>-----Original Message-----  
>From: Howard Schuman [mailto:hschuman@umich.edu]  
>Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2004 17:29  
>To: Raghavan K. Mayur  
>Subject: Re: New Controversy!!!!

>  
>I don't question the integrity of your poll at all, but would be  
>interested (a) in your trends over the past year, and (b) wht your own  
>interpretation is of why your results differ from most polls (e.g.,  
>different assumptions in screening? or what?).

>  
>Raghavan K. Mayur wrote:

>>I direct the IBD/TIPP Poll. To briefly answer your question, our  
>>methodology is given in the story that IBD ran today (see below). We  
>>have been using the same method for the past 6 months and simply report  
>>the #s -- we have no hidden agendas or ulterior motives to make the #s  
>>swing one way or the other. They are what they are -- and we simply  
>>report the findings. And do our best to interpret them in light of  
>>current events.

>>  
>>FYI: To answer your question "Are they cooking their figures?" --  
>>Absolutely not, "Does IBD have secret pro-Kerry sympathies?" -- Again  
>>no.

>>  
>>You may go back to RealClearPolitics.com and look over this year's  
>>election polling since the beginning and make your own conclusions.

>>  
>>Raghavan Mayur  
>>President, TechnoMetrica Market Intelligence

>>  
>>IBD Story ---

>>-----  
>>Who's Leading Presidential Vote? This Time, Polls Offer Little Help

>>By: Staff

>>  
>>Investors Business Daily

>>  
>>The race is dead even. No, it's Bush in a cakewalk.

>>  
>>Americans have been bombarded and bewildered by a blizzard of reputable  
>>polls showing very different results. What's going on?

>>  
>>IBD/TIPP's latest poll shows President Bush and Sen. John Kerry all

>>  
>>tied

>

>  
>>at 45%, with Ralph Nader taking 2%. Head to head, Kerry actually leads,  
>>46%-45%.  
>>  
>>But several other surveys show Bush with a tidy lead.  
>>  
>>Gallup's most recent poll for CNN and USA Today gives Bush an  
>>eight-point lead (52% vs. 44%), while ABC News and Time magazine show  
>>six-point advantages.  
>>  
>>Why the difference between these other polls and IBD/TIPP?  
>>  
>>Methodological differences -- such as likely voter screens, weighting  
>>  
>>  
>for  
>  
>  
>>party affiliation, timing of polls and allocation of undecided voters --  
>>are key factors that contribute to the differences.  
>>  
>>With the election looming, most polls now focus on likely voters.  
>>Pollsters want to weed out people who won't vote, but don't want to  
>>screen out those who likely will.  
>>  
>>Most observers think turnout will rise from 2000 because the race is  
>>close and so important. But no one knows how much.  
>>  
>>"Obviously there is more intensity and engagement by voters this  
>>election," said Carroll Doherty, editor at the Pew Research Center.  
>>  
>>  
>"The  
>  
>  
>>challenge to pollsters is to tease out that higher turnout in their  
>>surveys."  
>>  
>>IBD/TIPP defines likely voters as adults who say they're very likely to  
>>vote in November, have a high level of interest in the election and  
>>  
>>  
>have  
>  
>  
>>voted in every or nearly every presidential election or are eligible  
>>  
>>  
>for  
>  
>  
>>the first time.  
>>  
>>Pollsters also are having more trouble reaching people. Cell phones and

