

From: LISTS.ASU.EDU LISTSERV Server (16.0) [LISTSERV@asu.edu]  
Sent: Sunday, May 29, 2011 8:57 AM  
To: Shapard Wolf  
Subject: File: "AAPORNET LOG0801"

---

Date: Wed, 2 Jan 2008 08:57:21 -0500  
Reply-To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>  
Subject: Re: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course  
Comments: To: Dominic Lusinchi <dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
In-Reply-To: A<005701c84a8c\$7a8bfa90\$6e01a8c0@acer14219167c5>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Classic revisionism! Let me respond point by point.

1. You state, " This statement gives the false impression that the Digest sample was random - which it certainly was not." The statement reads, "Even samples that are selected at random can be hopelessly flawed if respondents are selected from a pool that is different than the population the researcher is attempting to measure. That was the case with the most famous polling disaster of all time: the 1936 Literary Digest presidential poll." That statement, taken out of context, does not give the impression that the Digest sample was random, but it does state -- not imply or give an impression -- that when the sample frame is different than [sic] the population, the sample is "hopelessly flawed."

2. You state, " We have no empirical evidence, that I am aware of, that would allow us to reach such a conclusion" [that the sample did not match the population]. In 1936, the United States was in the midst of an economic depression; the sample was mailed out to a pool consisting in very large measure of Literary Digest subscribers, motor vehicle owners (who had registered their vehicles), and people with telephone listings. If you really believe that sample was representative of the voters of the time, I suppose that if you had a time machine and could go back, you'd use the same sample. As for evidence of a poor match between sample and population, just for an example, in 2005 in the United States, the ratio of cars to persons was 245:288 (millions), or 1.17 persons per car. In 1936, the ratio of cars to persons was 2:130, or 65 persons per car. Even allowing for voter registration differences, and percent of the population eligible to vote, and all the other factors, this was a nonrepresentative sample.

3. You make some allusions to a Gallup Poll. " The Gallup survey, as reported by Squire, does not, in my opinion, provide the data to conclude that selection bias in the original sample of 10 million used by the Digest was a serious issue. At most we can say that IF nonresponse bias had not been an issue, The Literary Digest should have been able to call the election in favor of FDR, but its estimate would have been off by a substantial margin - like other polls were."

I don't suppose that the other polls to which you refer include the 1936 poll

of 50,000 respondents conducted by George Gallup that predicted the election result accurately -- and was roundly categorized as naïve at the time. But Gallup collected his data from a more representative sample.

4. You state, " I suggest that if we are going to use the 1936 Digest poll as an example of bad survey research, we should use it as an illustration of what happens when \*nonresponse bias\* occurs in a survey. (The response rate to the poll was 24%.)" Point #2, above, refers to a lack of empirical evidence; where is the empirical evidence for nonresponse bias? It might be suggested that, in addition to sampling from the upper stratum the people who responded (voluntarily, without promise of reward, incentive, and without any refusal conversion effort) were the people who thought that FDR -- the incumbent -- was a 'traitor to his class' and were anxious to vote him out of office. But that's just an idle speculation. If the results had gone the other way, one might have argued that Gallup's flawed prediction was due to potential FDR voters failing to get to the polls because they were poor, and everybody "knows" that poor people are just lazy. Idle speculation is idle speculation. I don't know of any empirical evidence that would support any hypothesis of nonresponse bias, and the special edition of POQ in 2006 offered no convincing argument in favor of response rate as a consistent indicator of survey quality. Even a 100% response rate from a nonrepresentative sample can produce an erroneous result.

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  
517-353-2639

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Dominic Lusinchi  
Sent: Saturday, December 29, 2007 9:34 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

I apologize in advance to my colleagues who are members of the SRMSnet and might have read, some weeks ago, my diatribe regarding the way the 1936 Literary Digest poll is being reported.

I am disappointed that AAPOR is promoting a web site ([http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor\\_polling07](http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor_polling07)), whose merits, otherwise, are undeniable, that reiterates inaccuracies about the failure of the 1936 Literary Digest poll.

On the page that gives examples of "bad sampling" ([http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor\\_polling07](http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor_polling07)), in a paragraph entitled "A Notorious Polling Disaster", we read:

"Even samples that are selected at random can be hopelessly flawed if respondents are selected from a pool that is different than the population

the researcher is attempting to measure. That was the case with the most famous polling disaster of all time: the 1936 Literary Digest presidential poll."

This statement gives the false impression that the Digest sample was random - which it certainly was not. It also implies that the Digest sample (mistakenly referred as "respondents") was selected from a pool that was "different" from the target population. We have no empirical evidence, that I am aware of, that would allow us to reach such a conclusion. By the way, the target population is the voting population (nearly 46M in 1936, total popular vote): we know that, if the past is anything like the present, IT (the voting population) is a biased "sample" of the voting-age population -in the U.S. at least.

The author of the text on this web page goes on to quote a Mr. Curtis, who writes, as many have before him: "The magazine surveyed more than 2 million people [the number of respondents to the poll, DL], chosen from the magazine's subscriber list, phone books and car registrations." These are not the only sources that the Digest used to compile its list. This statement merely repeats, as I said, what many have asserted before: that the Digest list was made up only of people who had phones or cars. As Maurice Bryson (The American Statistician, 1976, 30, 4, p.184-185) urged more than 20 yrs ago: Check your sources!

Mr. Curtis goes on to write: "Even though the sample was enormous, it was unrepresentative of the population of voters." We know that the sample was enormous (the Digest, we are told, mailed out around 10M ballots). But how do we know that it was unrepresentative?

Mr. Curtis concludes: "Not everyone could afford a phone or car during the Depression, and those who could afford cars tended to vote Republican in greater numbers than those who couldn't. As a result, the poll showed Republican Alf Landon beating the actual winner, Democrat Franklin Roosevelt." This statement continues to promote "selection bias" as the principal cause of the Digest's "fiasco". It is wrong!

I suggest that if we are going to use the 1936 Digest poll as an example of bad survey research, we should use it as an illustration of what happens when \*nonresponse bias\* occurs in a survey. (The response rate to the poll was 24%.)

The scant empirical evidence that exists indicates that \*nonresponse bias\* was to blame: respondents were very different in their voting intentions than nonrespondents were. The evidence I am referring to are two studies, both published in AAPOR's flagship journal the Public Opinion Quarterly: Don Cahalan, "The Digest Poll Rides Again!", Public Opinion Quarterly, 1989, 53, pp.129-133; and Peverill Squire, "Why the 1936 Literary Digest poll failed" Public Opinion Quarterly, 1988, 52, 125-133. Both studies have some serious limitations. Cahalan, who uses the soundest methodology (a telephone survey based on a random sample from the Digest list with a response rate of 80%), conducted his study in one city only! Squire analyzes the data from a Gallup poll. The "sample" is national, but it is based on the quota methodology.

The Gallup survey, as reported by Squire, does not, in my opinion, provide

the data to conclude that selection bias in the original sample of 10 million used by the Digest was a serious issue. At most we can say that IF nonresponse bias had not been an issue, The Literary Digest should have been able to call the election in favor of FDR, but its estimate would have been off by a substantial margin - like other polls were.

It is ironic that AAPOR sponsors a web site (the polling course) that promotes an analysis of the 1936 Digest poll that is contradicted by authors published in POQ!

Let's heed Bryson's words and put an end to this \*statistical myth\*!

By the way: this is all meant in a friendly spirit as befits the season.

Happy New Year to all.

Dominic Lusinchi

Far West Research  
Statistical Consulting  
San Francisco, California  
415-664-3032  
www.farwestresearch.com

P.S. I would disagree with the characterization that "The Literary Digest fiasco ushered in the age of probability-based surveys." The 1948 election did that (see "Fifty Years of Survey Sampling in the United States", Martin R. Frankel and Lester R. Frankel, Public Opinion Quarterly, 51, Part 2, 1987, S127-S138, p.S129).

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Pat Lewis  
Sent: Thursday, December 27, 2007 10:58 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

At The Wall Street Journal, Carl Bialik, AKA The Numbers Guy, encourages his readers to look at the NewsU Course

<http://blogs.wsj.com/numbersguy/>

December 27, 2007, 10:43 am

A Polling Primer <<http://blogs.wsj.com/numbersguy/a-polling-primer-245/>>

As journalists and voters focus on next week's Iowa caucus, they'll be inundated with polling data. Sites such as Pollster.com<<http://www.pollster.com/>>and Real Clear Politics <<http://www.realclearpolitics.com/>> compile the latest primary polling numbers, while news sites including WSJ.com<<http://online.wsj.com/public/resources/documents/info-enlargePic07.html>> distribute the numbers.

[image: poll]

Before digesting all the data, reporters and readers may want to consult an online course with useful tips on interpreting and analyzing polls.

Understanding  
& Interpreting

Polls<[http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor\\_polling07](http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor_polling07)>,

free with registration, is targeted at journalists but also useful for consumers of journalism - not just political coverage, but any reporting based on surveys. It was released by the Poynter Institute, a school for journalists in St. Petersburg, Fla., and American Association for Public Opinion Research (Aapor), a polling professional organization. The course explains how good polls can undermine - and trump - conventional wisdom, while bad polls mislead and can create bad journalism.

The goal of the course is to get its students "to understand that not all polls are equal," said Cliff Zukin, a survey expert at Rutgers and former president of Aapor who helped develop the course. Sometimes the best reporting on certain polls, he said, is the decision to not cover them.

--

Pat Lewis  
Communications Director  
American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR)  
1405 North George Mason Drive  
Arlington, Virginia  
703.527-5245  
cell 703.201.5070  
[www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org)

AAPOR -- the leading association of public opinion and survey research professionals.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
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> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Wed, 2 Jan 2008 08:21:47 -0700

Reply-To: "Margaret R. Roller" <rnr@ROLLERRESEARCH.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Margaret R. Roller" <rnr@ROLLERRESEARCH.COM>  
Subject: Self-selection Bias  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Can anyone point me in the direction of published studies concerning response tendencies associated with self-selection bias. In particular, I am interested in the likelihood of extreme -- i.e., very positive or very negative -- responses from a self-administered questionnaire inserted in a publication.

Thank you.

--  
Margaret R. Roller  
Roller Marketing Research  
rnr@rollerresearch.com

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Wed, 2 Jan 2008 10:21:51 -0500  
Reply-To: "Karunaratne, Sanjeewa" <sanjeewa.karunaratne@UCONN.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Karunaratne, Sanjeewa" <sanjeewa.karunaratne@UCONN.EDU>  
Subject: Land line incidence of low income households  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Happy New Year you all -

I am trying to find out any research which talks about the incidence of low income households (generally according to federal poverty guidelines) having land lines. We are planning to conduct a RDD study on low income households and believe the incidence is high - a reasonable estimate is our issue.

Any direction, suggestion, or link is highly appreciated.

Thanks,

Sanjeewa

Sanjeewa Karunaratne

Project Manager  
Center for Survey Research and Analysis  
University of Connecticut  
860-486-5257 (phone)  
860-486-6655 (fax)  
sanjeewa.karunaratne@uconn.edu  
www.csra.uconn.edu

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
=====

Date: Wed, 2 Jan 2008 10:40:01 -0500  
Reply-To: Jonathan Brill <[brillje@UMDNJ.EDU](mailto:brillje@UMDNJ.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jonathan Brill <[brillje@UMDNJ.EDU](mailto:brillje@UMDNJ.EDU)>  
Subject: post-stratification weighting consultant  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Comments: cc: Rachel Pruchno <[pruchnra@umdnj.edu](mailto:pruchnra@umdnj.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT  
Content-disposition: inline  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

I am seeking to identify a consultant with expertise and credible experience in post-stratification weighting of survey data. The consultant would be in a position to provide an NIH biosketch and letter of support for a grant application making use of the ORANJ BOWL data repository and panel resources which will be submitted for February 1, 2008. If you know of anyone who would be a good candidate for this role, please let me know or ask him or her to contact me.

Thanks!

Regards,  
Jonathan

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.  
General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm) Panel Research Program  
Associate Director, Research Call Center & Panel Research  
NEW JERSEY INSTITUTE FOR SUCCESSFUL AGING  
School of Osteopathic Medicine  
University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey  
42 East Laurel Road, UDP Suite 2300  
Stratford, New Jersey 08084  
Telephone (direct): 856.566-6727  
Fax (research group): 856.566-6874  
E-mail: [brillje@umdnj.edu](mailto:brillje@umdnj.edu)  
[www.oranjbowl.info](http://www.oranjbowl.info)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email communication may contain private, confidential, or legally privileged information intended for the sole use of the designated and/or duly authorized recipient(s). If you are not the intended recipient or have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by email and permanently delete all copies of this email including all attachments without reading them. If you are the intended recipient, secure the contents in a manner that conforms to all applicable state and/or federal requirements related to privacy and confidentiality of such information.

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====

Date: Wed, 2 Jan 2008 10:39:40 -0800

Reply-To: Dominic Lusinchi <[dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM](mailto:dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM)>

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

From: Dominic Lusinchi <[dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM](mailto:dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM)>

Organization: Far West Research

Subject: Re: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

Comments: To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <[Nathaniel.Ehrlich@ssc.msu.edu](mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@ssc.msu.edu)> ,

[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

In-Reply-To: <[EC15B06368AAA4419321FF6D2159CB1C01B057A5@sscent03-2.ssc.msu.edu](mailto:EC15B06368AAA4419321FF6D2159CB1C01B057A5@sscent03-2.ssc.msu.edu)>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I will pass on the "ism" bit which does nothing for the understanding of the issue at hand.

I will go over your points.

1. The statement quoted is not taken out of context. It is the first paragraph under the header "A Notorious Polling Disaster".

2. In Chicago, the Digest polled every third registered voter (see its Nov. 14, 1936 issue). The response rate to the poll in that city was 20%. The Digest predicted Landon to win over FDR: 49% vs. 48% (rounded). FDR received 65% of the vote in Chicago. This result is consistent with what Cahalan (in Cedar Rapids, Iowa) and Squire (nationwide) found out: the voting preferences of respondents and nonrespondents were very different. There can be no question of selection bias here.

As for your numbers regarding car registrations, they do not match my sources. In 1936, according to the Historical Statistics of the U.S. (Bicentennial ed., U.S. Bureau of the Census), there were about 24M automobiles registered (Series Q 153). According to the same source, the total population of the U.S. was 128M (Series A 6). In any case, the Literary Digest used a variety of sources (see Aug. 22, 1936 issue), including motor-vehicle registration, to compile its list.

3. Squire (see POQ, 1988, 52, p.125-133) reports on a poll conducted by Gallup in May 1937. The Gallup poll you are referring to is a pre-election



poll. The Gallup poll did correctly predict a victory for FDR but it was off by quite a bit (53.8 percent vs 60.8 of the total popular vote).

By the way, if we are to believe the Gallup survey as reported by Squire, it shows (table 1, p. 130 of Squire's paper in POQ) that FDR was favored by all "classes" of voters (whether they owned a car or a telephone, or both or neither). Even if we allow for an overestimation in favor of Roosevelt, the only group where FDR does not have a majority is among owners of a car and a telephone - there it is a tie between him and Landon.

4. You state: "Where is the empirical evidence for nonresponse bias?" Read the two papers referred to. Look at table 1 in the Cahalan paper (p.131): among those who report receiving and returning the Digest ballot (the respondents) only 29% favor FDR. Among those that say they received the Digest ballot but did not return, or say they did not receive it or don't remember (the nonrespondents) 53% favor FDR. In the Squire paper, look at table 3 (p.131): among Digest poll respondents (ignoring small parties), FDR received 48.6%; among nonrespondents: ~69.8%.

Although the empirical evidence has its limitation, it is the best evidence that we have and it beats "idle speculation" or beliefs. And the empirical evidence as I read it indicates that the failure of the Literary Digest poll in 1936 (20 point error in its prediction) was due primarily to nonresponse bias.

You state: "Even a 100% response rate from a nonrepresentative sample can produce an erroneous result." Nonrepresentative of what? What if those that are left out of the sampling frame and those in the sampling frame have the same distribution on the substantive variable at issue?

In any case, the empirical evidence, despite its limitations, supports Bryson's conjecture that the Digest poll failed because of nonresponse bias.

Good chatting with you but I got to get to work.

Cheers,  
Dominic Lusinchi

Applied Statistician  
Far West Research  
Statistical Consulting  
San Francisco, California  
415-664-3032  
www.farwestresearch.com

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

From: Ehrlich, Nathaniel [mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@ssc.msu.edu]  
Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2008 5:57 AM  
To: Dominic Lusinchi; AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: RE: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

Classic revisionism! Let me respond point by point.

1. You state, " This statement gives the false impression that the Digest sample was random - which it certainly was not." The statement reads, "Even samples that are selected at random can be hopelessly flawed if respondents

are selected from a pool that is different than the population the researcher is attempting to measure. That was the case with the most famous polling disaster of all time: the 1936 Literary Digest presidential poll." That statement, taken out of context, does not give the impression that the Digest sample was random, but it does state -- not imply or give an impression -- that when the sample frame is different than [sic] the population, the sample is "hopelessly flawed."

2. You state, " We have no empirical evidence, that I am aware of, that would allow us to reach such a conclusion" [that the sample did not match the population]. In 1936, the United States was in the midst of an economic depression; the sample was mailed out to a pool consisting in very large measure of Literary Digest subscribers, motor vehicle owners (who had registered their vehicles), and people with telephone listings. If you really believe that sample was representative of the voters of the time, I suppose that if you had a time machine and could go back, you'd use the same sample.

As for evidence of a poor match between sample and population, just for an example, in 2005 in the United States, the ratio of cars to persons was 245:288 (millions), or 1.17 persons per car. In 1936, the ratio of cars to persons was 2:130, or 65 persons per car. Even allowing for voter registration differences, and percent of the population eligible to vote, and all the other factors, this was a nonrepresentative sample.

3. You make some allusions to a Gallup Poll. " The Gallup survey, as reported by Squire, does not, in my opinion, provide the data to conclude that selection bias in the original sample of 10 million used by the Digest was a serious issue. At most we can say that IF nonresponse bias had not been an issue, The Literary Digest should have been able to call the election in favor of FDR, but its estimate would have been off by a substantial margin - like other polls were."

I don't suppose that the other polls to which you refer include the 1936 poll of 50,000 respondents conducted by George Gallup that predicted the election result accurately -- and was roundly categorized as naïve at the time. But Gallup collected his data from a more representative sample.

4. You state, " I suggest that if we are going to use the 1936 Digest poll as an example of bad survey research, we should use it as an illustration of what happens when \*nonresponse bias\* occurs in a survey. (The response rate to the poll was 24%.)" Point #2, above, refers to a lack of empirical evidence; where is the empirical evidence for nonresponse bias? It might be suggested that, in addition to sampling from the upper stratum the people who responded (voluntarily, without promise of reward, incentive, and without any refusal conversion effort) were the people who thought that FDR -- the incumbent -- was a 'traitor to his class' and were anxious to vote him out of office. But that's just an idle speculation. If the results had gone the other way, one might have argued that Gallup's flawed prediction was due to potential FDR voters failing to get to the polls because they were poor, and everybody "knows" that poor people are just lazy. Idle speculation is idle speculation. I don't know of any empirical evidence that would support any hypothesis of nonresponse bias, and the special edition of POQ in 2006 offered no convincing argument in favor of response rate as a consistent indicator of survey quality. Even a 100% response rate from a nonrepresentative sample can produce an erroneous result.

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  
517-353-2639

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Dominic Lusinchi  
Sent: Saturday, December 29, 2007 9:34 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

I apologize in advance to my colleagues who are members of the SRMSnet and might have read, some weeks ago, my diatribe regarding the way the 1936 Literary Digest poll is being reported.

I am disappointed that AAPOR is promoting a web site ([http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor\\_polling07](http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor_polling07)), whose merits, otherwise, are undeniable, that reiterates inaccuracies about the failure of the 1936 Literary Digest poll.

On the page that gives examples of "bad sampling" ([http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor\\_polling07](http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor_polling07)), in a paragraph entitled "A Notorious Polling Disaster", we read:

"Even samples that are selected at random can be hopelessly flawed if respondents are selected from a pool that is different than the population the researcher is attempting to measure. That was the case with the most famous polling disaster of all time: the 1936 Literary Digest presidential poll."

This statement gives the false impression that the Digest sample was random - which it certainly was not. It also implies that the Digest sample (mistakenly referred as "respondents") was selected from a pool that was "different" from the target population. We have no empirical evidence, that I am aware of, that would allow us to reach such a conclusion. By the way, the target population is the voting population (nearly 46M in 1936, total popular vote): we know that, if the past is anything like the present, IT (the voting population) is a biased "sample" of the voting-age population -in the U.S. at least.

The author of the text on this web page goes on to quote a Mr. Curtis, who writes, as many have before him: "The magazine surveyed more than 2 million people [the number of respondents to the poll, DL], chosen from the magazine's subscriber list, phone books and car registrations." These are not the only sources that the Digest used to compile its list. This statement merely repeats, as I said, what many have asserted before: that the Digest list was made up only of people who had phones or cars. As Maurice Bryson (The American Statistician, 1976, 30, 4, p.184-185) urged

more than 20 yrs ago: Check your sources!

Mr. Curtis goes on to write: "Even though the sample was enormous, it was unrepresentative of the population of voters." We know that the sample was enormous (the Digest, we are told, mailed out around 10M ballots). But how do we know that it was unrepresentative?

Mr. Curtis concludes: "Not everyone could afford a phone or car during the Depression, and those who could afford cars tended to vote Republican in greater numbers than those who couldn't. As a result, the poll showed Republican Alf Landon beating the actual winner, Democrat Franklin Roosevelt." This statement continues to promote "selection bias" as the principal cause of the Digest's "fiasco". It is wrong!

I suggest that if we are going to use the 1936 Digest poll as an example of bad survey research, we should use it as an illustration of what happens when *\*nonresponse bias\** occurs in a survey. (The response rate to the poll was 24%.)

The scant empirical evidence that exists indicates that *\*nonresponse bias\** was to blame: respondents were very different in their voting intentions than nonrespondents were. The evidence I am referring to are two studies, both published in AAPOR's flagship journal the Public Opinion Quarterly: Don Cahalan, "The Digest Poll Rides Again!", Public Opinion Quarterly, 1989, 53, pp.129-133; and Peverill Squire, "Why the 1936 Literary Digest poll failed" Public Opinion Quarterly, 1988, 52, 125-133. Both studies have some serious limitations. Cahalan, who uses the soundest methodology (a telephone survey based on a random sample from the Digest list with a response rate of 80%), conducted his study in one city only! Squire analyzes the data from a Gallup poll. The "sample" is national, but it is based on the quota methodology.

The Gallup survey, as reported by Squire, does not, in my opinion, provide the data to conclude that selection bias in the original sample of 10 million used by the Digest was a serious issue. At most we can say that IF nonresponse bias had not been an issue, The Literary Digest should have been able to call the election in favor of FDR, but its estimate would have been off by a substantial margin - like other polls were.

It is ironic that AAPOR sponsors a web site (the polling course) that promotes an analysis of the 1936 Digest poll that is contradicted by authors published in POQ!

Let's heed Bryson's words and put an end to this *\*statistical myth\**!

By the way: this is all meant in a friendly spirit as befits the season.

Happy New Year to all.

Dominic Lusinchi

Far West Research  
Statistical Consulting  
San Francisco, California  
415-664-3032

www.farwestresearch.com

P.S. I would disagree with the characterization that "The Literary Digest fiasco ushered in the age of probability-based surveys." The 1948 election did that (see "Fifty Years of Survey Sampling in the United States", Martin R. Frankel and Lester R. Frankel, Public Opinion Quarterly, 51, Part 2, 1987, S127-S138, p.S129).

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Pat Lewis  
Sent: Thursday, December 27, 2007 10:58 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

At The Wall Street Journal, Carl Bialik, AKA The Numbers Guy, encourages his readers to look at the NewsU Course

<http://blogs.wsj.com/numbersguy/>

December 27, 2007, 10:43 am

A Polling Primer <<http://blogs.wsj.com/numbersguy/a-polling-primer-245/>>

As journalists and voters focus on next week's Iowa caucus, they'll be inundated with polling data. Sites such as Pollster.com<<http://www.pollster.com/>>and Real Clear Politics <<http://www.realclearpolitics.com/>> compile the latest primary polling numbers, while news sites including WSJ.com<<http://online.wsj.com/public/resources/documents/info-enlargePic07.html>> distribute the numbers.

[image: poll]

Before digesting all the data, reporters and readers may want to consult an online course with useful tips on interpreting and analyzing polls. Understanding & Interpreting Polls<[http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor\\_polling07](http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor_polling07)>, free with registration, is targeted at journalists but also useful for consumers of journalism - not just political coverage, but any reporting based on surveys. It was released by the Poynter Institute, a school for journalists in St. Petersburg, Fla., and American Association for Public Opinion Research (Aapor), a polling professional organization. The course explains how good polls can undermine - and trump - conventional wisdom, while bad polls mislead and can create bad journalism.

The goal of the course is to get its students "to understand that not all polls are equal," said Cliff Zukin, a survey expert at Rutgers and former president of Aapor who helped develop the course. Sometimes the best reporting on certain polls, he said, is the decision to not cover them.

--  
Pat Lewis

Communications Director  
American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR)  
1405 North George Mason Drive  
Arlington, Virginia  
703.527-5245  
cell 703.201.5070  
www.aapor.org

AAPOR -- the leading association of public opinion and survey research professionals.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
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> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Wed, 2 Jan 2008 14:35:46 -0500  
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: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course  
Comments: To: Dominic Lusinchi <[dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM](mailto:dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: A<[001801c84d6e\\$d6034920\\$6e01a8c0@acer14219167c5](mailto:001801c84d6e$d6034920$6e01a8c0@acer14219167c5)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

1. The statement in question reads " That was the case with the most famous polling disaster of all time: the 1936 Literary Digest presidential poll." The word " That" I took to refer to the main clause "if respondents are selected from a pool that is different from the population the researcher is attempting to measure", not the modifier that starts, even if the selection is random. I agree that a cursory reading could yield the observation that the author implied a random sample, but let it go. The issue is whether the sample was representative of the population or not.

2. I'm not going to comment on the Nov 14 Digest (is this the Literary Digest? A post election poll?) and my source of vehicles registered was in error. The ratio was indeed 24:128, still 5 persons to each vehicle. My bad.

Your fourth statement refers to a post-election poll. Curious thing about those: people's memories, or reports, of their own votes cast are often influenced by the actual result, and their attitudes about that result. In the Michigan election of 2006, a proposal to end preferential state hiring and college admission based on race passed by a margin of 62:38 percent. A post-election survey of people who claimed to have voted on the issue showed a 62:38 split AGAINST the measure. So I personally don't put too much confidence on after-the-fact reporting, including exit polls, no matter the sampling strategy. It's possible that the Michigan voters didn't want to admit having voted for a proposal that was opposed by both the Democratic and Republican candidates; and there are several speculative scenarios for the FDR nonrespondent total of close to 70% -- and my speculation and yours will undoubtedly differ.

You didn't answer my question, though, about what you would do if it was September 1936; would you really use the Literary Digest sample frame? If not, why not?

I agree that it's good to chat, but like you I have bills to pay, and work is how that gets done.

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  
517-353-2639

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Dominic Lusinchi  
Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2008 1:40 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

I will pass on the "ism" bit which does nothing for the understanding of the issue at hand.

I will go over your points.

1. The statement quoted is not taken out of context. It is the first paragraph under the header "A Notorious Polling Disaster".
2. In Chicago, the Digest polled every third registered voter (see its Nov. 14, 1936 issue). The response rate to the poll in that city was 20%. The Digest predicted Landon to win over FDR: 49% vs. 48% (rounded). FDR received 65% of the vote in Chicago. This result is consistent with what Cahalan (in Cedar Rapids, Iowa) and Squire (nationwide) found out: the voting preferences of respondents and nonrespondents were very different. There can be no question of selection bias here.

As for your numbers regarding car registrations, they do not match my sources. In 1936, according to the Historical Statistics of the U.S.

(Bicentennial ed., U.S. Bureau of the Census), there were about 24M automobiles registered (Series Q 153). According to the same source, the total population of the U.S. was 128M (Series A 6). In any case, the Literary Digest used a variety of sources (see Aug. 22, 1936 issue), including motor-vehicle registration, to compile its list.

3. Squire (see POQ, 1988, 52, p.125-133) reports on a poll conducted by Gallup in May 1937. The Gallup poll you are referring to is a pre-election poll. The Gallup poll did correctly predict a victory for FDR but it was off by quite a bit (53.8 percent vs 60.8 of the total popular vote).

By the way, if we are to believe the Gallup survey as reported by Squire, it shows (table 1, p. 130 of Squire's paper in POQ) that FDR was favored by all "classes" of voters (whether they owned a car or a telephone, or both or neither). Even if we allow for an overestimation in favor of Roosevelt, the only group where FDR does not have a majority is among owners of a car and a telephone - there it is a tie between him and Landon.

4. You state: "Where is the empirical evidence for nonresponse bias?" Read the two papers referred to. Look at table 1 in the Cahalan paper (p.131): among those who report receiving and returning the Digest ballot (the respondents) only 29% favor FDR. Among those that say they received the Digest ballot but did not return, or say they did not receive it or don't remember (the nonrespondents) 53% favor FDR. In the Squire paper, look at table 3 (p.131): among Digest poll respondents (ignoring small parties), FDR received 48.6%; among nonrespondents: ~69.8%.

Although the empirical evidence has its limitation, it is the best evidence that we have and it beats "idle speculation" or beliefs. And the empirical evidence as I read it indicates that the failure of the Literary Digest poll in 1936 (20 point error in its prediction) was due primarily to nonresponse bias.

You state: "Even a 100% response rate from a nonrepresentative sample can produce an erroneous result." Nonrepresentative of what? What if those that are left out of the sampling frame and those in the sampling frame have the same distribution on the substantive variable at issue?

In any case, the empirical evidence, despite its limitations, supports Bryson's conjecture that the Digest poll failed because of nonresponse bias.

Good chatting with you but I got to get to work.

Cheers,  
Dominic Lusinchi

Applied Statistician  
Far West Research  
Statistical Consulting  
San Francisco, California  
415-664-3032  
www.farwestresearch.com

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

From: Ehrlich, Nathaniel [mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@ssc.msu.edu]

Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2008 5:57 AM



To: Dominic Lusinchi; AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: RE: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

Classic revisionism! Let me respond point by point.

1. You state, " This statement gives the false impression that the Digest sample was random - which it certainly was not." The statement reads, "Even samples that are selected at random can be hopelessly flawed if respondents are selected from a pool that is different than the population the researcher is attempting to measure. That was the case with the most famous polling disaster of all time: the 1936 Literary Digest presidential poll." That statement, taken out of context, does not give the impression that the Digest sample was random, but it does state -- not imply or give an impression -- that when the sample frame is different than [sic] the population, the sample is "hopelessly flawed."

2. You state, " We have no empirical evidence, that I am aware of, that would allow us to reach such a conclusion" [that the sample did not match the population]. In 1936, the United States was in the midst of an economic depression; the sample was mailed out to a pool consisting in very large measure of Literary Digest subscribers, motor vehicle owners (who had registered their vehicles), and people with telephone listings. If you really believe that sample was representative of the voters of the time, I suppose that if you had a time machine and could go back, you'd use the same sample.

As for evidence of a poor match between sample and population, just for an example, in 2005 in the United States, the ratio of cars to persons was 245:288 (millions), or 1.17 persons per car. In 1936, the ratio of cars to persons was 2:130, or 65 persons per car. Even allowing for voter registration differences, and percent of the population eligible to vote, and all the other factors, this was a nonrepresentative sample.

3. You make some allusions to a Gallup Poll. " The Gallup survey, as reported by Squire, does not, in my opinion, provide the data to conclude that selection bias in the original sample of 10 million used by the Digest was a serious issue. At most we can say that IF nonresponse bias had not been an issue, The Literary Digest should have been able to call the election in favor of FDR, but its estimate would have been off by a substantial margin - like other polls were."

I don't suppose that the other polls to which you refer include the 1936 poll of 50,000 respondents conducted by George Gallup that predicted the election result accurately -- and was roundly categorized as naïve at the time. But Gallup collected his data from a more representative sample.

4. You state, " I suggest that if we are going to use the 1936 Digest poll as an example of bad survey research, we should use it as an illustration of what happens when \*nonresponse bias\* occurs in a survey. (The response rate to the poll was 24%.)" Point #2, above, refers to a lack of empirical evidence; where is the empirical evidence for nonresponse bias? It might be suggested that, in addition to sampling from the upper stratum the people who responded (voluntarily, without promise of reward, incentive, and without any refusal conversion effort) were the people who thought that FDR -- the incumbent -- was a 'traitor to his class' and were anxious to vote him out of office. But that's just an idle speculation. If the results had

gone the other way, one might have argued that Gallup's flawed prediction was due to potential FDR voters failing to get to the polls because they were poor, and everybody "knows" that poor people are just lazy. Idle speculation is idle speculation. I don't know of any empirical evidence that would support any hypothesis of nonresponse bias, and the special edition of POQ in 2006 offered no convincing argument in favor of response rate as a consistent indicator of survey quality. Even a 100% response rate from a nonrepresentative sample can produce an erroneous result.

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  
517-353-2639

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Dominic Lusinchi  
Sent: Saturday, December 29, 2007 9:34 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

I apologize in advance to my colleagues who are members of the SRMSnet and might have read, some weeks ago, my diatribe regarding the way the 1936 Literary Digest poll is being reported.

I am disappointed that AAPOR is promoting a web site ([http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor\\_polling07](http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor_polling07)), whose merits, otherwise, are undeniable, that reiterates inaccuracies about the failure of the 1936 Literary Digest poll.

On the page that gives examples of "bad sampling" ([http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor\\_polling07](http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor_polling07)), in a paragraph entitled "A Notorious Polling Disaster", we read:

"Even samples that are selected at random can be hopelessly flawed if respondents are selected from a pool that is different than the population the researcher is attempting to measure. That was the case with the most famous polling disaster of all time: the 1936 Literary Digest presidential poll."

This statement gives the false impression that the Digest sample was random - which it certainly was not. It also implies that the Digest sample (mistakenly referred as "respondents") was selected from a pool that was "different" from the target population. We have no empirical evidence, that I am aware of, that would allow us to reach such a conclusion. By the way, the target population is the voting population (nearly 46M in 1936, total popular vote): we know that, if the past is anything like the present, IT (the voting population) is a biased "sample" of the voting-age population -in the U.S. at least.

The author of the text on this web page goes on to quote a Mr. Curtis, who writes, as many have before him: "The magazine surveyed more than 2 million people [the number of respondents to the poll, DL], chosen from the magazine's subscriber list, phone books and car registrations." These are not the only sources that the Digest used to compile its list. This statement merely repeats, as I said, what many have asserted before: that the Digest list was made up only of people who had phones or cars. As Maurice Bryson (The American Statistician, 1976, 30, 4, p.184-185) urged more than 20 yrs ago: Check your sources!

Mr. Curtis goes on to write: "Even though the sample was enormous, it was unrepresentative of the population of voters." We know that the sample was enormous (the Digest, we are told, mailed out around 10M ballots). But how do we know that it was unrepresentative?

Mr. Curtis concludes: "Not everyone could afford a phone or car during the Depression, and those who could afford cars tended to vote Republican in greater numbers than those who couldn't. As a result, the poll showed Republican Alf Landon beating the actual winner, Democrat Franklin Roosevelt." This statement continues to promote "selection bias" as the principal cause of the Digest's "fiasco". It is wrong!

I suggest that if we are going to use the 1936 Digest poll as an example of bad survey research, we should use it as an illustration of what happens when *\*nonresponse bias\** occurs in a survey. (The response rate to the poll was 24%.)

The scant empirical evidence that exists indicates that *\*nonresponse bias\** was to blame: respondents were very different in their voting intentions than nonrespondents were. The evidence I am referring to are two studies, both published in AAPOR's flagship journal the Public Opinion Quarterly: Don Cahalan, "The Digest Poll Rides Again!", Public Opinion Quarterly, 1989, 53, pp.129-133; and Peverill Squire, "Why the 1936 Literary Digest poll failed" Public Opinion Quarterly, 1988, 52, 125-133. Both studies have some serious limitations. Cahalan, who uses the soundest methodology (a telephone survey based on a random sample from the Digest list with a response rate of 80%), conducted his study in one city only! Squire analyzes the data from a Gallup poll. The "sample" is national, but it is based on the quota methodology.

The Gallup survey, as reported by Squire, does not, in my opinion, provide the data to conclude that selection bias in the original sample of 10 million used by the Digest was a serious issue. At most we can say that IF nonresponse bias had not been an issue, The Literary Digest should have been able to call the election in favor of FDR, but its estimate would have been off by a substantial margin - like other polls were.

It is ironic that AAPOR sponsors a web site (the polling course) that promotes an analysis of the 1936 Digest poll that is contradicted by authors published in POQ!

Let's heed Bryson's words and put an end to this *\*statistical myth\**!

By the way: this is all meant in a friendly spirit as befits the season.

Happy New Year to all.

Dominic Lusinchi

Far West Research  
Statistical Consulting  
San Francisco, California  
415-664-3032  
www.farwestresearch.com

P.S. I would disagree with the characterization that "The Literary Digest fiasco ushered in the age of probability-based surveys." The 1948 election did that (see "Fifty Years of Survey Sampling in the United States", Martin R. Frankel and Lester R. Frankel, Public Opinion Quarterly, 51, Part 2, 1987, S127-S138, p.S129).

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Pat Lewis  
Sent: Thursday, December 27, 2007 10:58 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

At The Wall Street Journal, Carl Bialik, AKA The Numbers Guy, encourages his readers to look at the NewsU Course

<http://blogs.wsj.com/numbersguy/>

December 27, 2007, 10:43 am

A Polling Primer <<http://blogs.wsj.com/numbersguy/a-polling-primer-245/>>

As journalists and voters focus on next week's Iowa caucus, they'll be inundated with polling data. Sites such as Pollster.com<<http://www.pollster.com/>>and Real Clear Politics <<http://www.realclearpolitics.com/>> compile the latest primary polling numbers, while news sites including WSJ.com<<http://online.wsj.com/public/resources/documents/info-enlargePic07.html>> distribute the numbers.

[image: poll]

Before digesting all the data, reporters and readers may want to consult an online course with useful tips on interpreting and analyzing polls. Understanding & Interpreting Polls<[http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor\\_polling07](http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor_polling07)>, free with registration, is targeted at journalists but also useful for consumers of journalism - not just political coverage, but any reporting based on surveys. It was released by the Poynter Institute, a school for journalists in St. Petersburg, Fla., and American Association for Public Opinion Research (Aapor), a polling professional organization. The course explains how good polls can undermine - and trump - conventional wisdom, while bad polls mislead and can create bad journalism.

The goal of the course is to get its students "to understand that not all polls are equal," said Cliff Zukin, a survey expert at Rutgers and former president of Aapor who helped develop the course. Sometimes the best reporting on certain polls, he said, is the decision to not cover them.

--

Pat Lewis  
Communications Director  
American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR)  
1405 North George Mason Drive  
Arlington, Virginia  
703.527-5245  
cell 703.201.5070  
www.aapor.org

AAPOR -- the leading association of public opinion and survey research professionals.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
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> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Wed, 2 Jan 2008 12:18:32 -0800  
Reply-To: Dominic Lusinchi <[dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM](mailto:dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Dominic Lusinchi <[dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM](mailto:dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM)>  
Organization: Far West Research  
Subject: Re: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course  
Comments: To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <[Nathaniel.Ehrlich@ssc.msu.edu](mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@ssc.msu.edu)>,  
AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
In-Reply-To: <[EC15B06368AAA4419321FF6D2159CB1C01B058F3@sscnet03-2.ssc.msu.edu](mailto:EC15B06368AAA4419321FF6D2159CB1C01B058F3@sscnet03-2.ssc.msu.edu)>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

1. OK. But the question is: Was the Digest sample biased in favor of Landon? And if so, can it explain why the poll was off by 20 points? My argument is that the limited evidence we have indicates a large nonresponse bias. It also indicates that there might have been some selection bias (in favor of Landon) in the Digest but that its (minor) effect on the results was swamped by the nonresponse bias. Furthermore, the evidence in favor of nonresponse bias is much clearer than that on selection bias.

2. In the November, 14, 1936 issue of the Digest the editors tried to understand why the poll went so wrong when, in the past, they had been so successful using the same "methodology".

3. Of course, you are right in saying that one should take the results of a post-election poll with a heavy grain of salt. I do not deny that the evidence we have is less than perfect. Despite its imperfections, it cannot be denied that it shows a clear nonresponse bias. We can assess its imperfections and determine what we can conclude regarding the issue at hand: that is why I say that the evidence on nonresponse bias is very convincing, whereas, in my view, the data on selection bias is not as transparent.

4. In 1936, survey research/polling was in its infancy. Gallup was a far more sophisticated researcher than the folks at the Digest. But they had been successful in previous elections: why should they doubt their own "methods"? In 1932, they were off by less than 1 point! But even Gallup and other major pollsters of the day were using a methodology with its own problems: that came to light in 1948! So to answer your question, I see no reason not to use the Digest sample, only I would not have sent out 10M "ballots", but a considerably smaller number and with the money we would have saved I would have done a nonresponse follow-up (assuming a nonresponse rate of 24%). (Nothing like 20:20 hindsight!)

5. My point for bringing this up in the first place is that I think it is wrong to characterize the Digest poll failure as the result of a biased sample when the existing evidence indicates that nonresponse bias was the primary cause. What I am advocating is that if we use the 1936 Digest poll as an example of bad survey research the emphasis should be shifted towards nonresponse bias rather than selection bias. At the very least we should talk about both.

Cheers,  
Dominic

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

From: Ehrlich, Nathaniel [mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@ssc.msu.edu]

Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2008 11:36 AM

To: Dominic Lusinchi; AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: RE: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

1. The statement in question reads " That was the case with the most famous polling disaster of all time: the 1936 Literary Digest presidential poll." The word " That" I took to refer to the main clause "if respondents are selected from a pool that is different from the population the researcher is attempting to measure", not the modifier that starts, even if the selection is random. I agree that a cursory reading could yield the observation that the author implied a random sample, but let it go. The issue is whether the sample was representative of the population or not.

2. I'm not going to comment on the Nov 14 Digest (is this the Literary Digest? A post election poll?) and my source of vehicles registered was in error. The ratio was indeed 24:128, still 5 persons to each vehicle. My bad.

Your fourth statement refers to a post-election poll. Curious thing about those: people's memories, or reports, of their own votes cast are often influenced by the actual result, and their attitudes about that result. In the Michigan election of 2006, a proposal to end preferential state hiring and college admission based on race passed by a margin of 62:38 percent. A post-election survey of people who claimed to have voted on the issue showed a 62:38 split AGAINST the measure. So I personally don't put too much confidence on after-the-fact reporting, including exit polls, no matter the sampling strategy. It's possible that the Michigan voters didn't want to admit having voted for a proposal that was opposed by both the Democratic and Republican candidates; and there are several speculative scenarios for the FDR nonrespondent total of close to 70% -- and my speculation and yours will undoubtedly differ.

You didn't answer my question, though, about what you would do if it was September 1936; would you really use the Literary Digest sample frame? If not, why not?

I agree that it's good to chat, but like you I have bills to pay, and work is how that gets done.

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  
517-353-2639

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Dominic Lusinchi  
Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2008 1:40 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

I will pass on the "ism" bit which does nothing for the understanding of the issue at hand.

I will go over your points.

1. The statement quoted is not taken out of context. It is the first paragraph under the header "A Notorious Polling Disaster".

2. In Chicago, the Digest polled every third registered voter (see its Nov. 14, 1936 issue). The response rate to the poll in that city was 20%. The Digest predicted Landon to win over FDR: 49% vs. 48% (rounded). FDR received 65% of the vote in Chicago. This result is consistent with what Cahalan (in Cedar Rapids, Iowa) and Squire (nationwide) found out: the voting preferences of respondents and nonrespondents were very different. There can be no question of selection bias here.

As for your numbers regarding car registrations, they do not match my sources. In 1936, according to the Historical Statistics of the U.S. (Bicentennial ed., U.S. Bureau of the Census), there were about 24M automobiles registered (Series Q 153). According to the same source, the total population of the U.S. was 128M (Series A 6). In any case, the Literary Digest used a variety of sources (see Aug. 22, 1936 issue), including motor-vehicle registration, to compile its list.

3. Squire (see POQ, 1988, 52, p.125-133) reports on a poll conducted by Gallup in May 1937. The Gallup poll you are referring to is a pre-election poll. The Gallup poll did correctly predict a victory for FDR but it was off by quite a bit (53.8 percent vs 60.8 of the total popular vote).

By the way, if we are to believe the Gallup survey as reported by Squire, it shows (table 1, p. 130 of Squire's paper in POQ) that FDR was favored by all "classes" of voters (whether they owned a car or a telephone, or both or neither). Even if we allow for an overestimation in favor of Roosevelt, the only group where FDR does not have a majority is among owners of a car and a telephone - there it is a tie between him and Landon.

4. You state: "Where is the empirical evidence for nonresponse bias?" Read the two papers referred to. Look at table 1 in the Cahalan paper (p.131): among those who report receiving and returning the Digest ballot (the respondents) only 29% favor FDR. Among those that say they received the Digest ballot but did not return, or say they did not receive it or don't remember (the nonrespondents) 53% favor FDR. In the Squire paper, look at table 3 (p.131): among Digest poll respondents (ignoring small parties), FDR received 48.6%; among nonrespondents: ~69.8%.

Although the empirical evidence has its limitation, it is the best evidence that we have and it beats "idle speculation" or beliefs. And the empirical evidence as I read it indicates that the failure of the Literary Digest poll in 1936 (20 point error in its prediction) was due primarily to nonresponse bias.

You state: "Even a 100% response rate from a nonrepresentative sample can produce an erroneous result." Nonrepresentative of what? What if those that are left out of the sampling frame and those in the sampling frame have the same distribution on the substantive variable at issue?

In any case, the empirical evidence, despite its limitations, supports Bryson's conjecture that the Digest poll failed because of nonresponse bias.

Good chatting with you but I got to get to work.

Cheers,  
Dominic Lusinchi



Applied Statistician  
Far West Research  
Statistical Consulting  
San Francisco, California  
415-664-3032  
www.farwestresearch.com

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

From: Ehrlich, Nathaniel [mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@ssc.msu.edu]  
Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2008 5:57 AM  
To: Dominic Lusinchi; AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: RE: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

Classic revisionism! Let me respond point by point.

1. You state, " This statement gives the false impression that the Digest sample was random - which it certainly was not." The statement reads, "Even samples that are selected at random can be hopelessly flawed if respondents are selected from a pool that is different than the population the researcher is attempting to measure. That was the case with the most famous polling disaster of all time: the 1936 Literary Digest presidential poll." That statement, taken out of context, does not give the impression that the Digest sample was random, but it does state -- not imply or give an impression -- that when the sample frame is different than [sic] the population, the sample is "hopelessly flawed."