>>answering machines are a big reason. Polling firms call back several  
>>times to reach people. IBD/TIPP calls four times.  
>>  
>>Even when someone answers, fewer take part. So the overall response  
>>  
>>  
>rate  
>  
>  
>>is just 30%.  
>>  
>>So IBD/TIPP weights poll results to account for demographic variations  
>>based on census proportions for age, gender and race.  
>>  
>>Most other surveys do this. But pollsters are divided over weighting  
>>  
>>  
>for  
>  
>  
>>political party identification.  
>>  
>>"There are two schools of thought. The first one says that party ID  
>>varies from poll to poll, while the second school believes it's  
>>relatively stable and changes over several years," said Raghavan Mayur,  
>>president of TIPP, a unit of TechnoMetrica Market Intelligence, IBD's  
>>pollster.  
>>  
>>IBD/TIPP takes the latter view, weighting surveys to a benchmark of  
>>party composition based on a profile of voting-age Americans polled  
>>  
>>  
>over  
>  
>  
>>five to six months. The latest IBD poll considers voting-age Americans  
>>to be 37% Democratic, 35% Republican and 26% independent.  
>>  
>>John Zogby, whose election eve polls were very accurate in 1996 and  
>>2000, uses a party weight of 39% Democrat, 35% GOP and 26% independent,  
>>based on 2000 exit polls.  
>>  
>>Other pollsters say party weighting is a bad idea overall.  
>>"The problem is that party ID is an attitude," said Mark Blumenthal, a  
>>Democratic pollster who runs MysteryPollster.com. "The reality is a lot  
>>of people change their affiliations over a short period of time."  
>>  
>>The latest Gallup poll, which doesn't weight for party, has 43%  
>>Republicans, 31% Democrats and 25% independents.  
>>  
>>Roughly 90% of Republicans and Democrats vote for their party's  
>>candidate, so a poll's makeup has a huge impact on final results. Not  
>>surprisingly, IBD shows an even race; Gallup gives Bush a nine-point  
>>edge.

>>  
>>Scott Rasmussen, whose daily tracking poll has shown Bush with a one-  
>>  
>>  
>to  
>  
>  
>>four-point lead over the past month, says weighting party ID on past  
>>results gives you a "plausible starting point."  
>>  
>>"That may change a bit, but it's highly unlikely we'll see more  
>>(self-described) Republicans than Democrats," he said.  
>>  
>>IBD's poll stands out right now because others showing a closer race  
>>haven't released fresh results lately.  
>>  
>>Zogby's most recent poll, taken Sept. 17-19, showed Bush with a  
>>three-point lead. Over those same dates, the Wall Street Journal/NBC  
>>poll, which adjusts for party ID, showed a four-point Bush lead.  
>>  
>>Also, there has been a downward shift in Bush's lead the past 10 days  
>>  
>>  
>or  
>  
>  
>>so. IBD's poll has gone from Bush up three to even. Gallup says his  
>>  
>>  
>lead  
>  
>  
>>has shrunk from +14 to +8. Time says it's fallen from +11 to +6.  
>>  
>>However, Pew Research Center's newly released Sept. 22-26 poll shows  
>>Bush with a 48%-40% lead among registered voters. A Sept. 11- 14 poll  
>>had the race tied.  
>>  
>>Pew's new "unweighted" poll included 33% Democrats, 32% Republicans and  
>>30% independents.  
>>  
>>In a recent paper, Pew compared how several major polls changed from  
>>early August to early September. In all, voters' GOP ties rose from one  
>>to 10 percentage points.  
>>  
>>Weighting has problems, too.  
>>  
>>Republicans fumed this summer when a Los Angeles Times poll showed a  
>>sudden shift in party ID, with 38% Democrats and 25% GOP. Not  
>>surprisingly, Kerry had a seven-point lead. Other surveys didn't  
>>  
>>  
>confirm  
>

>  
 >>those results.  
 >>  
 >>"I understand the confusion and strong reaction when a poll shows a  
 >>10-point GOP or Democrat advantage at a time when we are saying the  
 >>nation is evenly divided," said Pew's Doherty.  
 >>  
 >>Pollsters agree you shouldn't rely on a single poll. A rough and ready  
 >>solution is to average out recent surveys. Real Clear Politics' average  
 >>shows Bush with a 5.9-point lead over Kerry in a three-way race.  
 >>  
 >>-----Original Message-----  
 >>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Andrew E. Smith  
 >>Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2004 14:23  
 >>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
 >>Subject: New Controversy!!!!  
 >>  
 >>I've been following with great interest the controversy over Gallup's  
 >>poll  
 >>numbers in the presidential race. But after looking at today's edition  
 >>of www.realclearpolitics.com (which has a nicely updated series of  
 >>polls),  
 >>I think there's a new target for us to go after - the Investor's  
 >>Business  
 >>Daily/TIPP survey!  
 >>  
 >>Why is the IBD/TIPP poll SO out of line with the rest of the polling  
 >>community? Are they cooking their figures? Are their methods  
 >>biased? Does IBD have secret pro-Kerry sympathies?  
 >>  
 >>I'm sure Moveon.org must working hard to get to the bottom of this. I  
 >>expect we'll see another full-page ad in the Times soon.  
 >>  
 >>And where does Gallup go to get their reputation back?  
 >>  
 >>RCP Average 9/20 - 9/28           49.5% 43.5% 1.9% Bush  
 >>+6.0  
 >>LA Times (1100 LV) 9/25 - 9/28 51% 45% 2% Bush +6  
 >>CNN/USAT/Gallup (758 LV) 9/24 - 9/26 52% 44% 3% Bush +8  
 >>IBD/TIPP (649 LV) 9/22 - 9/27 45% 45% 2% TIE  
 >>ABC News/WP (810 LV) 9/23 - 9/26 51% 45% 1% Bush +6  
 >>Pew Research (948 RV) 9/22 - 9/26 48% 40% 2% Bush +8  
 >>Time (877 LV) 9/21 - 9/23 48% 42% 5% Bush +6  
 >>FOX News (1000 LV) 9/21 - 9/22 46% 42% 1% Bush +4  
 >>Battleground (1000 LV) 9/20 - 9/23 50% 45% 0% Bush +5  
 >>Marist (630 LV) 9/20 - 9/22 50% 44% 2% Bush +6  
 >>CBS News (931 LV) 9/20 - 9/22 51% 42% 2% Bush +9  
 >>AP/Ipsos (931 LV) 9/20 - 9/22 52% 45% 1% Bush +7  
 >>  
 >>-----  
 >>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
 >>Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
 >>set aapornet nomail  
 >>On your return send: set aapornet mail