2. You state, " We have no empirical evidence, that I am aware of, that would allow us to reach such a conclusion" [that the sample did not match the population]. In 1936, the United States was in the midst of an economic depression; the sample was mailed out to a pool consisting in very large measure of Literary Digest subscribers, motor vehicle owners (who had registered their vehicles), and people with telephone listings. If you really believe that sample was representative of the voters of the time, I suppose that if you had a time machine and could go back, you'd use the same sample.

As for evidence of a poor match between sample and population, just for an example, in 2005 in the United States, the ratio of cars to persons was 245:288 (millions), or 1.17 persons per car. In 1936, the ratio of cars to persons was 2:130, or 65 persons per car. Even allowing for voter registration differences, and percent of the population eligible to vote, and all the other factors, this was a nonrepresentative sample.

3. You make some allusions to a Gallup Poll. " The Gallup survey, as reported by Squire, does not, in my opinion, provide the data to conclude that selection bias in the original sample of 10 million used by the Digest was a serious issue. At most we can say that IF nonresponse bias had not been an issue, The Literary Digest should have been able to call the election in favor of FDR, but its estimate would have been off by a substantial margin - like other polls were."

I don't suppose that the other polls to which you refer include the 1936 poll of 50,000 respondents conducted by George Gallup that predicted the election result accurately -- and was roundly categorized as naïve at the

time. But Gallup collected his data from a more representative sample.

4. You state, " I suggest that if we are going to use the 1936 Digest poll as an example of bad survey research, we should use it as an illustration of what happens when \*nonresponse bias\* occurs in a survey. (The response rate to the poll was 24%.)" Point #2, above, refers to a lack of empirical evidence; where is the empirical evidence for nonresponse bias? It might be suggested that, in addition to sampling from the upper stratum the people who responded (voluntarily, without promise of reward, incentive, and without any refusal conversion effort) were the people who thought that FDR -- the incumbent -- was a 'traitor to his class' and were anxious to vote him out of office. But that's just an idle speculation. If the results had gone the other way, one might have argued that Gallup's flawed prediction was due to potential FDR voters failing to get to the polls because they were poor, and everybody "knows" that poor people are just lazy. Idle speculation is idle speculation. I don't know of any empirical evidence that would support any hypothesis of nonresponse bias, and the special edition of POQ in 2006 offered no convincing argument in favor of response rate as a consistent indicator of survey quality. Even a 100% response rate from a nonrepresentative sample can produce an erroneous result.

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  
517-353-2639

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Dominic Lusinchi  
Sent: Saturday, December 29, 2007 9:34 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

I apologize in advance to my colleagues who are members of the SRMSnet and might have read, some weeks ago, my diatribe regarding the way the 1936 Literary Digest poll is being reported.

I am disappointed that AAPOR is promoting a web site ([http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor\\_polling07](http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor_polling07)), whose merits, otherwise, are undeniable, that reiterates inaccuracies about the failure of the 1936 Literary Digest poll.

On the page that gives examples of "bad sampling" ([http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor\\_polling07](http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor_polling07)), in a paragraph entitled "A Notorious Polling Disaster", we read:

"Even samples that are selected at random can be hopelessly flawed if respondents are selected from a pool that is different than the population the researcher is attempting to measure. That was the case with the most famous polling disaster of all time: the 1936 Literary Digest presidential

poll."

This statement gives the false impression that the Digest sample was random - which it certainly was not. It also implies that the Digest sample (mistakenly referred as "respondents") was selected from a pool that was "different" from the target population. We have no empirical evidence, that I am aware of, that would allow us to reach such a conclusion. By the way, the target population is the voting population (nearly 46M in 1936, total popular vote): we know that, if the past is anything like the present, IT (the voting population) is a biased "sample" of the voting-age population -in the U.S. at least.

The author of the text on this web page goes on to quote a Mr. Curtis, who writes, as many have before him: "The magazine surveyed more than 2 million people [the number of respondents to the poll, DL], chosen from the magazine's subscriber list, phone books and car registrations." These are not the only sources that the Digest used to compile its list. This statement merely repeats, as I said, what many have asserted before: that the Digest list was made up only of people who had phones or cars. As Maurice Bryson (The American Statistician, 1976, 30, 4, p.184-185) urged more than 20 yrs ago: Check your sources!

Mr. Curtis goes on to write: "Even though the sample was enormous, it was unrepresentative of the population of voters." We know that the sample was enormous (the Digest, we are told, mailed out around 10M ballots). But how do we know that it was unrepresentative?

Mr. Curtis concludes: "Not everyone could afford a phone or car during the Depression, and those who could afford cars tended to vote Republican in greater numbers than those who couldn't. As a result, the poll showed Republican Alf Landon beating the actual winner, Democrat Franklin Roosevelt." This statement continues to promote "selection bias" as the principal cause of the Digest's "fiasco". It is wrong!

I suggest that if we are going to use the 1936 Digest poll as an example of bad survey research, we should use it as an illustration of what happens when \*nonresponse bias\* occurs in a survey. (The response rate to the poll was 24%.)

The scant empirical evidence that exists indicates that \*nonresponse bias\* was to blame: respondents were very different in their voting intentions than nonrespondents were. The evidence I am referring to are two studies, both published in AAPOR's flagship journal the Public Opinion Quarterly: Don Cahalan, "The Digest Poll Rides Again!", Public Opinion Quarterly, 1989, 53, pp.129-133; and Peverill Squire, "Why the 1936 Literary Digest poll failed" Public Opinion Quarterly, 1988, 52, 125-133. Both studies have some serious limitations. Cahalan, who uses the soundest methodology (a telephone survey based on a random sample from the Digest list with a response rate of 80%), conducted his study in one city only! Squire analyzes the data from a Gallup poll. The "sample" is national, but it is based on the quota methodology.

The Gallup survey, as reported by Squire, does not, in my opinion, provide the data to conclude that selection bias in the original sample of 10 million used by the Digest was a serious issue. At most we can say that IF

nonresponse bias had not been an issue, The Literary Digest should have been able to call the election in favor of FDR, but its estimate would have been off by a substantial margin - like other polls were.

It is ironic that AAPOR sponsors a web site (the polling course) that promotes an analysis of the 1936 Digest poll that is contradicted by authors published in POQ!

Let's heed Bryson's words and put an end to this \*statistical myth\*!

By the way: this is all meant in a friendly spirit as befits the season.

Happy New Year to all.

Dominic Lusinchi

Far West Research  
Statistical Consulting  
San Francisco, California  
415-664-3032  
www.farwestresearch.com

P.S. I would disagree with the characterization that "The Literary Digest fiasco ushered in the age of probability-based surveys." The 1948 election did that (see "Fifty Years of Survey Sampling in the United States", Martin R. Frankel and Lester R. Frankel, Public Opinion Quarterly, 51, Part 2, 1987, S127-S138, p.S129).

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Pat Lewis  
Sent: Thursday, December 27, 2007 10:58 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

At The Wall Street Journal, Carl Bialik, AKA The Numbers Guy, encourages his readers to look at the NewsU Course

<http://blogs.wsj.com/numbersguy/>

December 27, 2007, 10:43 am

A Polling Primer <<http://blogs.wsj.com/numbersguy/a-polling-primer-245/>>

As journalists and voters focus on next week's Iowa caucus, they'll be inundated with polling data. Sites such as Pollster.com<<http://www.pollster.com/>>and Real Clear Politics <<http://www.realclearpolitics.com/>> compile the latest primary polling numbers, while news sites including WSJ.com<<http://online.wsj.com/public/resources/documents/info-enlargePic07.html>>distribute the numbers.

[image: poll]

Before digesting all the data, reporters and readers may want to consult an

online course with useful tips on interpreting and analyzing polls.

Understanding

& Interpreting

Polls<[http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor\\_polling07](http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor_polling07)>,

free with registration, is targeted at journalists but also useful for consumers of journalism - not just political coverage, but any reporting based on surveys. It was released by the Poynter Institute, a school for journalists in St. Petersburg, Fla., and American Association for Public Opinion Research (Aapor), a polling professional organization. The course explains how good polls can undermine - and trump - conventional wisdom, while bad polls mislead and can create bad journalism.

The goal of the course is to get its students "to understand that not all polls are equal," said Cliff Zukin, a survey expert at Rutgers and former president of Aapor who helped develop the course. Sometimes the best reporting on certain polls, he said, is the decision to not cover them.

--

Pat Lewis

Communications Director

American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR)

1405 North George Mason Drive

Arlington, Virginia

703.527-5245

cell 703.201.5070

[www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org)

AAPOR -- the leading association of public opinion and survey research professionals.

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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> .

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Wed, 2 Jan 2008 16:25:13 -0500  
Reply-To: David Moore <dmoore62@COMCAST.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: David Moore <dmoore62@COMCAST.NET>  
Subject: Re: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course  
Comments: To: Dominic Lusinchi <dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
In-Reply-To: <002601c84d7c\$a57fd1c0\$6e01a8c0@acer14219167c5>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

There is evidence that both non-response and bad sampling contributed to the Literary Digest's error in 1936, but I think it is difficult to judge that MOST of the error could be attributable to one or the other source.

As far as sampling goes, Gallup Poll Survey #46 (8/10-15/36) (reported on p. 32 of Volume One of The Gallup Poll Public Opinion, available in your local library!) shows the following support for Roosevelt as a percentage of the vote for Roosevelt and Landon:

Overall support of Roosevelt 53%  
Upper third in income 41%  
Middle third in income 70%  
Lower third in income 82%

Telephone lists 41%  
Automobile registration 44%

These figures suggest that oversampling the middle and higher income people, by relying extensively (but not solely) on the "tel-auto" lists, must certainly have contributed to the Digest's error. According to the results of this poll, had there been 100% participation by people on the tel-auto lists, it appears that Landon would have been projected to win with anywhere from 56% to 59% of the vote. And in fact, that's exactly what George Gallup predicted would happen (much to the outrage of Wilfred Funk, owner and publisher of the Literary Digest).

The problem was compounded, however, by non-response. How much is difficult to say, but there is one example in Allentown, PA, where the Digest mailed ballots to ALL registered voters. No sampling problem here. But while Landon received 53% of the vote among Allentown people who returned the ballot, the election gave Landon only 41% of the vote.

In Chicago, the Digest sent ballots to every third voter, so it appears as though there was no sampling frame bias here either. However, Landon got 49% of the vote among those who returned the ballots, but only 32% of the actual vote.

Some of the differences in Allentown and Chicago could have been due to voters changing their minds between the time the ballot was sent (very early in the process) and when the election occurred, but certainly not all of the

differences are due to that. Gallup showed some increase in support for Roosevelt over the course of the campaign, though Crossley did not.

George Gallup was himself hurt by non-response bias, because he supplemented his polling with mail ballots (in the states). His predictions in 1936 were wrong in four states, and in two states where he showed an even split, Roosevelt won by 15 points. He vowed never again to use mail ballots in election polls, noting that the "lower economic strata" simply did not return ballots in the same proportions as people in higher strata.

David

David W. Moore, Ph.D.  
Senior Fellow, The Carsey Institute  
73 Main Street, Huddleston Hall  
The University of New Hampshire  
Durham, NH 03824

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Dominic Lusinchi  
Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2008 3:19 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

1. OK. But the question is: Was the Digest sample biased in favor of Landon? And if so, can it explain why the poll was off by 20 points? My argument is that the limited evidence we have indicates a large nonresponse bias. It also indicates that there might have been some selection bias (in favor of Landon) in the Digest but that its (minor) effect on the results was swamped by the nonresponse bias. Furthermore, the evidence in favor of nonresponse bias is much clearer than that on selection bias.
2. In the November, 14, 1936 issue of the Digest the editors tried to understand why the poll went so wrong when, in the past, they had been so successful using the same "methodology".
3. Of course, you are right in saying that one should take the results of a post-election poll with a heavy grain of salt. I do not deny that the evidence we have is less than perfect. Despite its imperfections, it cannot be denied that it shows a clear nonresponse bias. We can assess its imperfections and determine what we can conclude regarding the issue at hand: that is why I say that the evidence on nonresponse bias is very convincing, whereas, in my view, the data on selection bias is not as transparent.
4. In 1936, survey research/polling was in its infancy. Gallup was a far more sophisticated researcher than the folks at the Digest. But they had been successful in previous elections: why should they doubt their own "methods"? In 1932, they were off by less than 1 point! But even Gallup and other major pollsters of the day were using a methodology with its own problems: that came to light in 1948! So to answer your question, I see no reason not to use the Digest sample, only I would not have sent out 10M "ballots", but a considerably smaller number and with the money we would have saved I would have done a nonresponse follow-up (assuming a nonresponse

rate of 24%). (Nothing like 20:20 hindsight!)

5. My point for bringing this up in the first place is that I think it is wrong to characterize the Digest poll failure as the result of a biased sample when the existing evidence indicates that nonresponse bias was the primary cause. What I am advocating is that if we use the 1936 Digest poll as an example of bad survey research the emphasis should be shifted towards nonresponse bias rather than selection bias. At the very least we should talk about both.

Cheers,  
Dominic

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

From: Ehrlich, Nathaniel [mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@ssc.msu.edu]  
Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2008 11:36 AM  
To: Dominic Lusinchi; AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: RE: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

1. The statement in question reads " That was the case with the most famous polling disaster of all time: the 1936 Literary Digest presidential poll." The word " That" I took to refer to the main clause "if respondents are selected from a pool that is different from the population the researcher is attempting to measure", not the modifier that starts, even if the selection is random. I agree that a cursory reading could yield the observation that the author implied a random sample, but let it go. The issue is whether the sample was representative of the population or not.

2. I'm not going to comment on the Nov 14 Digest (is this the Literary Digest? A post election poll?) and my source of vehicles registered was in error. The ratio was indeed 24:128, still 5 persons to each vehicle. My bad.

Your fourth statement refers to a post-election poll. Curious thing about those: people's memories, or reports, of their own votes cast are often influenced by the actual result, and their attitudes about that result. In the Michigan election of 2006, a proposal to end preferential state hiring and college admission based on race passed by a margin of 62:38 percent. A post-election survey of people who claimed to have voted on the issue showed a 62:38 split AGAINST the measure. So I personally don't put too much confidence on after-the-fact reporting, including exit polls, no matter the sampling strategy. It's possible that the Michigan voters didn't want to admit having voted for a proposal that was opposed by both the Democratic and Republican candidates; and there are several speculative scenarios for the FDR nonrespondent total of close to 70% -- and my speculation and yours will undoubtedly differ.

You didn't answer my question, though, about what you would do if it was September 1936; would you really use the Literary Digest sample frame? If not, why not?

I agree that it's good to chat, but like you I have bills to pay, and work is how that gets done.



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  
517-353-2639

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Dominic Lusinchi  
Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2008 1:40 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

I will pass on the "ism" bit which does nothing for the understanding of the issue at hand.

I will go over your points.

1. The statement quoted is not taken out of context. It is the first paragraph under the header "A Notorious Polling Disaster".

2. In Chicago, the Digest polled every third registered voter (see its Nov. 14, 1936 issue). The response rate to the poll in that city was 20%. The Digest predicted Landon to win over FDR: 49% vs. 48% (rounded). FDR received 65% of the vote in Chicago. This result is consistent with what Cahalan (in Cedar Rapids, Iowa) and Squire (nationwide) found out: the voting preferences of respondents and nonrespondents were very different. There can be no question of selection bias here.

As for your numbers regarding car registrations, they do not match my sources. In 1936, according to the Historical Statistics of the U.S. (Bicentennial ed., U.S. Bureau of the Census), there were about 24M automobiles registered (Series Q 153). According to the same source, the total population of the U.S. was 128M (Series A 6). In any case, the Literary Digest used a variety of sources (see Aug. 22, 1936 issue), including motor-vehicle registration, to compile its list.

3. Squire (see POQ, 1988, 52, p.125-133) reports on a poll conducted by Gallup in May 1937. The Gallup poll you are referring to is a pre-election poll. The Gallup poll did correctly predict a victory for FDR but it was off by quite a bit (53.8 percent vs 60.8 of the total popular vote).

By the way, if we are to believe the Gallup survey as reported by Squire, it shows (table 1, p. 130 of Squire's paper in POQ) that FDR was favored by all "classes" of voters (whether they owned a car or a telephone, or both or neither). Even if we allow for an overestimation in favor of Roosevelt, the only group where FDR does not have a majority is among owners of a car and a telephone - there it is a tie between him and Landon.

4. You state: "Where is the empirical evidence for nonresponse bias?" Read the two papers referred to. Look at table 1 in the Cahalan paper (p.131): among those who report receiving and returning the Digest ballot (the respondents) only 29% favor FDR. Among those that say they received the Digest ballot but did not return, or say they did not receive it or don't

remember (the nonrespondents) 53% favor FDR. In the Squire paper, look at table 3 (p.131): among Digest poll respondents (ignoring small parties), FDR received 48.6%; among nonrespondents: ~69.8%.

Although the empirical evidence has its limitation, it is the best evidence that we have and it beats "idle speculation" or beliefs. And the empirical evidence as I read it indicates that the failure of the Literary Digest poll in 1936 (20 point error in its prediction) was due primarily to nonresponse bias.

You state: "Even a 100% response rate from a nonrepresentative sample can produce an erroneous result." Nonrepresentative of what? What if those that are left out of the sampling frame and those in the sampling frame have the same distribution on the substantive variable at issue?

In any case, the empirical evidence, despite its limitations, supports Bryson's conjecture that the Digest poll failed because of nonresponse bias.

Good chatting with you but I got to get to work.

Cheers,  
Dominic Lusinchi

Applied Statistician  
Far West Research  
Statistical Consulting  
San Francisco, California  
415-664-3032  
www.farwestresearch.com

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

From: Ehrlich, Nathaniel [mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@ssc.msu.edu]  
Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2008 5:57 AM  
To: Dominic Lusinchi; AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: RE: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

Classic revisionism! Let me respond point by point.

1. You state, " This statement gives the false impression that the Digest sample was random - which it certainly was not." The statement reads, "Even samples that are selected at random can be hopelessly flawed if respondents are selected from a pool that is different than the population the researcher is attempting to measure. That was the case with the most famous polling disaster of all time: the 1936 Literary Digest presidential poll." That statement, taken out of context, does not give the impression that the Digest sample was random, but it does state -- not imply or give an impression -- that when the sample frame is different than [sic] the population, the sample is "hopelessly flawed."

2. You state, " We have no empirical evidence, that I am aware of, that would allow us to reach such a conclusion" [that the sample did not match the population]. In 1936, the United States was in the midst of an economic depression; the sample was mailed out to a pool consisting in very large measure of Literary Digest subscribers, motor vehicle owners (who had registered their vehicles), and people with telephone listings. If you

really believe that sample was representative of the voters of the time, I suppose that if you had a time machine and could go back, you'd use the same sample.

As for evidence of a poor match between sample and population, just for an example, in 2005 in the United States, the ratio of cars to persons was 245:288 (millions), or 1.17 persons per car. In 1936, the ratio of cars to persons was 2:130, or 65 persons per car. Even allowing for voter registration differences, and percent of the population eligible to vote, and all the other factors, this was a nonrepresentative sample.

3. You make some allusions to a Gallup Poll. " The Gallup survey, as reported by Squire, does not, in my opinion, provide the data to conclude that selection bias in the original sample of 10 million used by the Digest was a serious issue. At most we can say that IF nonresponse bias had not been an issue, The Literary Digest should have been able to call the election in favor of FDR, but its estimate would have been off by a substantial margin - like other polls were."

I don't suppose that the other polls to which you refer include the 1936 poll of 50,000 respondents conducted by George Gallup that predicted the election result accurately -- and was roundly categorized as naïve at the time. But Gallup collected his data from a more representative sample.

4. You state, " I suggest that if we are going to use the 1936 Digest poll as an example of bad survey research, we should use it as an illustration of what happens when \*nonresponse bias\* occurs in a survey. (The response rate to the poll was 24%.)" Point #2, above, refers to a lack of empirical evidence; where is the empirical evidence for nonresponse bias? It might be suggested that, in addition to sampling from the upper stratum the people who responded (voluntarily, without promise of reward, incentive, and without any refusal conversion effort) were the people who thought that FDR -- the incumbent -- was a 'traitor to his class' and were anxious to vote him out of office. But that's just an idle speculation. If the results had gone the other way, one might have argued that Gallup's flawed prediction was due to potential FDR voters failing to get to the polls because they were poor, and everybody "knows" that poor people are just lazy. Idle speculation is idle speculation. I don't know of any empirical evidence that would support any hypothesis of nonresponse bias, and the special edition of POQ in 2006 offered no convincing argument in favor of response rate as a consistent indicator of survey quality. Even a 100% response rate from a nonrepresentative sample can produce an erroneous result.

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  
517-353-2639

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Dominic Lusinchi  
Sent: Saturday, December 29, 2007 9:34 PM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: Re: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

I apologize in advance to my colleagues who are members of the SRMSnet and might have read, some weeks ago, my diatribe regarding the way the 1936 Literary Digest poll is being reported.

I am disappointed that AAPOR is promoting a web site ([http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor\\_polling07](http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor_polling07)), whose merits, otherwise, are undeniable, that reiterates inaccuracies about the failure of the 1936 Literary Digest poll.

On the page that gives examples of "bad sampling" ([http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor\\_polling07](http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor_polling07)), in a paragraph entitled "A Notorious Polling Disaster", we read:

"Even samples that are selected at random can be hopelessly flawed if respondents are selected from a pool that is different than the population the researcher is attempting to measure. That was the case with the most famous polling disaster of all time: the 1936 Literary Digest presidential poll."

This statement gives the false impression that the Digest sample was random - which it certainly was not. It also implies that the Digest sample (mistakenly referred as "respondents") was selected from a pool that was "different" from the target population. We have no empirical evidence, that I am aware of, that would allow us to reach such a conclusion. By the way, the target population is the voting population (nearly 46M in 1936, total popular vote): we know that, if the past is anything like the present, IT (the voting population) is a biased "sample" of the voting-age population -in the U.S. at least.

The author of the text on this web page goes on to quote a Mr. Curtis, who writes, as many have before him: "The magazine surveyed more than 2 million people [the number of respondents to the poll, DL], chosen from the magazine's subscriber list, phone books and car registrations." These are not the only sources that the Digest used to compile its list. This statement merely repeats, as I said, what many have asserted before: that the Digest list was made up only of people who had phones or cars. As Maurice Bryson (The American Statistician, 1976, 30, 4, p.184-185) urged more than 20 yrs ago: Check your sources!

Mr. Curtis goes on to write: "Even though the sample was enormous, it was unrepresentative of the population of voters." We know that the sample was enormous (the Digest, we are told, mailed out around 10M ballots). But how do we know that it was unrepresentative?

Mr. Curtis concludes: "Not everyone could afford a phone or car during the Depression, and those who could afford cars tended to vote Republican in greater numbers than those who couldn't. As a result, the poll showed Republican Alf Landon beating the actual winner, Democrat Franklin Roosevelt." This statement continues to promote "selection bias" as the principal cause of the Digest's "fiasco". It is wrong!

I suggest that if we are going to use the 1936 Digest poll as an example of bad survey research, we should use it as an illustration of what happens when \*nonresponse bias\* occurs in a survey. (The response rate to the poll was 24%.)

The scant empirical evidence that exists indicates that \*nonresponse bias\* was to blame: respondents were very different in their voting intentions than nonrespondents were. The evidence I am referring to are two studies, both published in AAPOR's flagship journal the Public Opinion Quarterly: Don Cahalan, "The Digest Poll Rides Again!", Public Opinion Quarterly, 1989, 53, pp.129-133; and Peverill Squire, "Why the 1936 Literary Digest poll failed" Public Opinion Quarterly, 1988, 52, 125-133. Both studies have some serious limitations. Cahalan, who uses the soundest methodology (a telephone survey based on a random sample from the Digest list with a response rate of 80%), conducted his study in one city only! Squire analyzes the data from a Gallup poll. The "sample" is national, but it is based on the quota methodology.

The Gallup survey, as reported by Squire, does not, in my opinion, provide the data to conclude that selection bias in the original sample of 10 million used by the Digest was a serious issue. At most we can say that IF nonresponse bias had not been an issue, The Literary Digest should have been able to call the election in favor of FDR, but its estimate would have been off by a substantial margin - like other polls were.

It is ironic that AAPOR sponsors a web site (the polling course) that promotes an analysis of the 1936 Digest poll that is contradicted by authors published in POQ!

Let's heed Bryson's words and put an end to this \*statistical myth\*!

By the way: this is all meant in a friendly spirit as befits the season.

Happy New Year to all.

Dominic Lusinchi

Far West Research  
Statistical Consulting  
San Francisco, California  
415-664-3032  
www.farwestresearch.com

P.S. I would disagree with the characterization that "The Literary Digest fiasco ushered in the age of probability-based surveys." The 1948 election did that (see "Fifty Years of Survey Sampling in the United States", Martin R. Frankel and Lester R. Frankel, Public Opinion Quarterly, 51, Part 2, 1987, S127-S138, p.S129).

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Pat Lewis  
Sent: Thursday, December 27, 2007 10:58 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

At The Wall Street Journal, Carl Bialik, AKA The Numbers Guy, encourages his readers to look at the NewsU Course

<http://blogs.wsj.com/numbersguy/>

December 27, 2007, 10:43 am

A Polling Primer <<http://blogs.wsj.com/numbersguy/a-polling-primer-245/>>

As journalists and voters focus on next week's Iowa caucus, they'll be inundated with polling data. Sites such as Pollster.com<<http://www.pollster.com/>>and Real Clear Politics <<http://www.realclearpolitics.com/>> compile the latest primary polling numbers, while news sites including WSJ.com<<http://online.wsj.com/public/resources/documents/info-enlargePic07.html>> distribute the numbers.

[image: poll]

Before digesting all the data, reporters and readers may want to consult an online course with useful tips on interpreting and analyzing polls.

Understanding  
& Interpreting

Polls<[http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor\\_polling07](http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor_polling07)>,

free with registration, is targeted at journalists but also useful for consumers of journalism - not just political coverage, but any reporting based on surveys. It was released by the Poynter Institute, a school for journalists in St. Petersburg, Fla., and American Association for Public Opinion Research (Aapor), a polling professional organization. The course explains how good polls can undermine - and trump - conventional wisdom, while bad polls mislead and can create bad journalism.

The goal of the course is to get its students "to understand that not all polls are equal," said Cliff Zukin, a survey expert at Rutgers and former president of Aapor who helped develop the course. Sometimes the best reporting on certain polls, he said, is the decision to not cover them.

--

Pat Lewis

Communications Director

American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR)

1405 North George Mason Drive

Arlington, Virginia

703.527-5245

cell 703.201.5070

[www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org)

AAPOR -- the leading association of public opinion and survey research professionals.

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

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 this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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> .

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Wed, 2 Jan 2008 14:15:00 -0800

Reply-To: Dominic Lusinchi <[dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM](mailto:dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM)>

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

From: Dominic Lusinchi <[dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM](mailto:dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM)>

Organization: Far West Research

Subject: Re: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

Comments: To: David Moore <[dmoore62@comcast.net](mailto:dmoore62@comcast.net)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

In-Reply-To:

<!&!AAAAAAAAAAAYAAAAAAAAAKDckmbCVxlHn6UiOGrTmAHCgAAAEAAAAP9ZYGz0EUpMjF0IHwO8AY

oBAAAAAA==@comcast.net>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Thank you, David, for this analysis.

A few remarks:

Gallup, at the time, used quota sampling methods: so there is no way to figure out a response rate. So the over-sampling you mentioned could be the result of people eager to register their discontent with New Deal policies being more willing to participate in the survey.

Also the Gallup poll that Funk reacted to (NYT, July 19, 1936) predicted

what the Digest poll results would be before the Digest poll was completed: what it uncovered (could it not?) was the same mechanism that would plague the Digest poll i.e., respondents that were hot under the collar and highly motivated to answer the poll and express their unhappiness with FDR (?). Hence the nonresponse bias in the Digest poll.

I agree that "it is difficult to judge that MOST of the error could be attributable to one or the other source": but the evidence presented by Cahalan and Squire points to nonresponse bias as the more likely of the two.

Be that as it may: it seems to me that if we want to educate journalists, a more balanced view of the Literary Digest "fiasco" should include the mention of nonresponse bias as a contributor.

Dominic

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

From: David Moore [mailto:dmoore62@comcast.net]

Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2008 1:25 PM

To: 'Dominic Lusinchi'; AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: RE: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

There is evidence that both non-response and bad sampling contributed to the Literary Digest's error in 1936, but I think it is difficult to judge that MOST of the error could be attributable to one or the other source.

As far as sampling goes, Gallup Poll Survey #46 (8/10-15/36) (reported on p. 32 of Volume One of The Gallup Poll Public Opinion, available in your local library!) shows the following support for Roosevelt as a percentage of the vote for Roosevelt and Landon:

Overall support of Roosevelt 53%

Upper third in income 41%

Middle third in income 70%

Lower third in income 82%

Telephone lists 41%

Automobile registration 44%

These figures suggest that oversampling the middle and higher income people, by relying extensively (but not solely) on the "tel-auto" lists, must certainly have contributed to the Digest's error. According to the results of this poll, had there been 100% participation by people on the tel-auto lists, it appears that Landon would have been projected to win with anywhere from 56% to 59% of the vote. And in fact, that's exactly what George Gallup predicted would happen (much to the outrage of Wilfred Funk, owner and publisher of the Literary Digest).

The problem was compounded, however, by non-response. How much is difficult to say, but there is one example in Allentown, PA, where the Digest mailed ballots to ALL registered voters. No sampling problem here. But while Landon received 53% of the vote among Allentown people who returned the ballot, the election gave Landon only 41% of the vote.



In Chicago, the Digest sent ballots to every third voter, so it appears as though there was no sampling frame bias here either. However, Landon got 49% of the vote among those who returned the ballots, but only 32% of the actual vote.

Some of the differences in Allentown and Chicago could have been due to voters changing their minds between the time the ballot was sent (very early in the process) and when the election occurred, but certainly not all of the differences are due to that. Gallup showed some increase in support for Roosevelt over the course of the campaign, though Crossley did not.

George Gallup was himself hurt by non-response bias, because he supplemented his polling with mail ballots (in the states). His predictions in 1936 were wrong in four states, and in two states where he showed an even split, Roosevelt won by 15 points. He vowed never again to use mail ballots in election polls, noting that the "lower economic strata" simply did not return ballots in the same proportions as people in higher strata.

David

David W. Moore, Ph.D.  
Senior Fellow, The Carsey Institute  
73 Main Street, Huddleston Hall  
The University of New Hampshire  
Durham, NH 03824

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Dominic Lusinchi  
Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2008 3:19 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

1. OK. But the question is: Was the Digest sample biased in favor of Landon? And if so, can it explain why the poll was off by 20 points? My argument is that the limited evidence we have indicates a large nonresponse bias. It also indicates that there might have been some selection bias (in favor of Landon) in the Digest but that its (minor) effect on the results was swamped by the nonresponse bias. Furthermore, the evidence in favor of nonresponse bias is much clearer than that on selection bias.

2. In the November, 14, 1936 issue of the Digest the editors tried to understand why the poll went so wrong when, in the past, they had been so successful using the same "methodology".

3. Of course, you are right in saying that one should take the results of a post-election poll with a heavy grain of salt. I do not deny that the evidence we have is less than perfect. Despite its imperfections, it cannot be denied that it shows a clear nonresponse bias. We can assess its imperfections and determine what we can conclude regarding the issue at hand: that is why I say that the evidence on nonresponse bias is very convincing, whereas, in my view, the data on selection bias is not as transparent.

4. In 1936, survey research/polling was in its infancy. Gallup was a far more sophisticated researcher than the folks at the Digest. But they had been successful in previous elections: why should they doubt their own "methods"? In 1932, they were off by less than 1 point! But even Gallup and other major pollsters of the day were using a methodology with its own problems: that came to light in 1948! So to answer your question, I see no reason not to use the Digest sample, only I would not have sent out 10M "ballots", but a considerably smaller number and with the money we would have saved I would have done a nonresponse follow-up (assuming a nonresponse rate of 24%). (Nothing like 20:20 hindsight!)

5. My point for bringing this up in the first place is that I think it is wrong to characterize the Digest poll failure as the result of a biased sample when the existing evidence indicates that nonresponse bias was the primary cause. What I am advocating is that if we use the 1936 Digest poll as an example of bad survey research the emphasis should be shifted towards nonresponse bias rather than selection bias. At the very least we should talk about both.

Cheers,  
Dominic

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

From: Ehrlich, Nathaniel [mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@ssc.msu.edu]  
Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2008 11:36 AM  
To: Dominic Lusinchi; AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: RE: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

1. The statement in question reads " That was the case with the most famous polling disaster of all time: the 1936 Literary Digest presidential poll." The word " That" I took to refer to the main clause "if respondents are selected from a pool that is different from the population the researcher is attempting to measure", not the modifier that starts, even if the selection is random. I agree that a cursory reading could yield the observation that the author implied a random sample, but let it go. The issue is whether the sample was representative of the population or not.

2. I'm not going to comment on the Nov 14 Digest (is this the Literary Digest? A post election poll?) and my source of vehicles registered was in error. The ratio was indeed 24:128, still 5 persons to each vehicle. My bad.

Your fourth statement refers to a post-election poll. Curious thing about those: people's memories, or reports, of their own votes cast are often influenced by the actual result, and their attitudes about that result. In the Michigan election of 2006, a proposal to end preferential state hiring and college admission based on race passed by a margin of 62:38 percent. A post-election survey of people who claimed to have voted on the issue showed a 62:38 split AGAINST the measure. So I personally don't put too much confidence on after-the-fact reporting, including exit polls, no matter the sampling strategy. It's possible that the Michigan voters didn't want to admit having voted for a proposal that was opposed by both the Democratic and Republican candidates; and there are several speculative scenarios for the FDR nonrespondent total of close to 70% -- and my speculation and yours

will undoubtedly differ.

You didn't answer my question, though, about what you would do if it was September 1936; would you really use the Literary Digest sample frame? If not, why not?

I agree that it's good to chat, but like you I have bills to pay, and work is how that gets done.

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  
517-353-2639

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Dominic Lusinchi  
Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2008 1:40 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

I will pass on the "ism" bit which does nothing for the understanding of the issue at hand.

I will go over your points.

1. The statement quoted is not taken out of context. It is the first paragraph under the header "A Notorious Polling Disaster".
2. In Chicago, the Digest polled every third registered voter (see its Nov. 14, 1936 issue). The response rate to the poll in that city was 20%. The Digest predicted Landon to win over FDR: 49% vs. 48% (rounded). FDR received 65% of the vote in Chicago. This result is consistent with what Cahalan (in Cedar Rapids, Iowa) and Squire (nationwide) found out: the voting preferences of respondents and nonrespondents were very different. There can be no question of selection bias here.  
As for your numbers regarding car registrations, they do not match my sources. In 1936, according to the Historical Statistics of the U.S. (Bicentennial ed., U.S. Bureau of the Census), there were about 24M automobiles registered (Series Q 153). According to the same source, the total population of the U.S. was 128M (Series A 6). In any case, the Literary Digest used a variety of sources (see Aug. 22, 1936 issue), including motor-vehicle registration, to compile its list.

3. Squire (see POQ, 1988, 52, p.125-133) reports on a poll conducted by Gallup in May 1937. The Gallup poll you are referring to is a pre-election poll. The Gallup poll did correctly predict a victory for FDR but it was off by quite a bit (53.8 percent vs 60.8 of the total popular vote).  
By the way, if we are to believe the Gallup survey as reported by Squire, it shows (table 1, p. 130 of Squire's paper in POQ) that FDR was favored by all "classes" of voters (whether they owned a car or a telephone, or both or

neither). Even if we allow for an overestimation in favor of Roosevelt, the only group where FDR does not have a majority is among owners of a car and a telephone - there it is a tie between him and Landon.

4. You state: "Where is the empirical evidence for nonresponse bias?" Read the two papers referred to. Look at table 1 in the Cahalan paper (p.131): among those who report receiving and returning the Digest ballot (the respondents) only 29% favor FDR. Among those that say they received the Digest ballot but did not return, or say they did not receive it or don't remember (the nonrespondents) 53% favor FDR. In the Squire paper, look at table 3 (p.131): among Digest poll respondents (ignoring small parties), FDR received 48.6%; among nonrespondents: ~69.8%.

Although the empirical evidence has its limitation, it is the best evidence that we have and it beats "idle speculation" or beliefs. And the empirical evidence as I read it indicates that the failure of the Literary Digest poll in 1936 (20 point error in its prediction) was due primarily to nonresponse bias.

You state: "Even a 100% response rate from a nonrepresentative sample can produce an erroneous result." Nonrepresentative of what? What if those that are left out of the sampling frame and those in the sampling frame have the same distribution on the substantive variable at issue?

In any case, the empirical evidence, despite its limitations, supports Bryson's conjecture that the Digest poll failed because of nonresponse bias.

Good chatting with you but I got to get to work.

Cheers,  
Dominic Lusinchi

Applied Statistician  
Far West Research  
Statistical Consulting  
San Francisco, California  
415-664-3032  
www.farwestresearch.com

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

From: Ehrlich, Nathaniel [mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@ssc.msu.edu]  
Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2008 5:57 AM  
To: Dominic Lusinchi; AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: RE: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

Classic revisionism! Let me respond point by point.

1. You state, " This statement gives the false impression that the Digest sample was random - which it certainly was not." The statement reads, "Even samples that are selected at random can be hopelessly flawed if respondents are selected from a pool that is different than the population the researcher is attempting to measure. That was the case with the most famous polling disaster of all time: the 1936 Literary Digest presidential poll." That statement, taken out of context, does not give the impression that the Digest sample was random, but it does state -- not imply or give an

impression -- that when the sample frame is different than [sic] the population, the sample is "hopelessly flawed."

2. You state, " We have no empirical evidence, that I am aware of, that would allow us to reach such a conclusion" [that the sample did not match the population]. In 1936, the United States was in the midst of an economic depression; the sample was mailed out to a pool consisting in very large measure of Literary Digest subscribers, motor vehicle owners (who had registered their vehicles), and people with telephone listings. If you really believe that sample was representative of the voters of the time, I suppose that if you had a time machine and could go back, you'd use the same sample.

As for evidence of a poor match between sample and population, just for an example, in 2005 in the United States, the ratio of cars to persons was 245:288 (millions), or 1.17 persons per car. In 1936, the ratio of cars to persons was 2:130, or 65 persons per car. Even allowing for voter registration differences, and percent of the population eligible to vote, and all the other factors, this was a nonrepresentative sample.

3. You make some allusions to a Gallup Poll. " The Gallup survey, as reported by Squire, does not, in my opinion, provide the data to conclude that selection bias in the original sample of 10 million used by the Digest was a serious issue. At most we can say that IF nonresponse bias had not been an issue, The Literary Digest should have been able to call the election in favor of FDR, but its estimate would have been off by a substantial margin - like other polls were."

I don't suppose that the other polls to which you refer include the 1936 poll of 50,000 respondents conducted by George Gallup that predicted the election result accurately -- and was roundly categorized as naïve at the time. But Gallup collected his data from a more representative sample.

4. You state, " I suggest that if we are going to use the 1936 Digest poll as an example of bad survey research, we should use it as an illustration of what happens when \*nonresponse bias\* occurs in a survey. (The response rate to the poll was 24%.)" Point #2, above, refers to a lack of empirical evidence; where is the empirical evidence for nonresponse bias? It might be suggested that, in addition to sampling from the upper stratum the people who responded (voluntarily, without promise of reward, incentive, and without any refusal conversion effort) were the people who thought that FDR -- the incumbent -- was a 'traitor to his class' and were anxious to vote him out of office. But that's just an idle speculation. If the results had gone the other way, one might have argued that Gallup's flawed prediction was due to potential FDR voters failing to get to the polls because they were poor, and everybody "knows" that poor people are just lazy. Idle speculation is idle speculation. I don't know of any empirical evidence that would support any hypothesis of nonresponse bias, and the special edition of POQ in 2006 offered no convincing argument in favor of response rate as a consistent indicator of survey quality. Even a 100% response rate from a nonrepresentative sample can produce an erroneous result.

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  
517-353-2639

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Dominic Lusinchi  
Sent: Saturday, December 29, 2007 9:34 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

I apologize in advance to my colleagues who are members of the SRMSnet and might have read, some weeks ago, my diatribe regarding the way the 1936 Literary Digest poll is being reported.

I am disappointed that AAPOR is promoting a web site ([http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor\\_polling07](http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor_polling07)), whose merits, otherwise, are undeniable, that reiterates inaccuracies about the failure of the 1936 Literary Digest poll.

On the page that gives examples of "bad sampling" ([http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor\\_polling07](http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor_polling07)), in a paragraph entitled "A Notorious Polling Disaster", we read:

"Even samples that are selected at random can be hopelessly flawed if respondents are selected from a pool that is different than the population the researcher is attempting to measure. That was the case with the most famous polling disaster of all time: the 1936 Literary Digest presidential poll."

This statement gives the false impression that the Digest sample was random - which it certainly was not. It also implies that the Digest sample (mistakenly referred as "respondents") was selected from a pool that was "different" from the target population. We have no empirical evidence, that I am aware of, that would allow us to reach such a conclusion. By the way, the target population is the voting population (nearly 46M in 1936, total popular vote): we know that, if the past is anything like the present, IT (the voting population) is a biased "sample" of the voting-age population -in the U.S. at least.

The author of the text on this web page goes on to quote a Mr. Curtis, who writes, as many have before him: "The magazine surveyed more than 2 million people [the number of respondents to the poll, DL], chosen from the magazine's subscriber list, phone books and car registrations." These are not the only sources that the Digest used to compile its list. This statement merely repeats, as I said, what many have asserted before: that the Digest list was made up only of people who had phones or cars. As Maurice Bryson (The American Statistician, 1976, 30, 4, p.184-185) urged more than 20 yrs ago: Check your sources!

Mr. Curtis goes on to write: "Even though the sample was enormous, it was unrepresentative of the population of voters." We know that the sample was enormous (the Digest, we are told, mailed out around 10M ballots). But how

do we know that it was unrepresentative?

Mr. Curtis concludes: "Not everyone could afford a phone or car during the Depression, and those who could afford cars tended to vote Republican in greater numbers than those who couldn't. As a result, the poll showed Republican Alf Landon beating the actual winner, Democrat Franklin Roosevelt." This statement continues to promote "selection bias" as the principal cause of the Digest's "fiasco". It is wrong!

I suggest that if we are going to use the 1936 Digest poll as an example of bad survey research, we should use it as an illustration of what happens when \*nonresponse bias\* occurs in a survey. (The response rate to the poll was 24%.)

The scant empirical evidence that exists indicates that \*nonresponse bias\* was to blame: respondents were very different in their voting intentions than nonrespondents were. The evidence I am referring to are two studies, both published in AAPOR's flagship journal the Public Opinion Quarterly: Don Cahalan, "The Digest Poll Rides Again!", Public Opinion Quarterly, 1989, 53, pp.129-133; and Peverill Squire, "Why the 1936 Literary Digest poll failed" Public Opinion Quarterly, 1988, 52, 125-133. Both studies have some serious limitations. Cahalan, who uses the soundest methodology (a telephone survey based on a random sample from the Digest list with a response rate of 80%), conducted his study in one city only! Squire analyzes the data from a Gallup poll. The "sample" is national, but it is based on the quota methodology.

The Gallup survey, as reported by Squire, does not, in my opinion, provide the data to conclude that selection bias in the original sample of 10 million used by the Digest was a serious issue. At most we can say that IF nonresponse bias had not been an issue, The Literary Digest should have been able to call the election in favor of FDR, but its estimate would have been off by a substantial margin - like other polls were.

It is ironic that AAPOR sponsors a web site (the polling course) that promotes an analysis of the 1936 Digest poll that is contradicted by authors published in POQ!

Let's heed Bryson's words and put an end to this \*statistical myth\*!

By the way: this is all meant in a friendly spirit as befits the season.

Happy New Year to all.

Dominic Lusinchi

Far West Research  
Statistical Consulting  
San Francisco, California  
415-664-3032  
www.farwestresearch.com

P.S. I would disagree with the characterization that "The Literary Digest fiasco ushered in the age of probability-based surveys." The 1948 election did that (see "Fifty Years of Survey Sampling in the United States", Martin

R. Frankel and Lester R. Frankel, Public Opinion Quarterly, 51, Part 2, 1987, S127-S138, p.S129).

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Pat Lewis  
Sent: Thursday, December 27, 2007 10:58 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

At The Wall Street Journal, Carl Bialik, AKA The Numbers Guy, encourages his readers to look at the NewsU Course

<http://blogs.wsj.com/numbersguy/>

December 27, 2007, 10:43 am

A Polling Primer <<http://blogs.wsj.com/numbersguy/a-polling-primer-245/>>

As journalists and voters focus on next week's Iowa caucus, they'll be inundated with polling data. Sites such as Pollster.com<<http://www.pollster.com/>>and Real Clear Politics <<http://www.realclearpolitics.com/>> compile the latest primary polling numbers, while news sites including WSJ.com<<http://online.wsj.com/public/resources/documents/info-enlargePic07.html>>distribute the numbers.

[image: poll]

Before digesting all the data, reporters and readers may want to consult an online course with useful tips on interpreting and analyzing polls. Understanding & Interpreting Polls<[http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor\\_polling07](http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor_polling07)>, free with registration, is targeted at journalists but also useful for consumers of journalism - not just political coverage, but any reporting based on surveys. It was released by the Poynter Institute, a school for journalists in St. Petersburg, Fla., and American Association for Public Opinion Research (Aapor), a polling professional organization. The course explains how good polls can undermine - and trump - conventional wisdom, while bad polls mislead and can create bad journalism.

The goal of the course is to get its students "to understand that not all polls are equal," said Cliff Zukin, a survey expert at Rutgers and former president of Aapor who helped develop the course. Sometimes the best reporting on certain polls, he said, is the decision to not cover them.

--

Pat Lewis  
Communications Director  
American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR)  
1405 North George Mason Drive  
Arlington, Virginia  
703.527-5245



cell 703.201.5070

www.aapor.org

AAPOR -- the leading association of public opinion and survey research professionals.

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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> .

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Wed, 2 Jan 2008 17:38:13 -0500

Reply-To: Info <[info@POLLINGCOMPANY.COM](mailto:info@POLLINGCOMPANY.COM)>

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

From: Info <[info@POLLINGCOMPANY.COM](mailto:info@POLLINGCOMPANY.COM)>

Subject: Washington, DC Job Posting - Research Analyst/Associate

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

the polling company(tm), inc./WomanTrend, a full service market =  
research, public affairs and political consulting firm headquartered in =  
Washington DC, is looking to hire a Research Analyst/Associate.

Job Description: The Research Associate will be responsible for =  
working with project managers and directors, as well as other Associates =

on proposal development, program design, questionnaire construction, = data analysis and report writing for quantitative and qualitative = research. This individual will also be responsible for gathering = secondary research data related to project objectives and assisting the = company's President & CEO. Position may also include some client = development duties including identifying and reaching out to potential = new clients, arranging and attending meetings, and writing/following up = on proposals.