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

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

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

=====  
Date: Thu, 30 Sep 2004 16:25:21 -0700  
Reply-To: [ellis.godard@csun.edu](mailto:ellis.godard@csun.edu)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Ellis Godard <[ellis.godard@CSUN.EDU](mailto:ellis.godard@CSUN.EDU)>  
Organization: CSUN  
Subject: Re: Overseas voters  
Comments: To: Hank Zucker <[hank@SURVEYSYSTEM.COM](mailto:hank@SURVEYSYSTEM.COM)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Overseas media are more critical of Bush, but overseas Americans may be more conservative - those in military service, those in foreign investment and construction, expat businessmen, et al. IIRC, Republicans actively promoted absentee ballots to those overseas (esp those in the service) during the 2000 election, for that very reason.

Ellis

> -----Original Message-----  
> From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Hank Zucker  
> Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2004 1:26 PM  
> To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
> Subject: Overseas voters  
>  
>  
> Does anyone have any data on the number of overseas voters?



>  
> I have heard that overseas eligibles might cast votes in  
> higher-than-usual numbers this year. This seems logical. It  
> also seems logical that they would tend to lean more toward  
> Kerry than voters in the US, since most overseas media are  
> far more critical of Bush than are American media.  
>  
> I wonder if there will be enough of this group, which is left  
> out of the polls, to make a difference in some very close  
> state. Does anyone have any data or any thoughts?  
>  
> Hank  
>  
> Hank Zucker, Ph.D.  
> Creative Research Systems  
> www.surveysystem.com  
> (707) 765-1001

---

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

---

Date: Thu, 30 Sep 2004 16:25:21 -0700  
Reply-To: [ellis.godard@csun.edu](mailto:ellis.godard@csun.edu)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Ellis Godard <[ellis.godard@CSUN.EDU](mailto:ellis.godard@CSUN.EDU)>  
Organization: CSUN  
Subject: Re: New Controversy!!!!  
Comments: To: "Raghavan K. Mayur" <[mayur@TECHNOMETRICA.COM](mailto:mayur@TECHNOMETRICA.COM)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

So, what does account for the difference? Sampling errors across the polls play a role, yes. Anything else? Does IDB/TIPP have demographically different samples, temporally different calling, or otherwise politically different results? Were the questions asked the same way, with the same or similar leading questions - and, if not, what differences were there in terms of other questions asked before the Bush/Kerry one?

And is the difference unique to this set of averages? (Andrew Smith's questions imply that perhaps IDB/TIPP consistently paints Kerry as doing better than others.)