Qualifications: Applicants should have 1-3 years experience in a = political, marketing, public affairs, or public opinion research = company, be able to manage several tasks at the same time, and willing = to work in a fast-paced, small group environment. Strong computer = skills a must and knowledge of SPSS, Access and Excel encouraged. = Exceptional writing skills and statistical knowledge required. = Candidate must have a Bachelor's degree, and higher education a plus. = Salary and benefits commensurate with experience. =20

Please send cover letter, resume, salary requirements, and references = to Shelley West at [swest@pollingcompany.com](mailto:swest@pollingcompany.com) or fax them to (202) = 467-6551. No phone inquiries please. For more information about the = polling company(tm), inc./WomanTrend, please visit our website: = [www.pollingcompany.com](http://www.pollingcompany.com).

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====

Date: Thu, 3 Jan 2008 05:13:23 -0500  
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: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course  
Comments: To: Dominic Lusinchi <[dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM](mailto:dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: A<[002601c84d7c5a57fd1c0\\$6e01a8c0@acer14219167c5](mailto:002601c84d7c5a57fd1c0$6e01a8c0@acer14219167c5)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

At the beginning of a new day (4:45 am) I would conclude that we are in agreement on the basics, which amount to a realization that there will always be an irreducible minimal error when estimating the future (or as the apocryphal statement goes, "Prediction is difficult, especially as regards the future.") Hindsight is also often less than perfect: the time for definitive proof of what happened, and why, as in the many assassinations of the 1960's, and in my lifetime there have been several Presidential elections where the results have been close enough to be questioned.

Where we will continue to disagree is on the issues of sample quality and nonrespondent bias. If we are sampling from a population that has an equal number of men and women, for example, and our distribution in the sample is 60:40, we can measure the degree to which the sample fails to match the

population without further speculation. When a survey has a percent of nonresponse, we have no way of knowing -- as opposed to believing -- how the results would have been different if all of the targeted individuals had chosen to respond. We can conduct further surveys to ask nonrespondents why they didn't respond and how they would have responded if they had, but my belief -- as opposed to knowledge -- is that if a person has chosen not to respond, and later changes her mind, whatever response one gets is less credible than the responses of willing respondents. And even the responses of willing respondents to a hypothetical issue (e.g. "if the election were held today, for whom would you vote for President?") are suspect on many different levels.

If knowledge vs. belief sounds like a comparison between Darwinism and Creationism, so be it.

Cheers to you. Today is a telecommuting day, and it's now 5:08, so I'm officially on the clock.

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  
517-353-2639

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Dominic Lusinchi  
Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2008 3:19 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

1. OK. But the question is: Was the Digest sample biased in favor of Landon? And if so, can it explain why the poll was off by 20 points? My argument is that the limited evidence we have indicates a large nonresponse bias. It also indicates that there might have been some selection bias (in favor of Landon) in the Digest but that its (minor) effect on the results was swamped by the nonresponse bias. Furthermore, the evidence in favor of nonresponse bias is much clearer than that on selection bias.

2. In the November, 14, 1936 issue of the Digest the editors tried to understand why the poll went so wrong when, in the past, they had been so successful using the same "methodology".

3. Of course, you are right in saying that one should take the results of a post-election poll with a heavy grain of salt. I do not deny that the evidence we have is less than perfect. Despite its imperfections, it cannot be denied that it shows a clear nonresponse bias. We can assess its imperfections and determine what we can conclude regarding the issue at hand: that is why I say that the evidence on nonresponse bias is very convincing, whereas, in my view, the data on selection bias is not as transparent.

4. In 1936, survey research/polling was in its infancy. Gallup was a far more sophisticated researcher than the folks at the Digest. But they had been successful in previous elections: why should they doubt their own "methods"? In 1932, they were off by less than 1 point! But even Gallup and other major pollsters of the day were using a methodology with its own problems: that came to light in 1948! So to answer your question, I see no reason not to use the Digest sample, only I would not have sent out 10M "ballots", but a considerably smaller number and with the money we would have saved I would have done a nonresponse follow-up (assuming a nonresponse rate of 24%). (Nothing like 20:20 hindsight!)

5. My point for bringing this up in the first place is that I think it is wrong to characterize the Digest poll failure as the result of a biased sample when the existing evidence indicates that nonresponse bias was the primary cause. What I am advocating is that if we use the 1936 Digest poll as an example of bad survey research the emphasis should be shifted towards nonresponse bias rather than selection bias. At the very least we should talk about both.

Cheers,  
Dominic

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

From: Ehrlich, Nathaniel [mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@ssc.msu.edu]  
Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2008 11:36 AM  
To: Dominic Lusinchi; AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: RE: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

1. The statement in question reads " That was the case with the most famous polling disaster of all time: the 1936 Literary Digest presidential poll." The word " That" I took to refer to the main clause "if respondents are selected from a pool that is different from the population the researcher is attempting to measure", not the modifier that starts, even if the selection is random. I agree that a cursory reading could yield the observation that the author implied a random sample, but let it go. The issue is whether the sample was representative of the population or not.

2. I'm not going to comment on the Nov 14 Digest (is this the Literary Digest? A post election poll?) and my source of vehicles registered was in error. The ratio was indeed 24:128, still 5 persons to each vehicle. My bad.

Your fourth statement refers to a post-election poll. Curious thing about those: people's memories, or reports, of their own votes cast are often influenced by the actual result, and their attitudes about that result. In the Michigan election of 2006, a proposal to end preferential state hiring and college admission based on race passed by a margin of 62:38 percent. A post-election survey of people who claimed to have voted on the issue showed a 62:38 split AGAINST the measure. So I personally don't put too much confidence on after-the-fact reporting, including exit polls, no matter the sampling strategy. It's possible that the Michigan voters didn't want to admit having voted for a proposal that was opposed by both the Democratic and Republican candidates; and there are several speculative scenarios for the FDR nonrespondent total of close to 70% -- and my speculation and yours

will undoubtedly differ.

You didn't answer my question, though, about what you would do if it was September 1936; would you really use the Literary Digest sample frame? If not, why not?

I agree that it's good to chat, but like you I have bills to pay, and work is how that gets done.

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  
517-353-2639

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Dominic Lusinchi  
Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2008 1:40 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

I will pass on the "ism" bit which does nothing for the understanding of the issue at hand.

I will go over your points.

1. The statement quoted is not taken out of context. It is the first paragraph under the header "A Notorious Polling Disaster".
2. In Chicago, the Digest polled every third registered voter (see its Nov. 14, 1936 issue). The response rate to the poll in that city was 20%. The Digest predicted Landon to win over FDR: 49% vs. 48% (rounded). FDR received 65% of the vote in Chicago. This result is consistent with what Cahalan (in Cedar Rapids, Iowa) and Squire (nationwide) found out: the voting preferences of respondents and nonrespondents were very different. There can be no question of selection bias here.  
As for your numbers regarding car registrations, they do not match my sources. In 1936, according to the Historical Statistics of the U.S. (Bicentennial ed., U.S. Bureau of the Census), there were about 24M automobiles registered (Series Q 153). According to the same source, the total population of the U.S. was 128M (Series A 6). In any case, the Literary Digest used a variety of sources (see Aug. 22, 1936 issue), including motor-vehicle registration, to compile its list.

3. Squire (see POQ, 1988, 52, p.125-133) reports on a poll conducted by Gallup in May 1937. The Gallup poll you are referring to is a pre-election poll. The Gallup poll did correctly predict a victory for FDR but it was off by quite a bit (53.8 percent vs 60.8 of the total popular vote).  
By the way, if we are to believe the Gallup survey as reported by Squire, it shows (table 1, p. 130 of Squire's paper in POQ) that FDR was favored by all "classes" of voters (whether they owned a car or a telephone, or both or

neither). Even if we allow for an overestimation in favor of Roosevelt, the only group where FDR does not have a majority is among owners of a car and a telephone - there it is a tie between him and Landon.

4. You state: "Where is the empirical evidence for nonresponse bias?" Read the two papers referred to. Look at table 1 in the Cahalan paper (p.131): among those who report receiving and returning the Digest ballot (the respondents) only 29% favor FDR. Among those that say they received the Digest ballot but did not return, or say they did not receive it or don't remember (the nonrespondents) 53% favor FDR. In the Squire paper, look at table 3 (p.131): among Digest poll respondents (ignoring small parties), FDR received 48.6%; among nonrespondents: ~69.8%.

Although the empirical evidence has its limitation, it is the best evidence that we have and it beats "idle speculation" or beliefs. And the empirical evidence as I read it indicates that the failure of the Literary Digest poll in 1936 (20 point error in its prediction) was due primarily to nonresponse bias.

You state: "Even a 100% response rate from a nonrepresentative sample can produce an erroneous result." Nonrepresentative of what? What if those that are left out of the sampling frame and those in the sampling frame have the same distribution on the substantive variable at issue?

In any case, the empirical evidence, despite its limitations, supports Bryson's conjecture that the Digest poll failed because of nonresponse bias.

Good chatting with you but I got to get to work.

Cheers,  
Dominic Lusinchi

Applied Statistician  
Far West Research  
Statistical Consulting  
San Francisco, California  
415-664-3032  
www.farwestresearch.com

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

From: Ehrlich, Nathaniel [mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@ssc.msu.edu]  
Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2008 5:57 AM  
To: Dominic Lusinchi; AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: RE: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

Classic revisionism! Let me respond point by point.

1. You state, " This statement gives the false impression that the Digest sample was random - which it certainly was not." The statement reads, "Even samples that are selected at random can be hopelessly flawed if respondents are selected from a pool that is different than the population the researcher is attempting to measure. That was the case with the most famous polling disaster of all time: the 1936 Literary Digest presidential poll." That statement, taken out of context, does not give the impression that the Digest sample was random, but it does state -- not imply or give an

impression -- that when the sample frame is different than [sic] the population, the sample is "hopelessly flawed."

2. You state, " We have no empirical evidence, that I am aware of, that would allow us to reach such a conclusion" [that the sample did not match the population]. In 1936, the United States was in the midst of an economic depression; the sample was mailed out to a pool consisting in very large measure of Literary Digest subscribers, motor vehicle owners (who had registered their vehicles), and people with telephone listings. If you really believe that sample was representative of the voters of the time, I suppose that if you had a time machine and could go back, you'd use the same sample.

As for evidence of a poor match between sample and population, just for an example, in 2005 in the United States, the ratio of cars to persons was 245:288 (millions), or 1.17 persons per car. In 1936, the ratio of cars to persons was 2:130, or 65 persons per car. Even allowing for voter registration differences, and percent of the population eligible to vote, and all the other factors, this was a nonrepresentative sample.

3. You make some allusions to a Gallup Poll. " The Gallup survey, as reported by Squire, does not, in my opinion, provide the data to conclude that selection bias in the original sample of 10 million used by the Digest was a serious issue. At most we can say that IF nonresponse bias had not been an issue, The Literary Digest should have been able to call the election in favor of FDR, but its estimate would have been off by a substantial margin - like other polls were."

I don't suppose that the other polls to which you refer include the 1936 poll of 50,000 respondents conducted by George Gallup that predicted the election result accurately -- and was roundly categorized as naïve at the time. But Gallup collected his data from a more representative sample.

4. You state, " I suggest that if we are going to use the 1936 Digest poll as an example of bad survey research, we should use it as an illustration of what happens when \*nonresponse bias\* occurs in a survey. (The response rate to the poll was 24%.)" Point #2, above, refers to a lack of empirical evidence; where is the empirical evidence for nonresponse bias? It might be suggested that, in addition to sampling from the upper stratum the people who responded (voluntarily, without promise of reward, incentive, and without any refusal conversion effort) were the people who thought that FDR -- the incumbent -- was a 'traitor to his class' and were anxious to vote him out of office. But that's just an idle speculation. If the results had gone the other way, one might have argued that Gallup's flawed prediction was due to potential FDR voters failing to get to the polls because they were poor, and everybody "knows" that poor people are just lazy. Idle speculation is idle speculation. I don't know of any empirical evidence that would support any hypothesis of nonresponse bias, and the special edition of POQ in 2006 offered no convincing argument in favor of response rate as a consistent indicator of survey quality. Even a 100% response rate from a nonrepresentative sample can produce an erroneous result.

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  
517-353-2639

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Dominic Lusinchi  
Sent: Saturday, December 29, 2007 9:34 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

I apologize in advance to my colleagues who are members of the SRMSnet and might have read, some weeks ago, my diatribe regarding the way the 1936 Literary Digest poll is being reported.

I am disappointed that AAPOR is promoting a web site ([http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor\\_polling07](http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor_polling07)), whose merits, otherwise, are undeniable, that reiterates inaccuracies about the failure of the 1936 Literary Digest poll.

On the page that gives examples of "bad sampling" ([http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor\\_polling07](http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor_polling07)), in a paragraph entitled "A Notorious Polling Disaster", we read:

"Even samples that are selected at random can be hopelessly flawed if respondents are selected from a pool that is different than the population the researcher is attempting to measure. That was the case with the most famous polling disaster of all time: the 1936 Literary Digest presidential poll."

This statement gives the false impression that the Digest sample was random - which it certainly was not. It also implies that the Digest sample (mistakenly referred as "respondents") was selected from a pool that was "different" from the target population. We have no empirical evidence, that I am aware of, that would allow us to reach such a conclusion. By the way, the target population is the voting population (nearly 46M in 1936, total popular vote): we know that, if the past is anything like the present, IT (the voting population) is a biased "sample" of the voting-age population -in the U.S. at least.

The author of the text on this web page goes on to quote a Mr. Curtis, who writes, as many have before him: "The magazine surveyed more than 2 million people [the number of respondents to the poll, DL], chosen from the magazine's subscriber list, phone books and car registrations." These are not the only sources that the Digest used to compile its list. This statement merely repeats, as I said, what many have asserted before: that the Digest list was made up only of people who had phones or cars. As Maurice Bryson (The American Statistician, 1976, 30, 4, p.184-185) urged more than 20 yrs ago: Check your sources!

Mr. Curtis goes on to write: "Even though the sample was enormous, it was unrepresentative of the population of voters." We know that the sample was enormous (the Digest, we are told, mailed out around 10M ballots). But how



do we know that it was unrepresentative?

Mr. Curtis concludes: "Not everyone could afford a phone or car during the Depression, and those who could afford cars tended to vote Republican in greater numbers than those who couldn't. As a result, the poll showed Republican Alf Landon beating the actual winner, Democrat Franklin Roosevelt." This statement continues to promote "selection bias" as the principal cause of the Digest's "fiasco". It is wrong!

I suggest that if we are going to use the 1936 Digest poll as an example of bad survey research, we should use it as an illustration of what happens when \*nonresponse bias\* occurs in a survey. (The response rate to the poll was 24%.)

The scant empirical evidence that exists indicates that \*nonresponse bias\* was to blame: respondents were very different in their voting intentions than nonrespondents were. The evidence I am referring to are two studies, both published in AAPOR's flagship journal the Public Opinion Quarterly: Don Cahalan, "The Digest Poll Rides Again!", Public Opinion Quarterly, 1989, 53, pp.129-133; and Peverill Squire, "Why the 1936 Literary Digest poll failed" Public Opinion Quarterly, 1988, 52, 125-133. Both studies have some serious limitations. Cahalan, who uses the soundest methodology (a telephone survey based on a random sample from the Digest list with a response rate of 80%), conducted his study in one city only! Squire analyzes the data from a Gallup poll. The "sample" is national, but it is based on the quota methodology.

The Gallup survey, as reported by Squire, does not, in my opinion, provide the data to conclude that selection bias in the original sample of 10 million used by the Digest was a serious issue. At most we can say that IF nonresponse bias had not been an issue, The Literary Digest should have been able to call the election in favor of FDR, but its estimate would have been off by a substantial margin - like other polls were.

It is ironic that AAPOR sponsors a web site (the polling course) that promotes an analysis of the 1936 Digest poll that is contradicted by authors published in POQ!

Let's heed Bryson's words and put an end to this \*statistical myth\*!

By the way: this is all meant in a friendly spirit as befits the season.

Happy New Year to all.

Dominic Lusinchi

Far West Research  
Statistical Consulting  
San Francisco, California  
415-664-3032  
www.farwestresearch.com

P.S. I would disagree with the characterization that "The Literary Digest fiasco ushered in the age of probability-based surveys." The 1948 election did that (see "Fifty Years of Survey Sampling in the United States", Martin

R. Frankel and Lester R. Frankel, Public Opinion Quarterly, 51, Part 2, 1987, S127-S138, p.S129).

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Pat Lewis  
Sent: Thursday, December 27, 2007 10:58 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

At The Wall Street Journal, Carl Bialik, AKA The Numbers Guy, encourages his readers to look at the NewsU Course

<http://blogs.wsj.com/numbersguy/>

December 27, 2007, 10:43 am

A Polling Primer <<http://blogs.wsj.com/numbersguy/a-polling-primer-245/>>

As journalists and voters focus on next week's Iowa caucus, they'll be inundated with polling data. Sites such as Pollster.com<<http://www.pollster.com/>>and Real Clear Politics <<http://www.realclearpolitics.com/>> compile the latest primary polling numbers, while news sites including WSJ.com<<http://online.wsj.com/public/resources/documents/info-enlargePic07.html>>distribute the numbers.

[image: poll]

Before digesting all the data, reporters and readers may want to consult an online course with useful tips on interpreting and analyzing polls. Understanding & Interpreting Polls<[http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor\\_polling07](http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor_polling07)>, free with registration, is targeted at journalists but also useful for consumers of journalism - not just political coverage, but any reporting based on surveys. It was released by the Poynter Institute, a school for journalists in St. Petersburg, Fla., and American Association for Public Opinion Research (Aapor), a polling professional organization. The course explains how good polls can undermine - and trump - conventional wisdom, while bad polls mislead and can create bad journalism.

The goal of the course is to get its students "to understand that not all polls are equal," said Cliff Zukin, a survey expert at Rutgers and former president of Aapor who helped develop the course. Sometimes the best reporting on certain polls, he said, is the decision to not cover them.

--

Pat Lewis  
Communications Director  
American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR)  
1405 North George Mason Drive  
Arlington, Virginia  
703.527-5245

cell 703.201.5070

www.aapor.org

AAPOR -- the leading association of public opinion and survey research professionals.

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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> .

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====  
Date: Thu, 3 Jan 2008 10:06:45 -0800

Reply-To: Dominic Lusinchi <[dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM](mailto:dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM)>

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

From: Dominic Lusinchi <[dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM](mailto:dominic@FARWESTRESEARCH.COM)>

Organization: Far West Research

Subject: Re: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

Comments: To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <[Nathaniel.Ehrlich@ssc.msu.edu](mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@ssc.msu.edu)> ,

[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

In-Reply-To: <[EC15B06368AAA4419321FF6D2159CB1C01B05994@sscnet03-2.ssc.msu.edu](mailto:EC15B06368AAA4419321FF6D2159CB1C01B05994@sscnet03-2.ssc.msu.edu)>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I am impressed that you can actually function at 4:45 AM!

I don't disagree with your remarks. But let me come back to the original purpose of my posting.

AAPOR is sponsoring a polling course. In it, the authors give a very unbalanced description of the 1936 Literary Digest poll. The poll failed, they say, because the sample "came from the magazine's subscriber list, phone books and car registrations." At no point do they mention nonresponse (~76%, no less). With nonresponse, more often than not, comes nonresponse bias.

The reality is that the magazine, according to their own admission, used a variety of sources to create their list - including voter registration rolls. The fact is: we don't really know what procedures they followed to compile their list.

What do we know? We have two studies, published in the POQ, both indicate that nonresponse bias was largely responsible for the poll's failure. The evidence is incomplete, yes; it is less than perfect, yes. We also have the results of three cities/towns: Chicago, Scranton, and Allentown; where, we are told, registered voters were polled. The results bolster what the two studies mentioned conclude (nonresponse bias). The evidence is still incomplete, yes - but it is evidence and far better than the line that says: "The LD used phone books and car registrations, only rich people had a car or a phone, and rich people voted for Landon, ergo the fiasco."

So let me repeat: I suggest that if AAPOR is going to give its official stamp of approval to this site I would recommend that a more thorough account of the 1936 Literary Digest poll be given - certainly one that should mention nonresponse!

Don't work too hard.

Best,  
Dominic

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

From: Ehrlich, Nathaniel [mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@ssc.msu.edu]  
Sent: Thursday, January 03, 2008 2:13 AM  
To: Dominic Lusinchi; AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: RE: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

At the beginning of a new day (4:45 am) I would conclude that we are in agreement on the basics, which amount to a realization that there will always be an irreducible minimal error when estimating the future (or as the apocryphal statement goes, "Prediction is difficult, especially as regards the future.") Hindsight is also often less than perfect: the time for definitive proof of what happened, and why, as in the many assassinations of the 1960's, and in my lifetime there have been several Presidential elections where the results have been close enough to be questioned.

Where we will continue to disagree is on the issues of sample quality and nonrespondent bias. If we are sampling from a population that has an equal number of men and women, for example, and our distribution in the sample is 60:40, we can measure the degree to which the sample fails to match the population without further speculation. When a survey has a percent of nonresponse, we have no way of knowing -- as opposed to believing -- how the

results would have been different if all of the targeted individuals had chosen to respond. We can conduct further surveys to ask nonrespondents why they didn't respond and how they would have responded if they had, but my belief -- as opposed to knowledge -- is that if a person has chosen not to respond, and later changes her mind, whatever response one gets is less credible than the responses of willing respondents. And even the responses of willing respondents to a hypothetical issue (e.g. "if the election were held today, for whom would you vote for President?) are suspect on many different levels.

If knowledge vs. belief sounds like a comparison between Darwinism and Creationism, so be it.

Cheers to you. Today is a telecommuting day, and it's now 5:08, so I'm officially on the clock.

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  
517-353-2639

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Dominic Lusinchi  
Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2008 3:19 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

1. OK. But the question is: Was the Digest sample biased in favor of Landon? And if so, can it explain why the poll was off by 20 points? My argument is that the limited evidence we have indicates a large nonresponse bias. It also indicates that there might have been some selection bias (in favor of Landon) in the Digest but that its (minor) effect on the results was swamped by the nonresponse bias. Furthermore, the evidence in favor of nonresponse bias is much clearer than that on selection bias.

2. In the November, 14, 1936 issue of the Digest the editors tried to understand why the poll went so wrong when, in the past, they had been so successful using the same "methodology".

3. Of course, you are right in saying that one should take the results of a post-election poll with a heavy grain of salt. I do not deny that the evidence we have is less than perfect. Despite its imperfections, it cannot be denied that it shows a clear nonresponse bias. We can assess its imperfections and determine what we can conclude regarding the issue at hand: that is why I say that the evidence on nonresponse bias is very convincing, whereas, in my view, the data on selection bias is not as transparent.

4. In 1936, survey research/polling was in its infancy. Gallup was a far more sophisticated researcher than the folks at the Digest. But they had

been successful in previous elections: why should they doubt their own "methods"? In 1932, they were off by less than 1 point! But even Gallup and other major pollsters of the day were using a methodology with its own problems: that came to light in 1948! So to answer your question, I see no reason not to use the Digest sample, only I would not have sent out 10M "ballots", but a considerably smaller number and with the money we would have saved I would have done a nonresponse follow-up (assuming a nonresponse rate of 24%). (Nothing like 20:20 hindsight!)

5. My point for bringing this up in the first place is that I think it is wrong to characterize the Digest poll failure as the result of a biased sample when the existing evidence indicates that nonresponse bias was the primary cause. What I am advocating is that if we use the 1936 Digest poll as an example of bad survey research the emphasis should be shifted towards nonresponse bias rather than selection bias. At the very least we should talk about both.

Cheers,  
Dominic

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

From: Ehrlich, Nathaniel [mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@ssc.msu.edu]  
Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2008 11:36 AM  
To: Dominic Lusinchi; AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: RE: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

1. The statement in question reads " That was the case with the most famous polling disaster of all time: the 1936 Literary Digest presidential poll." The word " That" I took to refer to the main clause "if respondents are selected from a pool that is different from the population the researcher is attempting to measure", not the modifier that starts, even if the selection is random. I agree that a cursory reading could yield the observation that the author implied a random sample, but let it go. The issue is whether the sample was representative of the population or not.

2. I'm not going to comment on the Nov 14 Digest (is this the Literary Digest? A post election poll?) and my source of vehicles registered was in error. The ratio was indeed 24:128, still 5 persons to each vehicle. My bad.

Your fourth statement refers to a post-election poll. Curious thing about those: people's memories, or reports, of their own votes cast are often influenced by the actual result, and their attitudes about that result. In the Michigan election of 2006, a proposal to end preferential state hiring and college admission based on race passed by a margin of 62:38 percent. A post-election survey of people who claimed to have voted on the issue showed a 62:38 split AGAINST the measure. So I personally don't put too much confidence on after-the-fact reporting, including exit polls, no matter the sampling strategy. It's possible that the Michigan voters didn't want to admit having voted for a proposal that was opposed by both the Democratic and Republican candidates; and there are several speculative scenarios for the FDR nonrespondent total of close to 70% -- and my speculation and yours will undoubtedly differ.

You didn't answer my question, though, about what you would do if it was September 1936; would you really use the Literary Digest sample frame? If not, why not?

I agree that it's good to chat, but like you I have bills to pay, and work is how that gets done.

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  
517-353-2639

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Dominic Lusinchi  
Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2008 1:40 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

I will pass on the "ism" bit which does nothing for the understanding of the issue at hand.

I will go over your points.

1. The statement quoted is not taken out of context. It is the first paragraph under the header "A Notorious Polling Disaster".
2. In Chicago, the Digest polled every third registered voter (see its Nov. 14, 1936 issue). The response rate to the poll in that city was 20%. The Digest predicted Landon to win over FDR: 49% vs. 48% (rounded). FDR received 65% of the vote in Chicago. This result is consistent with what Cahalan (in Cedar Rapids, Iowa) and Squire (nationwide) found out: the voting preferences of respondents and nonrespondents were very different. There can be no question of selection bias here.

As for your numbers regarding car registrations, they do not match my sources. In 1936, according to the Historical Statistics of the U.S. (Bicentennial ed., U.S. Bureau of the Census), there were about 24M automobiles registered (Series Q 153). According to the same source, the total population of the U.S. was 128M (Series A 6). In any case, the Literary Digest used a variety of sources (see Aug. 22, 1936 issue), including motor-vehicle registration, to compile its list.

3. Squire (see POQ, 1988, 52, p.125-133) reports on a poll conducted by Gallup in May 1937. The Gallup poll you are referring to is a pre-election poll. The Gallup poll did correctly predict a victory for FDR but it was off by quite a bit (53.8 percent vs 60.8 of the total popular vote).

By the way, if we are to believe the Gallup survey as reported by Squire, it shows (table 1, p. 130 of Squire's paper in POQ) that FDR was favored by all "classes" of voters (whether they owned a car or a telephone, or both or neither). Even if we allow for an overestimation in favor of Roosevelt, the only group where FDR does not have a majority is among owners of a car and a

telephone - there it is a tie between him and Landon.

4. You state: "Where is the empirical evidence for nonresponse bias?" Read the two papers referred to. Look at table 1 in the Cahalan paper (p.131): among those who report receiving and returning the Digest ballot (the respondents) only 29% favor FDR. Among those that say they received the Digest ballot but did not return, or say they did not receive it or don't remember (the nonrespondents) 53% favor FDR. In the Squire paper, look at table 3 (p.131): among Digest poll respondents (ignoring small parties), FDR received 48.6%; among nonrespondents: ~69.8%.

Although the empirical evidence has its limitation, it is the best evidence that we have and it beats "idle speculation" or beliefs. And the empirical evidence as I read it indicates that the failure of the Literary Digest poll in 1936 (20 point error in its prediction) was due primarily to nonresponse bias.

You state: "Even a 100% response rate from a nonrepresentative sample can produce an erroneous result." Nonrepresentative of what? What if those that are left out of the sampling frame and those in the sampling frame have the same distribution on the substantive variable at issue?

In any case, the empirical evidence, despite its limitations, supports Bryson's conjecture that the Digest poll failed because of nonresponse bias.

Good chatting with you but I got to get to work.

Cheers,  
Dominic Lusinchi

Applied Statistician  
Far West Research  
Statistical Consulting  
San Francisco, California  
415-664-3032  
www.farwestresearch.com

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

From: Ehrlich, Nathaniel [mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@ssc.msu.edu]  
Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2008 5:57 AM  
To: Dominic Lusinchi; AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: RE: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

Classic revisionism! Let me respond point by point.

1. You state, " This statement gives the false impression that the Digest sample was random - which it certainly was not." The statement reads, "Even samples that are selected at random can be hopelessly flawed if respondents are selected from a pool that is different than the population the researcher is attempting to measure. That was the case with the most famous polling disaster of all time: the 1936 Literary Digest presidential poll." That statement, taken out of context, does not give the impression that the Digest sample was random, but it does state -- not imply or give an impression -- that when the sample frame is different than [sic] the population, the sample is "hopelessly flawed."



2. You state, " We have no empirical evidence, that I am aware of, that would allow us to reach such a conclusion" [that the sample did not match the population]. In 1936, the United States was in the midst of an economic depression; the sample was mailed out to a pool consisting in very large measure of Literary Digest subscribers, motor vehicle owners (who had registered their vehicles), and people with telephone listings. If you really believe that sample was representative of the voters of the time, I suppose that if you had a time machine and could go back, you'd use the same sample.

As for evidence of a poor match between sample and population, just for an example, in 2005 in the United States, the ratio of cars to persons was 245:288 (millions), or 1.17 persons per car. In 1936, the ratio of cars to persons was 2:130, or 65 persons per car. Even allowing for voter registration differences, and percent of the population eligible to vote, and all the other factors, this was a nonrepresentative sample.

3. You make some allusions to a Gallup Poll. " The Gallup survey, as reported by Squire, does not, in my opinion, provide the data to conclude that selection bias in the original sample of 10 million used by the Digest was a serious issue. At most we can say that IF nonresponse bias had not been an issue, The Literary Digest should have been able to call the election in favor of FDR, but its estimate would have been off by a substantial margin - like other polls were."

I don't suppose that the other polls to which you refer include the 1936 poll of 50,000 respondents conducted by George Gallup that predicted the election result accurately -- and was roundly categorized as naïve at the time. But Gallup collected his data from a more representative sample.

4. You state, " I suggest that if we are going to use the 1936 Digest poll as an example of bad survey research, we should use it as an illustration of what happens when \*nonresponse bias\* occurs in a survey. (The response rate to the poll was 24%.)" Point #2, above, refers to a lack of empirical evidence; where is the empirical evidence for nonresponse bias? It might be suggested that, in addition to sampling from the upper stratum the people who responded (voluntarily, without promise of reward, incentive, and without any refusal conversion effort) were the people who thought that FDR -- the incumbent -- was a 'traitor to his class' and were anxious to vote him out of office. But that's just an idle speculation. If the results had gone the other way, one might have argued that Gallup's flawed prediction was due to potential FDR voters failing to get to the polls because they were poor, and everybody "knows" that poor people are just lazy. Idle speculation is idle speculation. I don't know of any empirical evidence that would support any hypothesis of nonresponse bias, and the special edition of POQ in 2006 offered no convincing argument in favor of response rate as a consistent indicator of survey quality. Even a 100% response rate from a nonrepresentative sample can produce an erroneous result.

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  
517-353-2639

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Dominic Lusinchi  
Sent: Saturday, December 29, 2007 9:34 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

I apologize in advance to my colleagues who are members of the SRMSnet and might have read, some weeks ago, my diatribe regarding the way the 1936 Literary Digest poll is being reported.

I am disappointed that AAPOR is promoting a web site ([http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor\\_polling07](http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor_polling07)), whose merits, otherwise, are undeniable, that reiterates inaccuracies about the failure of the 1936 Literary Digest poll.

On the page that gives examples of "bad sampling" ([http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor\\_polling07](http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor_polling07)), in a paragraph entitled "A Notorious Polling Disaster", we read:

"Even samples that are selected at random can be hopelessly flawed if respondents are selected from a pool that is different than the population the researcher is attempting to measure. That was the case with the most famous polling disaster of all time: the 1936 Literary Digest presidential poll."

This statement gives the false impression that the Digest sample was random - which it certainly was not. It also implies that the Digest sample (mistakenly referred as "respondents") was selected from a pool that was "different" from the target population. We have no empirical evidence, that I am aware of, that would allow us to reach such a conclusion. By the way, the target population is the voting population (nearly 46M in 1936, total popular vote): we know that, if the past is anything like the present, IT (the voting population) is a biased "sample" of the voting-age population -in the U.S. at least.

The author of the text on this web page goes on to quote a Mr. Curtis, who writes, as many have before him: "The magazine surveyed more than 2 million people [the number of respondents to the poll, DL], chosen from the magazine's subscriber list, phone books and car registrations." These are not the only sources that the Digest used to compile its list. This statement merely repeats, as I said, what many have asserted before: that the Digest list was made up only of people who had phones or cars. As Maurice Bryson (The American Statistician, 1976, 30, 4, p.184-185) urged more than 20 yrs ago: Check your sources!

Mr. Curtis goes on to write: "Even though the sample was enormous, it was unrepresentative of the population of voters." We know that the sample was enormous (the Digest, we are told, mailed out around 10M ballots). But how do we know that it was unrepresentative?

Mr. Curtis concludes: "Not everyone could afford a phone or car during the Depression, and those who could afford cars tended to vote Republican in greater numbers than those who couldn't. As a result, the poll showed Republican Alf Landon beating the actual winner, Democrat Franklin Roosevelt." This statement continues to promote "selection bias" as the principal cause of the Digest's "fiasco". It is wrong!

I suggest that if we are going to use the 1936 Digest poll as an example of bad survey research, we should use it as an illustration of what happens when \*nonresponse bias\* occurs in a survey. (The response rate to the poll was 24%.)

The scant empirical evidence that exists indicates that \*nonresponse bias\* was to blame: respondents were very different in their voting intentions than nonrespondents were. The evidence I am referring to are two studies, both published in AAPOR's flagship journal the Public Opinion Quarterly: Don Cahalan, "The Digest Poll Rides Again!", Public Opinion Quarterly, 1989, 53, pp.129-133; and Peverill Squire, "Why the 1936 Literary Digest poll failed" Public Opinion Quarterly, 1988, 52, 125-133. Both studies have some serious limitations. Cahalan, who uses the soundest methodology (a telephone survey based on a random sample from the Digest list with a response rate of 80%), conducted his study in one city only! Squire analyzes the data from a Gallup poll. The "sample" is national, but it is based on the quota methodology.

The Gallup survey, as reported by Squire, does not, in my opinion, provide the data to conclude that selection bias in the original sample of 10 million used by the Digest was a serious issue. At most we can say that IF nonresponse bias had not been an issue, The Literary Digest should have been able to call the election in favor of FDR, but its estimate would have been off by a substantial margin - like other polls were.

It is ironic that AAPOR sponsors a web site (the polling course) that promotes an analysis of the 1936 Digest poll that is contradicted by authors published in POQ!

Let's heed Bryson's words and put an end to this \*statistical myth\*!

By the way: this is all meant in a friendly spirit as befits the season.

Happy New Year to all.

Dominic Lusinchi

Far West Research  
Statistical Consulting  
San Francisco, California  
415-664-3032  
www.farwestresearch.com

P.S. I would disagree with the characterization that "The Literary Digest fiasco ushered in the age of probability-based surveys." The 1948 election did that (see "Fifty Years of Survey Sampling in the United States", Martin R. Frankel and Lester R. Frankel, Public Opinion Quarterly, 51, Part 2, 1987, S127-S138, p.S129).

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Pat Lewis  
Sent: Thursday, December 27, 2007 10:58 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: The Numbers Guy Writes About AAPOR, NewsU Polling Course

At The Wall Street Journal, Carl Bialik, AKA The Numbers Guy, encourages his readers to look at the NewsU Course

<http://blogs.wsj.com/numbersguy/>

December 27, 2007, 10:43 am

A Polling Primer <<http://blogs.wsj.com/numbersguy/a-polling-primer-245/>>

As journalists and voters focus on next week's Iowa caucus, they'll be inundated with polling data. Sites such as Pollster.com<<http://www.pollster.com/>>and Real Clear Politics <<http://www.realclearpolitics.com/>> compile the latest primary polling numbers, while news sites including WSJ.com<<http://online.wsj.com/public/resources/documents/info-enlargePic07.html>>distribute the numbers.

[image: poll]

Before digesting all the data, reporters and readers may want to consult an online course with useful tips on interpreting and analyzing polls. Understanding & Interpreting Polls<[http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor\\_polling07](http://www.newsu.org/Angel/section/default.asp?format=course&id=aapor_polling07)>, free with registration, is targeted at journalists but also useful for consumers of journalism - not just political coverage, but any reporting based on surveys. It was released by the Poynter Institute, a school for journalists in St. Petersburg, Fla., and American Association for Public Opinion Research (Aapor), a polling professional organization. The course explains how good polls can undermine - and trump - conventional wisdom, while bad polls mislead and can create bad journalism.

The goal of the course is to get its students "to understand that not all polls are equal," said Cliff Zukin, a survey expert at Rutgers and former president of Aapor who helped develop the course. Sometimes the best reporting on certain polls, he said, is the decision to not cover them.

--

Pat Lewis  
Communications Director  
American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR)  
1405 North George Mason Drive  
Arlington, Virginia  
703.527-5245  
cell 703.201.5070  
[www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org)

AAPOR -- the leading association of public opinion and survey research professionals.

---

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

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 this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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> .

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

---

Date: Thu, 3 Jan 2008 21:45:35 -0500

Reply-To: "Leve, Jay" <[jleve@SURVEYUSA.COM](mailto:jleve@SURVEYUSA.COM)>

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

From: "Leve, Jay" <[jleve@SURVEYUSA.COM](mailto:jleve@SURVEYUSA.COM)>

Subject: Congratulations to Ann Selzer

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

Those old enough to remember Wilt Chamberlain scoring 100 points in a single basketball game have witnessed the polling equivalent tonight.=20

=20

A remarkable accomplishment.

=20

Jay H Leve

SurveyUSA

15 Bloomfield Ave

Verona NJ 07044

=20

973-857-8500 x 551

jleve@surveyusa.com

www.surveyusa.com

=20

=20

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====

Date: Thu, 3 Jan 2008 22:15:44 -0500

Reply-To: [sf@alum.mit.edu](mailto:sf@alum.mit.edu)

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

From: Steve Freeman <[steven.f.freeman@VERIZON.NET](mailto:steven.f.freeman@VERIZON.NET)>

Subject: Poll providing candidates' positions, but not names?

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

Has anyone ever seen or heard of a public opinion poll providing candidates' positions, but not names? I recall hearing about some such poll and that Mike Gravel emerged as Americans' top choice for President.

-----  
Steven F. Freeman \* Center for Organizational Dynamics \* University of Pennsylvania \* (215) 898-6967 \* [sff@sas.upenn.edu](mailto:sff@sas.upenn.edu)

-----  
Was the 2004 Presidential Election Stolen? Exit Polls, Election Fraud, and the Official Count by Steven F. Freeman and Joel Bleifuss (Seven Stories Press). Preview at [www.electionintegrity.org/book](http://www.electionintegrity.org/book)

-----  
For information about the Election Verification Project, please see [www.electionintegrity.org](http://www.electionintegrity.org)

-----  
For updates and discussions about election integrity, see <http://groups.google.com/group/ElectionIntegrity>

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
-----

Date: Fri, 4 Jan 2008 06:36:03 -0500  
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: Congratulations to Ann Selzer  
Comments: To: aapor <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
In-Reply-To: <[033131AB4310364FB652738936135D00D13683@exchange.hypotenuse.com](mailto:033131AB4310364FB652738936135D00D13683@exchange.hypotenuse.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Jay's congratulations to Ann Selzer are highly appropriate, and might include her appearance on the PBS Newshour to respond clearly and firmly to questions.

It's also worth noting that Obama's victory fits well Gary Langer's ABC/WP poll two weeks earlier. My sense is that not only the overall results for Obama but the correlates found in the two surveys were much the same.

Obama apparently continued to gain after each poll was completed and it would be useful to put aside the less adequate poll reports in order to try to track the change that occurred. hs

Leve, Jay wrote:

> Those old enough to remember Wilt Chamberlain scoring 100 points in a  
> single basketball game have witnessed the polling equivalent tonight.

>

>

>

> A remarkable accomplishment.

>

>

>

> Jay H Leve

>

> SurveyUSA

>

> 15 Bloomfield Ave

>

> Verona NJ 07044

>

>

>

> 973-857-8500 x 551

>

>

>

>

>

> jleve@surveyusa.com  
>  
> www.surveyusa.com  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Fri, 4 Jan 2008 13:31:13 -0500  
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: Congratulations to Ann Selzer  
Comments: To: [howard schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>](mailto:howard schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>)  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[477E1A23.4040408@umich.edu](mailto:477E1A23.4040408@umich.edu)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Ann Seltzer has demonstrated once again that she is a fine pollster, but the final Des Moines Register's Iowa Poll results hardly deserve to be called a remarkable accomplishment. Rather, they are very much in line with what one would expect from any good polling organization.

The Zogby tracking poll showed almost identical results to the Iowa Poll on Thursday morning. But Zogby also asked about 2nd choices among Democratic caucus goers whose first choices were candidates not likely to make the 15% cut-off and were able to allocate these among the viable candidates, providing a far more accurate prediction of the final caucus outcome on the Democratic side than the Iowa Poll:

	Iowa	Zogby	Adj.Zog	Actual
Democrats:			(Final)	
Obama	32%	31%	37.5	37.6
Edwards	24%	27%	33.7	29.8



Clinton	25%	24%	28.8	29.4
Richardson	6%	7%		
Biden	4%	5%		.9

Republicans: (95.5% reporting)

Huckabee	32%	31%	34%
Romney	26%	25%	25%
Thompson	9%	11%	13%
McCain	13%	10%	13%
Paul	9%	10%	10%
Giuliani	5%	6%	3%

I don't believe that Zogby ever actually published the allocated results but Eric Kleefeld, an enterprising young writer for the "Talking Points Memo" blog, asked for and published them yesterday.

Jan Werner

---

howard schuman wrote:

> Jay's congratulations to Ann Selzer are highly appropriate, and might  
 > include her appearance on the PBS Newshour to respond clearly and firmly  
 > to questions.

>  
 > It's also worth noting that Obama's victory fits well Gary Langer's  
 > ABC/WP poll two weeks earlier. My sense is that not only the overall  
 > results for Obama but the correlates found in the two surveys were much  
 > the same.

>  
 > Obama apparently continued to gain after each poll was completed and it  
 > would be useful to put aside the less adequate poll reports in order to  
 > try to track the change that occurred. hs

>  
 > Leve, Jay wrote:  
 >> Those old enough to remember Wilt Chamberlain scoring 100 points in a  
 >> single basketball game have witnessed the polling equivalent tonight.

>>  
 >>  
 >> A remarkable accomplishment.

>>  
 >>  
 >> Jay H Leve  
 >>  
 >> SurveyUSA  
 >>  
 >> 15 Bloomfield Ave  
 >>  
 >> Verona NJ 07044

>>  
 >>  
 >>  
 >> 973-857-8500 x 551

>>  
>> jleve@surveyusa.com  
>>  
>> www.surveyusa.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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Fri, 4 Jan 2008 17:40:33 -0500  
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: Member Survey Ending Soon!  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-15  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
Content-Disposition: inline

Dear Fellow AAPOR members:

As most of you know from previous announcements, emails and even letters some of you have received, we are strongly encouraging participation in the AAPOR Membership Survey. If you have already completed it, thanks.

However, we have usable responses from only about 50 percent of you, and we will end fieldwork in one week. Our partner in this effort, Survey Sciences Group, LLC (SSG), has generously taken some additional follow-up steps and extended the field period in an effort to give members as much time as possible to participate. As survey research professionals, we can do better!

The questionnaire is short, and while some of the questions seem general and basic, they all matter in helping AAPOR\*s Executive Council determine the direction of our organization. I can assure you that all the comments and suggestions you make in open-ended questions will be carefully considered by Council.

So please respond. If you\*ve lost the web address of the survey, or your password, SSG will help you. You can contact their support desk by sending an email to [aapor@ssgresearch.com](mailto:aapor@ssgresearch.com) or by calling toll free at 1-800-774-0142, extension 420.

Thanks,  
Carl Ramirez  
Membership & Chapter Relations Chair  
[ramirezc@gao.gov](mailto: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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Sun, 6 Jan 2008 14:45:12 -0500  
Reply-To: Scott Keeter <[skeeter@PEWRESEARCH.ORG](mailto:skeeter@PEWRESEARCH.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Scott Keeter <[skeeter@PEWRESEARCH.ORG](mailto:skeeter@PEWRESEARCH.ORG)>  
Subject: seeking endorsement for grant to validate self-reported vote in  
the 2004 ANES  
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'm posting this on behalf of a colleague.

=20

Michael McDonald is preparing a NSF grant proposal to validate respondent self-reported vote on the 2004 post-election ANES; last ANES vote validation was conducted in 1990. As part of making the case for the academic merit of the activity, he'd appreciate that anyone who would make use of the validated data to send him a sentence or two about how great it would be fund the project. Please send responses directly to Michael McDonald ([mmcdon@gmu.edu](mailto:mmcdon@gmu.edu)).