Ellis Godard

>> -----Original Message-----  
>> From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of  
>> Raghavan K. Mayur

>> Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2004 1:46 PM  
>> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>> Subject: Re: New Controversy!!!!  
>>  
>>  
>> I direct the IBD/TIPP Poll. To briefly answer your question,  
>> our methodology is given in the story that IBD ran today (see  
>> below). We have been using the same method for the past 6  
>> months and simply report the #s -- we have no hidden agendas  
>> or ulterior motives to make the #s swing one way or the  
>> other. They are what they are -- and we simply report the  
>> findings. And do our best to interpret them in light of  
>> current events.  
>>  
>> FYI: To answer your question "Are they cooking their  
>> figures?" -- Absolutely not, "Does IBD have secret pro-Kerry  
>> sympathies?" -- Again no.  
>>  
>> You may go back to RealClearPolitcs.com and look over this  
>> year's election polling since the beginning and make your own  
>> conclusions.  
>>  
>>  
>> Raghavan Mayur  
>> President, TechnoMetrica Market Intelligence  
>

---

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

---

Date: Thu, 30 Sep 2004 17:34:29 -0700  
Reply-To: John Nienstedt <[john@CERC.NET](mailto:john@CERC.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: John Nienstedt <[john@CERC.NET](mailto:john@CERC.NET)>  
Organization: CERC  
Subject: Re: A blast from the  
Comments: To: Andrew A Beveridge <[andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU](mailto:andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[0I4V00J4FNFJFE@mta8.srv.hcvlny.cv.net](mailto:0I4V00J4FNFJFE@mta8.srv.hcvlny.cv.net)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Right. But instead of viewing this as an indictment of the polls, I think this just highlights how fluid things can get in a high stakes presidential race. Even the best polls (and at the national level all the polling firms produce quality research using sound methods) are just snap shots in time. If you're a Kerry fan you shouldn't look at the polls and shoot the messengers or hang your head. Things can turn and, hey, that's what a campaign is for anyway -- to change minds. And, if you're a Bush fan, you can't get complacent for similar reasons.

John E. Nienstedt, Sr.  
john@cerc.net  
Get the edge at www.cerc.net

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Andrew A Beveridge  
Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2004 4:19 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: A blast from the

Four years ago, on October 27, 2000, a mere week and a half before the election, CNN said that polls from six major news sources -- CNN, USA Today, Gallup, ABC News and the Washington Post -- all found that George W. Bush was ahead in the popular vote. Some polls said Bush was substantially ahead.

"WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Republican presidential nominee George W. Bush holds a 49-to-43 percent edge over Democratic rival Al Gore in the latest CNN/Time poll, conducted Wednesday and Thursday.

The poll of 2,060 adult Americans, including 1,076 likely voters, has a margin of error of plus or minus three percentage points and is thus in essential agreement with a CNN/USA Today/Gallup tracking poll also released Friday. That poll gives Bush a 52 percent [to] 39 percent edge over Gore. More important, both polls show the same snapshot of the current state of the presidential campaign: a solid advantage for Bush.

ABC News and The Washington Post both have daily tracking polls today putting the race at 48 percent for Bush and 45 percent for Gore."  
[at:  
<http://www.cnn.com/2000/ALLPOLITICS/stories/10/27/cnntime.poll/index.htm>  
l

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

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

Date: Thu, 30 Sep 2004 22:08:18 -0700  
Reply-To: Mary Ellen Gordon <m.gordon@MARKETTRUTHS.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mary Ellen Gordon <m.gordon@MARKETTRUTHS.COM>  
Subject: Re: Overseas voters

I live in New Zealand, and the Americans I know here seem more motivated than in previous elections to put up with the hassles Fred mentioned in order to vote and to do so in such a way that their vote will actually count.

I agree with your point about the overseas media being more critical, but I suspect the more important issue in terms of whether overseas voters could actually make a difference in the election is how they are distributed according to state. You vote in the last state you lived in. I last lived in Massachusetts, so there is absolutely no chance my vote is going to matter.

So in my view, the real question is whether there are any swing states with large numbers of overseas voters and whether the majority of overseas voters from those states are military people or civilians. Of course, since the Census Bureau doesn't even know many Americans live abroad (there's an interesting discussion of this issue and how they plan to address it here: <http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/overseas/overseas-congress-report.html>), I'm sure no one has any idea how many eligible voters live abroad nor how they are distributed by state. The estimates I've seen for Americans living abroad (which would include kids and people who are not registered to vote) range between four and ten million.

Mary Ellen

Mary Ellen Gordon, Ph.D.  
E-mail [m.gordon@markettruths.com](mailto:m.gordon@markettruths.com)  
Web [www.markettruths.com](http://www.markettruths.com)

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