=20

For those interested, the project will use statewide voter registration files to validate ANES respondents' self-reported vote. A demonstration project conducted using California's voter registration file is available here:

=20

[http://www.electionstudies.org/announce/newsltr/ANES\\_VoteValidationMemo\\_20071031.pdf](http://www.electionstudies.org/announce/newsltr/ANES_VoteValidationMemo_20071031.pdf)

=20

or

=20

<http://tinyurl.com/38suzc>

=20

=20

Scott Keeter

Pew Research Center

1615 L St., NW, Suite 700

Washington, DC 20036

Voice 202 419 4362

Personal fax 206 600 5448

E-mail [skeeter@pewresearch.org](mailto:skeeter@pewresearch.org)

Web site <http://pollcats.net>

=20

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Sun, 6 Jan 2008 17:45:44 EST  
Reply-To: [BLUMWEP@AOL.COM](mailto:BLUMWEP@AOL.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mickey Blum <[BLUMWEP@AOL.COM](mailto:BLUMWEP@AOL.COM)>  
Subject: Asst. Prof Survey Research, tenure position,  
Sch. of Pub Affairs, Baruch, CUNY  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="UTF-8"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

=20

Assistant Professor - Survey Research=20  
School of Public Affairs =20  
Tenure Track; Appointment Beginning Fall 2008 =20  
Exempt =20  
Compensation commensurate with experience and academic accomplishments =20  
[\\_www.baruch.cuny.edu\\_](http://www.baruch.cuny.edu) (<http://www.baruch.cuny.edu/>) =20  
FY14546 =20  
Open until filled with application reviews to begin 1/30/2008 =20  
POSITION DESCRIPTION AND DUTIES=20  
Baruch College, School of Public Affairs (SPA) seeks applicants with a=20  
strong background in survey research methods applied to substantive  
policy=20=  
issues.=20  
A successful candidate will have experience with designing surveys,=20  
statistical sampling issues, and quantitative analysis of survey data. Subs=  
tantive=20  
research interests should align with topics in public affairs, including pu=

blic=20  
or nonprofit management, or a policy relevant field. The successful=20  
candidate will be active in the Baruch College Survey Research Unit and cou=20  
ld=20  
collaborate with other centers located at Baruch SPA. Teaching responsibili=20  
ties=20  
would include research methods courses in the School=E2=80=99s three gradua=20  
te degree =20  
programs and elective courses in survey research at the graduate and =20  
undergraduate level.=20  
We are seeking a scholar with a strong research trajectory and a commitment=20  
=20  
to teaching at the graduate and undergraduate levels. This scholar would=20  
become part of the 42 member interdisciplinary and highly collegial faculty=  
at=20  
the School. An active program of research relevant to Public Affairs is=20  
essential. An ability and willingness to do collaborative research with oth=20  
er Baruch=20  
faculty is desired.=20  
The School of Public Affairs, a Flagship institution of the CUNY system,=20  
specializes in teaching, research, and service in the areas of municipal=20  
government, nonprofit administration, policy analysis and evaluation, healt=20  
h care=20  
policy and educational administration. The School offers graduate,=20  
undergraduate and executive degree programs. The faculty carries out resear=20  
ch,=20  
professional service, and formal education related to the challenges that a=  
=20  
pluralistic society faces in the formulation of public policies and the dis=20  
tribution =20  
of public and private resources. The School operates nationally recognized =20  
research centers, including: Center for Innovation and Leadership in =20  
Government, Center for Educational Leadership, Center on Equality, Pluralis=20  
m and=20  
Policy, Center for Nonprofit Strategy and Management, and the Baruch Survey=  
=20  
Research Unit. The New York Census Data Research Center and the CUNY Institu=20  
te for =20  
Demographic Research are located at the School. The student body is among t=  
he=20  
most diverse in the nation. The graduate program is largely composed of=20  
active professionals. There is a small but growing undergraduate program. S=  
ervice=20  
to the school, to the college and to the broader policy community is also=20  
essential.=20  
The URL for the School is: <http://www.baruch.cuny.edu/spa/index.jsp>=20  
The URL for the Baruch Survey Research Unit is =20  
(<http://www.baruch.cuny.edu/spa/Centers/BaruchSurveyResearchUnit.jsp>). =20

#### QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS =20

A Ph.D. Degree or equivalent doctoral level degree is required. Candidates=20  
must demonstrate excellence or high promise for excellence in graduate and=20  
undergraduate teaching, an active agenda of applied research, a record or=20  
promise of strong scholarly publication, and an ability to interact product=  
ively =20

across disciplinary boundaries. =20

TO APPLY =20

Please send or e-mail (preferred) cover letter, CV and the names of three=20

references to: =20

Address =20

Professor Dahlia Remler, Chair=20

Survey Research Search=20

School of Public Affairs, Office of the Dean=20

Baruch College, City University of New York=20

One Bernard Baruch Way, Box D-0901=20

New York, New York 10010=20

E-mail: Diane\_Hibbert@baruch.cuny.edu (search assistant) =20

The City University of New York=20

An Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action/Immigration Reform and =20

Control Act/=20

Americans with Disabilities Act Employer=20

\_http://portal.cuny.edu/cms/id/cuny/documents/jobposting/022902.htm#P-11\_0\_=20

(http://portal.cuny.edu/cms/id/cuny/documents/jobposting/022902.htm#P-

11\_0)=20=

.

\*\*\*\*\*Start the year off right. Easy ways to stay in shape. =20

http://body.aol.com/fitness/winter-exercise?NCID=3Daolcmp00300000002489

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====  
Date: Mon, 7 Jan 2008 07:46:37 -0500

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: A Political Tsunami

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

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

What is happening with Obama's candidacy was missed by many polls until quite recently but might have been forecast by those who heard his Keynote address to the 2004 Democratic Convention, knew of his prescient 2002 speech against the Iraq invasion, and were perhaps familiar with his book "Dreams from My Father." We may well be witnessing something so rare in American political history that it is hard to find a parallel without going back to the impact of Lincoln's pre-presidential speech at Cooper Union. hs

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

---

Date: Mon, 7 Jan 2008 09:43:39 -0500  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Subject: Oregon pollster may have run afoul of New Hampshire law  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Oregon pollster may have run afoul of New Hampshire law  
[http://www.boston.com/news/local/new\\_hampshire/articles/2008/01/04/oregon\\_pollster\\_may\\_have\\_run\\_afoul\\_of\\_new\\_hampshire\\_law/](http://www.boston.com/news/local/new_hampshire/articles/2008/01/04/oregon_pollster_may_have_run_afoul_of_new_hampshire_law/)

or

<http://tinyurl.com/294e5y>

Associated Press

PORTLAND, Ore.-A veteran Oregon pollster for Republican candidates may have run afoul of New Hampshire election law for a survey to determine how voters view Mitt Romney and his Mormon faith.

The New Hampshire attorney general's office has subpoenaed the records of Moore Information in Portland to determine if pollster Bob Moore met the New Hampshire requirements for presidential primary polling or whether it crossed over the line to a form of campaigning known as "push polling."

Moore was traveling Friday and could not be reached for comment.

But his office released a statement Friday that said the poll was a standard survey conducted with accepted methodology and a scientific sample size.

SNIP

--

Leo G. Simonetta  
Director of Research  
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 this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

---

Date: Mon, 7 Jan 2008 10:03:32 -0500  
Reply-To: Howard Fienberg <hfienberg@CMOR.ORG>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Howard Fienberg <hfienberg@CMOR.ORG>  
Subject: "Cellphone-only voters may be problematic for pollsters"  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Yet another article illustrating why CMOR has made it a priority to amend the federal TCPA to let researchers to use autodialers to call cell phone users -- and why we joined the AAPOR Cell Phone Task Force:

Cellphone-only voters may be problematic for pollsters

CONCORD, N.H. - As New Hampshire poll results are being released in the countdown to primary day, keep in mind the story of Fergus Cullen. The 35-year-old Republican has managed to avoid being called by a pollster for months because he has no landline telephone. Instead, he has only a cellphone - and pollsters tend not to call cellphones.

[http://www.boston.com/news/nation/articles/2008/01/07/cellphone\\_only\\_voters\\_may\\_be\\_problematic\\_for\\_pollsters?mode=PF](http://www.boston.com/news/nation/articles/2008/01/07/cellphone_only_voters_may_be_problematic_for_pollsters?mode=PF)

Sincerely,  
Howard Fienberg  
Director of Government Affairs  
CMOR: Promoting & Advocating Survey & Opinion Research  
hfienberg@cmor.org  
1111 16th St. NW, Suite 120  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 775-5170  
Fax: (202) 775-5172  
<<http://www.cmor.org/>> <http://www.cmor.org>  
<<http://www.youropinioncounts.org/>> <http://www.youropinioncounts.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 this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

---

Date: Mon, 7 Jan 2008 10:59:33 -0500



Reply-To: Colleen Porter <colleen\_porter@COX.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Colleen Porter <colleen\_porter@COX.NET>  
Subject: Re: A Political Tsunami  
Comments: To: howard schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
In-Reply-To: <200801071246.m07CLWH3012140@lists.asu.edu>  
Mime-Version: 1.0 (Apple Message framework v753)  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII; delp=yes; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Well, my (registered Republican) husband finally made his decision in favor of Obama on Saturday night, watching the marathon debates on ABC. The irony is that (and I don't know if they had such rules back in Lincoln's day?) his change of heart came a few days too late to actually vote in the Democratic primary, since we have closed primaries in our state.

He did sit on the couch with his laptop and make an online contribution, which is an important method of voting as well:)

The thing is, though, from a pollster's point of view: My husband may not even realize that he can't vote for Obama in the primary. If someone calls the house tomorrow, he'd likely tell an interviewer that he is voting for Obama.

Colleen Porter  
Gainesville, FL  
(Of course, living in Florida, it's not clear that a Democratic vote will mean anything, anyway....)

On Jan 7, 2008, at 7:46 AM, howard schuman wrote:

> What is happening with Obama's candidacy was missed by many polls  
> until  
> quite recently but might have been forecast by those who heard his  
> Keynote address to the 2004 Democratic Convention, knew of his  
> prescient  
> 2002 speech against the Iraq invasion, and were perhaps familiar with  
> his book "Dreams from My Father." We may well be witnessing  
> something so  
> rare in American political history that it is hard to find a parallel  
> without going back to the impact of Lincoln's pre-presidential  
> speech at  
> Cooper Union. hs  
>

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Mon, 7 Jan 2008 12:40:15 -0500  
Reply-To: howard schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: howard schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>  
Subject: Tunamis, 1860, and 2008  
Comments: To: aapor <aapornet@asu.edu>  
In-Reply-To: <47821F2D.8070300@umich.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The parallel between Lincoln in 1860 and Obama in 2008 involves not just the two different individuals, but two moments in time as well. In 1860 the United States was riven by struggles over the extension of slavery and ineluctable questions of violence, secession, and disunion. There was receptivity outside the South to someone unconventional who could try (however unsuccessfully) to address and perhaps even resolve the conflicts. It was not a normal political time.

Today the possibility of nuclear terrorism, brought home by the 9/11 attacks, by the failures in Iraq, Afghanistan, and now Pakistan, and by other mounting problems like global warming, the energy crisis, and economic disequilibrium, together with the large ideological gap between the two political parties, also makes the public receptive to an unconventional candidate who can appear--whether rightly or wrongly--to offer genuine hope of addressing so many huge problems. It is also not a normal political time.

Whatever the outcome this year, polls need to be put into historical context.

howard schuman wrote:

- > What is happening with Obama's candidacy was missed by many polls until
- > quite recently but might have been forecast by those who heard his
- > Keynote address to the 2004 Democratic Convention, knew of his prescient
- > 2002 speech against the Iraq invasion, and were perhaps familiar with
- > his book "Dreams from My Father." We may well be witnessing something so
- > rare in American political history that it is hard to find a parallel
- > without going back to the impact of Lincoln's pre-presidential speech at
- > Cooper Union. hs
- >
- > -----
- > 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 this: set aapornet mail
- > Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
- > 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 this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

---

Date: Mon, 7 Jan 2008 10:54:46 -0700

Reply-To: David Krane <[dkrane@HARRISINTERACTIVE.COM](mailto:dkrane@HARRISINTERACTIVE.COM)>

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

From: David Krane <[dkrane@HARRISINTERACTIVE.COM](mailto:dkrane@HARRISINTERACTIVE.COM)>

Subject: A Pollster=?ISO-8859-1?Q?=E2=80=99s?= Take on the Kenyan Elections

Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

My colleague, Humphrey Taylor, asked me to post this. Over the years he=20= has written and spoken about how democracies use surveys. He thought it=20= might be of interest to AAPORNET.=20

Humphrey writes...

In August 2007, I was in Kenya to participate in the launching of a new=20=

Harris Poll there conducted by our Global Network Member INFOTRAK Researc= h=20

and Consulting. At a meeting by the Center for Multiparty Democracy (CMD=

- Kenya) and attended by several of the presidential candidates and by the=20=

American Ambassador, I talked about the important role that polls play in= =20

democracies. Specifically, I said that honest and independent polls make= =20

it much harder for governments to steal elections.

I was very encouraged during my trip by what I saw of the democratic=20 process in Kenya. There was a lively multi-party democracy, a free press= =20

which had no reluctance to criticize the government or the president, a=20=

vigorous election campaign, and no evident fear that participating in the= =20

election or criticizing the government would be dangerous.

Until, and including, election day, January 27th, I continued to believe=20=

that this would be a reasonably free and fair election and that it was a=20=

sign of Kenyan, and African progress and maturity in political processes=20=

and democracy.

All of the Infotrak polls conducted in the 4 months before the elections

and, to the best of my knowledge, all of the other polls that were conducted, showed President Kibaki and his party trailing his challenger

Raila Odinga and his party by significant margins. Infotrak's final poll showed an 8.6% lead for Raila Odinga over President Kibaki. The results

of the final poll also indicated that most voters intended to vote for

the president, MP and Councilor from the same party. If they did so

there was no way the president could have been reelected when his party

suffered big losses in the parliamentary elections, which nobody disputes.

The early results of the election seemed to confirm the accuracy of the

polls. In the parliamentary elections there was a big swing against the

president's party with many members of his cabinet losing their

parliamentary seats. When each of these parliamentary results was being

announced in the individual constituencies the votes in the presidential

election there were also announced and showed Odinga substantially ahead

of President Kibaki. However, when the Electoral Commission announced the

final results everything had changed with President Kibaki allegedly winning many more votes in the constituencies where his lower votes had

been announced previously. In some of these constituencies it seemed that

well over 100 percent of registered voters had actually voted..

The awful violence that followed has been front page news of course.

However it is worth noting that this was almost certainly a good

election for polling in Kenya. I believe that they measured the voting

intentions of Kenyans with considerable accuracy. But, sadly, it seems

that I overestimated the potential for the polls to prevent the government

from stealing the election.

Humphrey Taylor,  
Chairman, The Harris Poll

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====  
Date: Mon, 7 Jan 2008 13:40:17 -0500

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: Tunamis, 1860, and 2008

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

In-Reply-To: <[478263FF.1020502@umich.edu](mailto:478263FF.1020502@umich.edu)>

Mime-Version: 1.0 (Apple Message framework v752.3)

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII; delp=yes; format=flowed

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

On Jan 7, 2008, at 12:40 PM, howard schuman wrote:

> The parallel between Lincoln in 1860 and Obama in 2008 involves not  
> just the two different individuals, but two moments in time as  
> well. In 1860 the United States was riven by struggles over the  
> extension of slavery and ineluctable questions of violence,  
> secession, and disunion. There was receptivity outside the South to  
> someone unconventional who could try (however unsuccessfully) to  
> address and perhaps even resolve the conflicts. It was not a normal  
> political time.

Of course, in 1860 the U.S. was on the verge of splitting up, and having a war over it. In 2008, Obama is talking about a post-partisan, post-political we're all in this together fantasy. In the first case, you couldn't miss the profound divisions in the society; in the second, a candidate is talking as if they're somehow unreal, the invention of politicians (politicians other than himself, that is) and pundits, and a substantial portion of the public seems to be buying it.

I read somewhere that the post-partisan meme appeals mainly to upper-income voters. Does anyone know if that's true?

Doug Henwood  
Left Business Observer  
38 Greene St - 4th fl.  
New York NY 10013-2505 USA  
<[dhenwood@panix.com](mailto:dhenwood@panix.com)>  
<<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>>

voice +1-212-219-0010

cell +1-917-865-2813

producer, Behind the News

Thursdays, 5-6 PM, WBAI, New York 99.5 FM

<<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Radio.html>>

podcast: <<http://shout.lbo-talk.org/lbo/radio-feed.php>>

iTunes: <<http://phobos.apple.com/WebObjects/MZStore.woa/wa/viewPodcast?id=73801817>>

-----  
download my book Wall Street (for free!) at

<<http://www.wallstreetthebook.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 this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====  
Date: Tue, 8 Jan 2008 13:07:25 -0600

Reply-To: John Stevenson <[stevens@SSC.WISC.EDU](mailto:stevens@SSC.WISC.EDU)>

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

From: John Stevenson <[stevens@SSC.WISC.EDU](mailto:stevens@SSC.WISC.EDU)>

Organization: UW Survey Center

Subject: [Fwd: message to aapornet]

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

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Greetings AAPORNETers,

We are seeking information anyone might have on current response rates for national RDD telephone surveys in order to make comparisons. We have been scouring the literature, and reviewing documentation at websites, but documentation is sparse. We have reviewed the results from the excellent work of Curtin, Singer, and Presser for the Surveys of Consumers (SCA), but would really like more.

Are there other recent national RDD telephone surveys out there that publish their response rates and provide enough documentation on their study design to understand their methodology.

By recent, say maybe in the last 5 years or so?

If you current run or know of any national RDDs, we would really appreciate hearing about your study.

Thank you very much. Please respond to:

John Stevenson

Associate Director  
University of Wisconsin Survey Center  
stevens@ssc.wisc.edu

--

John Stevenson  
Associate Director  
University of Wisconsin Survey Center  
1800 University Ave  
Madison, WI 53726  
ph (608)262-9032  
fx (608)262-8432  
www.uwsc.wisc.edu

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Tue, 8 Jan 2008 12:34:41 -0800  
Reply-To: Mario Callegaro <[mcallegaro@KNOWLEDGENETWORKS.COM](mailto:mcallegaro@KNOWLEDGENETWORKS.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mario Callegaro <[mcallegaro@KNOWLEDGENETWORKS.COM](mailto:mcallegaro@KNOWLEDGENETWORKS.COM)>  
Subject: Re: RDD response rates  
Comments: To: John Stevenson <[stevens@SSC.WISC.EDU](mailto:stevens@SSC.WISC.EDU)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: [A<4783C9ED.5000500@ssc.wisc.edu>](mailto:A<4783C9ED.5000500@ssc.wisc.edu>)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-2"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Dear John,

Check out the chapter by Holbrook, Krosnick and Pfent (chapter 23)  
in the new Wiley book: "Advances in Telephone Survey Methodology"  
<http://www.wiley.com/WileyCDA/WileyTitle/productCd-0471745316.html>  
This is exactly what you are looking for. Other chapters in the same book  
contain information about response rates.

Another interesting paper is the one by Bob Tortora published in the Slovenian  
Journal  
Metodološki zvezki, Vol. 1, No. 1, 2004, 21-32  
<http://mrvar.fdv.uni-lj.si/pub/mz/mz1.1/tortora.pdf>

Mario

Knowledge  
N E T W O R K S  
Mario Callegaro Ph.D.  
Survey Research Scientist  
[mcallegaro@knowledgenetworks.com](mailto:mcallegaro@knowledgenetworks.com)  
1350 Willow Rd, STE 102 Menlo Park, CA 94025-1516

Phone 650.289.2026 Fax 650.289.2001  
<http://www.knowledgenetworks.com>

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Tue, 8 Jan 2008 16:05:46 -0500  
Reply-To: Patrick Glaser <[pglaser@CMOR.ORG](mailto:pglaser@CMOR.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Patrick Glaser <[pglaser@CMOR.ORG](mailto:pglaser@CMOR.ORG)>  
Subject: Re: RDD response rates  
Comments: To: Mario Callegaro <[mcallegaro@KNOWLEDGENETWORKS.COM](mailto:mcallegaro@KNOWLEDGENETWORKS.COM)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[2C81210FC47F6F429069C964CE88145B026C5524@mail.knowledgenetworks.com](mailto:2C81210FC47F6F429069C964CE88145B026C5524@mail.knowledgenetworks.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-2"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Ciao Mario,

I'll add to that a study CMOR conducted from 2000-2002  
(<http://www.cmor.org/rc/studies.cfm>) which analyzed response rates from  
about 400 RDD surveys.

John- email me offline and I'd be happy to forward some results.

Patrick Glaser  
Director of Respondent Cooperation  
CMOR...Shielding the Profession  
Ph:212.480.2464  
Fx:860.682.1010

[pglaser@cmor.org](mailto:pglaser@cmor.org)  
[www.cmor.org](http://www.cmor.org)  
[www.youropinioncounts.org](http://www.youropinioncounts.org)

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Mario Callegaro  
Sent: Tuesday, January 08, 2008 3:35 PM  
To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Subject: Re: RDD response rates

Dear John,  
Check out the chapter by Holbrook, Krosnick and Pfent



(chapter 23) in the new Wiley book: "Advances in Telephone Survey Methodology"

<http://www.wiley.com/WileyCDA/WileyTitle/productCd-0471745316.html>

This is exactly what you are looking for. Other chapters in the same book contain information about response rates.

Another interesting paper is the one by Bob Tortora published in the Slovenian Journal Metodološki zvezki, Vol. 1, No. 1, 2004, 21-32

<http://mrvar.fdv.uni-lj.si/pub/mz/mz1.1/tortora.pdf>

Mario

Knowledge

NETWORKS

Mario Callegaro Ph.D.

Survey Research Scientist

[mcallegaro@knowledgenetworks.com](mailto:mcallegaro@knowledgenetworks.com)

1350 Willow Rd, STE 102 Menlo Park, CA 94025-1516

Phone 650.289.2026 Fax 650.289.2001 <http://www.knowledgenetworks.com>

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

Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text: signoff aapornet Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text: signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Tue, 8 Jan 2008 18:38:11 -0500

Reply-To: Info <[info@POLLINGCOMPANY.COM](mailto:info@POLLINGCOMPANY.COM)>

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

From: Info <[info@POLLINGCOMPANY.COM](mailto:info@POLLINGCOMPANY.COM)>

Subject: AA MODERATOR IN WASH, DC

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

I would appreciate recommendations for an African-American focus group = moderator based in the DC Metro area. For this specific project, I do = need someone who calls the DC area home so those located elsewhere, = however wonderful they may be, will not work.

=20

Please reply directly to me at [swest@pollingcompany.com](mailto:swest@pollingcompany.com)

=20

Thanks. =20

=20

Shelley West

Project Director

the polling company, inc./WomanTrend

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2008 09:03:56 -0500  
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: I was going to post a witty multiple choice question . . . .  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

but this covers the basics.

New Hampshire's Polling Fiasco  
Gary Langer  
ABC News

There will be a serious, critical look at the final pre-election polls in the Democratic presidential primary in New Hampshire; that is essential. It is simply unprecedented for so many polls to have been so wrong. We need to know why.

But we need to know it through careful, empirically based analysis. There will be a lot of claims about what happened - about respondents who reputedly lied, about alleged difficulties polling in biracial contests. That may be so. It also may be a smokescreen - a convenient foil for pollsters who'd rather fault their respondents than own up to other possibilities - such as their own failings in sampling and likely voter modeling.

SNIP

<http://blogs.abcnews.com/thenumbers/2008/01/new-hampshires.html>  
or  
<http://tinyurl.com/2haxoe>

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

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

---

Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2008 09:12:33 -0500  
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: I was going to post a witty multiple choice question . . . .  
Comments: To: [aapornet aapornet <aapornet@asu.edu>](mailto:aapornet aapornet <aapornet@asu.edu>)  
In-Reply-To:  
<[3248A9B21DD5574785FE5E2C8E5216849CB6D5@exchange.local.artscience.com](mailto:3248A9B21DD5574785FE5E2C8E5216849CB6D5@exchange.local.artscience.com)>  
Mime-Version: 1.0 (Apple Message framework v753)  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII; delp=yes; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Does anyone think that the phenomenon of black candidates doing worse than polls suggest was at play here? Does the public nature of the Iowa caucus produce a different dynamic from the private polling booth?

Doug Henwood  
Left Business Observer  
38 Greene St - 4th fl.  
New York NY 10013-2505 USA  
<[dhenwood@panix.com](mailto:dhenwood@panix.com)>  
<<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>>

voice +1-212-219-0010  
cell +1-917-865-2813

producer, Behind the News  
Thursdays, 5-6 PM, WBAI, New York 99.5 FM  
<<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Radio.html>>  
podcast: <<http://shout.lbo-talk.org/lbo/radio-feed.php>>  
iTunes: <<http://phobos.apple.com/WebObjects/MZStore.woa/wa/viewPodcast?id=73801817>>

---

download my book Wall Street (for free!) at  
<<http://www.wallstreetthebook.com>>

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2008 09:13:16 -0500  
Reply-To: "Santos, Rob" <[RSantos@UI.URBAN.ORG](mailto:RSantos@UI.URBAN.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Santos, Rob" <[RSantos@UI.URBAN.ORG](mailto:RSantos@UI.URBAN.ORG)>  
Subject: Re: I was going to post a witty multiple choice question . . . .  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

In-Reply-To:

A<3248A9B21DD5574785FE5E2C8E5216849CB6D5@exchange.local.artsience.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I miss Warren...

Rob Santos  
The Urban Institute

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

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

Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2008 9:04 AM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: I was going to post a witty multiple choice question . . . .

but this covers the basics.

New Hampshire's Polling Fiasco  
Gary Langer  
ABC News

There will be a serious, critical look at the final pre-election polls in the Democratic presidential primary in New Hampshire; that is essential. It is simply unprecedented for so many polls to have been so wrong. We need to know why.

But we need to know it through careful, empirically based analysis. There will be a lot of claims about what happened - about respondents who reputedly lied, about alleged difficulties polling in biracial contests. That may be so. It also may be a smokescreen - a convenient foil for pollsters who'd rather fault their respondents than own up to other possibilities - such as their own failings in sampling and likely voter modeling.

SNIP

<http://blogs.abcnews.com/thenumbers/2008/01/new-hampshires.html>

or

<http://tinyurl.com/2haxoe>

--

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

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu  
=====

Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2008 09:22:14 -0500  
Reply-To: Paul J Lavrakas PhD <pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Paul J Lavrakas PhD <pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET>  
Subject: Re: I was going to post a witty multiple choice question . . . .  
Comments: To: "Santos, Rob" <RSantos@UI.URBAN.ORG>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
In-Reply-To: <0F96478603980B46AAAFBA77069582ED03F66BE0@UIEXCH.urban.org>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

We all miss Warren's wisdom, but let's remember that the accuracy of the pre-election polls is the issue, not the exit polling data. It's been long known that pre-primary election polls are notoriously difficult to get right for many reasons beyond the researchers' control. That's not to say there were not improvements that the pre-primary poll methods that could/should have made and I trust (and hope) that the errors in NH will help the pollsters improve their future 2008 pre-primary polling.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Santos, Rob  
Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2008 9:13 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: I was going to post a witty multiple choice question . . . .

I miss Warren...

Rob Santos  
The Urban Institute

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta  
Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2008 9:04 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: I was going to post a witty multiple choice question . . . .

but this covers the basics.

New Hampshire's Polling Fiasco  
Gary Langer  
ABC News

There will be a serious, critical look at the final pre-election polls in the Democratic presidential primary in New Hampshire; that is essential. It is simply unprecedented for so many polls to have been so wrong. We need to

know why.

But we need to know it through careful, empirically based analysis. There will be a lot of claims about what happened - about respondents who reputedly lied, about alleged difficulties polling in biracial contests. That may be so. It also may be a smokescreen - a convenient foil for pollsters who'd rather fault their respondents than own up to other possibilities - such as their own failings in sampling and likely voter modeling.

SNIP

<http://blogs.abcnews.com/thenumbers/2008/01/new-hampshires.html>

or

<http://tinyurl.com/2haxoe>

--

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

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
[aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2008 09:24:18 -0500  
Reply-To: David Wilson <[dcwilson@UDEL.EDU](mailto:dcwilson@UDEL.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: David Wilson <[dcwilson@UDEL.EDU](mailto:dcwilson@UDEL.EDU)>  
Subject: The Poll disparities  
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 may have missed some polls here and there, but weren't Obama's numbers with the MOE (4% to 5%) of most polls? It seems Clinton got the boost, which might help with some of the thinking (hypothesizing) about the Bradley/Dinkins/Wilder effects.

One place I'm curious about is how the "undecideds," "don't know," and "not sure" responses were handled statistically. If they were included in the percentage slices for the pre-election poll results, then they probably "decided," eventually "knew," and became "sure." And more were for Clinton.

David

David C. Wilson

Assistant Professor

Department of Political Science &

International Relations

University of Delaware

455 Smith Hall

302-831-1935

dcwilson@udel.edu

<http://www.udel.edu/poscir/profiles/DWilson.shtml>

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2008 09:38:30 -0500  
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: Re: I was going to post a witty multiple choice question . . . .  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Comments: cc: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>  
In-Reply-To: <[81C6606C-250D-4A5F-8645-2104303F288D@panix.com](mailto:81C6606C-250D-4A5F-8645-2104303F288D@panix.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I think that is an interesting question, and is one that would make an

interesting experiment for a Masters thesis project for a budding political psychologist (if it has not already been done).

What I keep expecting to happen is that the polls are wrong, in that they under-predict Obama's support, given the proliferation of cell-phone only HHs among younger people (who could be under-represented in the polls). Of course, they're also less likely to show up and vote which may cancel this effect out. What concerns me, however, are some of the comments that followed the ABC blog: How this demonstrates that polls aren't to be trusted, etc.

Will AAPOR put out any kind of "official" release that addresses the NH primary situation? Often those who are quiet are presumed guilty, unfortunately.

Melissa Marcello  
President  
Pursuant, Inc.  
2141 P Street NW  
Suite 105  
Washington, DC 20037  
d. 202.887.0070, ext. 11  
f. 800.567.1723

Please visit our Website at [www.pursuantresearch.com](http://www.pursuantresearch.com)

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Doug Henwood  
Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2008 9:13 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: I was going to post a witty multiple choice question . . . .

Does anyone think that the phenomenon of black candidates doing worse than polls suggest was at play here? Does the public nature of the Iowa caucus produce a different dynamic from the private polling booth?

Doug Henwood  
Left Business Observer  
38 Greene St - 4th fl.  
New York NY 10013-2505 USA  
<dhenwood@panix.com>  
<<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>>

voice +1-212-219-0010  
cell +1-917-865-2813

producer, Behind the News  
Thursdays, 5-6 PM, WBAI, New York 99.5 FM  
<<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Radio.html>>  
podcast: <<http://shout.lbo-talk.org/lbo/radio-feed.php>>



iTunes: <<http://phobos.apple.com/WebObjects/MZStore.woa/wa/viewPodcast?id=73801817>>

---

download my book Wall Street (for free!) at  
<<http://www.wallstreetthebook.com>>

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2008 09:48:26 -0500  
Reply-To: Joel Bloom <[joelbloom@GMAIL.COM](mailto:joelbloom@GMAIL.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Joel Bloom <[joelbloom@GMAIL.COM](mailto:joelbloom@GMAIL.COM)>  
Subject: One possible contributing factor  
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  
Content-Disposition: inline

One factor that might have boosted Obama's numbers in the pre-primary polls is New Hampshire's tradition of one party's hot candidate getting substantial numbers of write-in votes in the other party's primary. I don't have exact numbers here, but I recall Gary Hart getting around 5% of the Republican primary vote in 1984 as a write-in, in addition to his votes in the Democratic primary. The write-in votes are not tabulated until later, so they don't show up in the media tallies, but they are there later when the official counts roll in. And unlike many states, New Hampshire does eventually give final counts of all write-ins by name. (I should add that this wouldn't do Obama, or anyone else, any practical good -- they won't get enough votes in the other party's primary to get any delegates even if they wanted them, and they aren't added to their tallies in their own party.)

Anyway, my thought is that if some small but important segment of registered Republicans planned on writing in Obama in the Republican primary (remember, independents, or whatever they call them in NH, can vote in either primary, but registered party members can only vote in their own party's primary), it is quite possible, even likely, that pollsters might have mistakenly included them in their Democratic primary sample. I'm going to go out on a bit of limb and guess that at least 10,000 Republicans wrote in Obama in the Republican primary and that much smaller numbers (but not zero) wrote in Clinton. If that's the case, that would have potentially been enough to at least tip polls to showing a slight Obama lead, which gets us part-way there, but obviously not all the way to the 6-8 point lead shown in the Pollster.com and other estimates.

If that's the case (and we might not know for a couple weeks) then we would need to think about modifying our screening procedures to take this into account. This would theoretically be the case for any state that allows write-ins, but for some reason it is either especially pronounced in NH, or perhaps other states just don't ever report the write-ins by name, just by number, or not even that.

Anyway, that's just one more possible contributing factor I wanted to get out there for consideration. Best,

-- Joel

--

Joel David Bloom, Ph.D.  
The University at Albany, SUNY

Research Assistant Professor, Dept. of Political Science  
Associate Director, Office of Institutional Research  
Phone: (518) 437-4791  
Cell: 541-579-6610  
E-mail: [jbloom@albany.edu](mailto:jbloom@albany.edu)  
Web: <http://www.albany.edu/ir/>

On Jan 9, 2008 9:22 AM, Paul J Lavrakas PhD <[pjlavrak@optonline.net](mailto:pjlavrak@optonline.net)> wrote:

> We all miss Warren's wisdom, but let's remember that the accuracy of the  
> pre-election polls is the issue, not the exit polling data. It's been  
> long  
> known that pre-primary election polls are notoriously difficult to get  
> right  
> for many reasons beyond the researchers' control. That's not to say there  
> were not improvements that the pre-primary poll methods that could/should  
> have made and I trust (and hope) that the errors in NH will help the  
> pollsters improve their future 2008 pre-primary polling.

>

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

> From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Santos, Rob  
> Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2008 9:13 AM  
> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
> Subject: Re: I was going to post a witty multiple choice question . . . .

>

> I miss Warren...

>

> Rob Santos  
> The Urban Institute

>

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

> From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta  
> Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2008 9:04 AM  
> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
> Subject: I was going to post a witty multiple choice question . . . .

>

> but this covers the basics.  
>  
>  
> New Hampshire's Polling Fiasco  
> Gary Langer  
> ABC News  
>  
> There will be a serious, critical look at the final pre-election polls in  
> the Democratic presidential primary in New Hampshire; that is essential.  
> It  
> is simply unprecedented for so many polls to have been so wrong. We need  
> to  
> know why.  
>  
> But we need to know it through careful, empirically based analysis.  
> There will be a lot of claims about what happened - about respondents who  
> reputedly lied, about alleged difficulties polling in biracial contests.  
> That may be so. It also may be a smokescreen - a convenient foil for  
> pollsters who'd rather fault their respondents than own up to other  
> possibilities - such as their own failings in sampling and likely voter  
> modeling.  
>  
> SNIP  
>  
> <http://blogs.abcnews.com/thenumbers/2008/01/new-hampshires.html>  
> or  
> <http://tinyurl.com/2haxoe>  
>  
>  
> --  
> Leo G. Simonetta  
> Director of Research  
> Art & Science Group, LLC  
> 6115 Falls Road, Suite 101  
> Baltimore MD 21209  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
> [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
> [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
> [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2008 07:39:56 -0700  
Reply-To: Mike O'Neil <[mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU](mailto:mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mike O'Neil <[mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU](mailto:mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU)>  
Subject: New Hampshire Democratic Polls--dissecting what happened  
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  
Content-Disposition: inline

It has been suggested that perhaps the NH Democratic polling overestimated the vote for a black candidate such as we have seen often in the past (Harvey Gant, Doug Wilder, etc.)

Gary Langer's post has suggested that there are numerous more recent examples (though he did not name them) where this effect was not evident.

I would reserve judgment.

There is an alternative theory that

All the last-minute press that the Clinton campaign was imploding (firing staff, might pull out of all states pre-Super Tuesday) triggered the well-known New Hampshire tendency to vote for the candidate that will keep the election in play ---but this was picked up in NONE of the pre-election polls, even those done within a day of the election.

I would suggest looking at one thing: the exit polls showed a female preference for Clinton that was not evident in Iowa. I would like to know if the pre-election polls in NH showed that same difference. If they did, it would support the "black-vote-overestimate" theory. If they did not, it would seem to indicate that what happened was a last-minute rallying of women voters to a woman who was under savage attack (NY Murdoch paper: "She is Yesterday", etc.). A race-bias effect in vote report would be unlikely to be gender-specific, so if Clinton's increase was primarily among women, it would undermine the race-bias theory.

Could someone with access to any of these data comment?

Mike O'Neil  
[www.oneilresearch.com](http://www.oneilresearch.com)

Could anyone share the vote by gender in any of the final NH pre-election polls?

--

Mike O'Neil

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2008 08:56:11 -0600  
Reply-To: "Smith, David W" <[SmithD2@UTHSCSA.EDU](mailto:SmithD2@UTHSCSA.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Smith, David W" <[SmithD2@UTHSCSA.EDU](mailto:SmithD2@UTHSCSA.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: response rates  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
In-Reply-To: <[AAPORNET%200801082100002566.5D2F@LISTS.ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET%200801082100002566.5D2F@LISTS.ASU.EDU)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

The Centers for Disease Control publishes a lot of information about response rates by state for the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, RDD surveys done in all states. The rates are published for about the last 12 years.

See: [http://www.cdc.gov/brfss/technical\\_infodata/quality.htm](http://www.cdc.gov/brfss/technical_infodata/quality.htm)

David Smith

David W. Smith, Ph.D., M.P.H.  
Biostatistics Division  
San Antonio Campus  
University of Texas School of Public Health  
[smithd2@uthscsa.edu](mailto:smithd2@uthscsa.edu)  
(210) 562-5512

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

Date: Tue, 8 Jan 2008 13:07:25 -0600  
From: John Stevenson <[stevens@SSC.WISC.EDU](mailto:stevens@SSC.WISC.EDU)>  
Subject: [Fwd: message to aapornet]

Greetings AAPORNETers,

We are seeking information anyone might have on current response rates for national RDD telephone surveys in order to make comparisons. We have been scouring the literature, and reviewing documentation at websites, but documentation is sparse. We have reviewed the results from the excellent work of Curtin, Singer, and Presser for the Surveys of Consumers (SCA), but would really like more.

Are there other recent national RDD telephone surveys out there that publish their response rates and provide enough documentation on their study design to understand their methodology.

By recent, say maybe in the last 5 years or so?

If you current run or know of any national RDDs, we would really appreciate hearing about your study.

Thank you very much. Please respond to:

John Stevenson  
Associate Director  
University of Wisconsin Survey Center  
stevenson@ssc.wisc.edu

--

John Stevenson  
Associate Director  
University of Wisconsin Survey Center  
1800 University Ave  
Madison, WI 53726  
ph (608)262-9032  
fx (608)262-8432  
www.uwsc.wisc.edu

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2008 08:58:29 -0600  
Reply-To: [amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU](mailto:amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Allan L. McCutcheon" <[amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU](mailto:amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: I was going to post a witty multiple choice question . . . .  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[001e01c852cb\\$082106c0\\$8b00a8c0@NYCNMRLAVRAKPB](mailto:001e01c852cb$082106c0$8b00a8c0@NYCNMRLAVRAKPB)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; DelSp="Yes"; format="flowed"  
Content-Disposition: inline  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

The likely voter models for the pre-election polls need to be re-considered. Yesterday's high Democratic turnout (290,000) was clearly unprecedented in the history of New Hampshire primaries. The 2004 Democratic primary--a record for participation in the NH Democratic primaries--was just short of 220,000, so yesterday we were looking at the participation of a far larger portion of the electorate (including the participation by independents). If this trend continues, the likely voter models for the pre-election polls will need to reflect this larger pool of participants.

--  
Donald O. Clifton Chair of Survey Science  
Professor of Statistics &  
Survey Research and Methodology  
tel. +402.458.2036  
fax +402.458.2038

Quoting Paul J Lavrakas PhD <pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET>:

> We all miss Warren's wisdom, but let's remember that the accuracy of the  
> pre-election polls is the issue, not the exit polling data. It's been long  
> known that pre-primary election polls are notoriously difficult to get right  
> for many reasons beyond the researchers' control. That's not to say there  
> were not improvements that the pre-primary poll methods that could/should  
> have made and I trust (and hope) that the errors in NH will help the  
> pollsters improve their future 2008 pre-primary polling.

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Santos, Rob  
> Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2008 9:13 AM  
> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
> Subject: Re: I was going to post a witty multiple choice question . . . .

> I miss Warren...

> Rob Santos  
> The Urban Institute

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta  
> Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2008 9:04 AM  
> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
> Subject: I was going to post a witty multiple choice question . . . .

> but this covers the basics.

> New Hampshire's Polling Fiasco  
> Gary Langer  
> ABC News

> There will be a serious, critical look at the final pre-election polls in  
> the Democratic presidential primary in New Hampshire; that is essential. It  
> is simply unprecedented for so many polls to have been so wrong. We need to  
> know why.

> But we need to know it through careful, empirically based analysis.  
> There will be a lot of claims about what happened - about respondents who  
> reputedly lied, about alleged difficulties polling in biracial contests.  
> That may be so. It also may be a smokescreen - a convenient foil for  
> pollsters who'd rather fault their respondents than own up to other  
> possibilities - such as their own failings in sampling and likely voter

> modeling.  
>  
> SNIP  
>  
> <http://blogs.abcnews.com/thenumbers/2008/01/new-hampshires.html>  
> or  
> <http://tinyurl.com/2haxoe>

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

> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
> [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2008 15:01:15 +0000  
Reply-To: "mail@marketsharescorp.com" <[mkshares@COMCAST.NET](mailto:mkshares@COMCAST.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "mail@marketsharescorp.com" <[mkshares@COMCAST.NET](mailto:mkshares@COMCAST.NET)>  
Subject: Re: The Poll disparities  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

I think the Democratic New Hampshire primary pollsters may have faced some unusual obstacles this year.

This was an extremely fluid situation, difficult to track. Obama got an unusual bounce from his win in Iowa only five days earlier. And this was a compressed 4-day campaign period. Voter preferences may have been very soft and subject to change.

Before Jan 3, Obama was trailing in most NH polls. After Jan 3, Obama led in



most NH polls by margins ranging from +3 to + 13 points. The unofficial count shows Clinton winning by 2 points.

There were events that could have helped Clinton, within hours of election day. In the final debate it appeared that Edwards and Obama were ganging up on Clinton. Some pundits attribute this to how well she did among women. Then there were her emotional comments about the status of her campaign on Sunday. Some said that this (their words) "humanized" her, that she appeared to be a victim.

We can't compare this with general election presidential poll accuracy (excluding late-breaking events). General election have partisan components. And the candidates are also known quantities by then.

I did a quick check of estimate error for the polls by pollster. The average margin error was about 8 points. Assuming Hilliary won by two points, the average estimate error is 5 points, outside the margin of error.

Nick Panagakis

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

From: David Wilson <dcwilson@UDEL.EDU>

> I may have missed some polls here and there, but weren't Obama's numbers  
> with the MOE (4% to 5%) of most polls? It seems Clinton got the boost, which  
> might help with some of the thinking (hypothesizing) about the  
> Bradley/Dinkins/Wilder effects.

>  
>  
>

> One place I'm curious about is how the "undecideds," "don't know," and "not  
> sure" responses were handled statistically. If they were included in the  
> percentage slices for the pre-election poll results, then they probably  
> "decided," eventually "knew," and became "sure." And more were for Clinton.

>  
>  
>  
>

> David

>  
>  
>

> David C. Wilson

>  
>  
>

> Assistant Professor

>  
>  
>

> Department of Political Science &

>  
>  
>

> International Relations

>  
>  
>

> University of Delaware

>

> 455 Smith Hall  
>  
> 302-831-1935  
>  
> dcwilson@udel.edu  
>  
> <http://www.udel.edu/poscir/profiles/DWilson.shtml>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2008 10:07:47 -0500  
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: Explanations and Research about New Hampshire  
Comments: To: aapor <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Among the many explanations for the difference between the last polls and the Democratic Primary vote in New Hampshire, it is especially important to test the claim that racial bias affected the poll results. Since such effects have been clearly related to race of interviewer in past research, it is possible to do this to some extent by examining differences within polls where there were sufficient numbers of both black and white interviewers. Among black interviewers, accent should also be considered. For the immediate future, more systematic experimental variation can be planned at both the national and state levels.

Given the range and variety of explanations now being offered, an ad hoc AAPOR Committee might well be set up to consider the various possibilities and to prepare a public report. The 1949 SSRC Committee on the 1948 election provides an important model from the past, and in this case a new committee could also work with polling organizations to develop research that makes use of polls still to come in later Primaries. hs

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2008 09:24:04 -0600  
Reply-To: "Andolina, Molly" <MANDOLIN@DEPAUL.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Andolina, Molly" <MANDOLIN@DEPAUL.EDU>  
Subject: NH Primary Electorate  
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

The exit polls show women making up 57% of the Democratic primary electorate.

Does anyone know if this common? Did the pre-election polls assume such large gender differences?

Molly W. Andolina, Ph.D.  
Assistant Professor  
Political Science Department  
DePaul University  
990 W. Fullerton Avenue, Suite 2219  
Chicago, IL 60614  
773-325-4709  
773-325-7337 (fax)  
mandolin@depaul.edu

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2008 08:27:15 -0700  
Reply-To: "Margaret R. Roller" <rmr@ROLLERRESEARCH.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Margaret R. Roller" <rmr@ROLLERRESEARCH.COM>  
Subject: Re: AA MODERATOR IN WASH, DC  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

I can highly recommend Naomi Henderson --  
<http://www.rivainc.com/main/history.htm>

--  
Margaret R. Roller  
Roller Marketing Research  
[rmr@rollerresearch.com](mailto:rmr@rollerresearch.com)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2008 10:36:08 -0500

Reply-To: "Murray, Patrick" <pdmurray@MONMOUTH.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Murray, Patrick" <pdmurray@MONMOUTH.EDU>  
Subject: Re: One possible contributing factor  
Comments: To: Joel Bloom <joeldbloom@GMAIL.COM>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Joel - According to the AP count, there were fewer than 5,000 write-ins =  
total on the Republican side. Even if all were for Obama, it's not =  
enough to make a difference in the pre polls.=20  
Patrick

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

From: AAPORNET on behalf of Joel Bloom  
Sent: Wed 1/9/2008 9:48 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: One possible contributing factor  
=20

One factor that might have boosted Obama's numbers in the pre-primary =  
polls  
is New Hampshire's tradition of one party's hot candidate getting  
substantial numbers of write-in votes in the other party's primary. I =  
don't  
have exact numbers here, but I recall Gary Hart getting around 5% of the  
Republican primary vote in 1984 as a write-in, in addition to his votes =  
in  
the Democratic primary. The write-in votes are not tabulated until =  
later, so  
they don't show up in the media tallies, but they are there later when =  
the  
official counts roll in. And unlike many states, New Hampshire does  
eventually give final counts of all write-ins by name. (I should add =  
that  
this wouldn't do Obama, or anyone else, any practical good -- they won't =  
get  
enough votes in the other party's primary to get any delegates even if =  
they  
wanted them, and they aren't added to their tallies in their own party.)

Anyway, my thought is that if some small but important segment of =  
registered  
Republicans planned on writing in Obama in the Republican primary =  
(remember,  
independents, or whatever they call them in NH, can vote in either =  
primary,  
but registered party members can only vote in their own party's =  
primary), it  
is quite possible, even likely, that pollsters might have mistakenly  
included them in their Democratic primary sample. I'm going to go out on =  
a  
bit of limb and guess that at least 10,000 Republicans wrote in Obama in =

the  
Republican primary and that much smaller numbers (but not zero) wrote in  
Clinton. If that's the case, that would have potentially been enough to =  
at  
least tip polls to showing a slight Obama lead, which gets us part-way  
there, but obviously not all the way to the 6-8 point lead shown in the  
Pollster.com and other estimates.

If that's the case (and we might not know for a couple weeks) then we =  
would  
need to think about modifying our screening procedures to take this into  
account. This would theoretically be the case for any state that allows  
write-ins, but for some reason it is either especially pronounced in NH, =  
or  
perhaps other states just don't ever report the write-ins by name, just =  
by  
number, or not even that.

Anyway, that's just one more possible contributing factor I wanted to =  
get  
out there for consideration. Best,

-- Joel

--=20

Joel David Bloom, Ph.D.  
The University at Albany, SUNY

Research Assistant Professor, Dept. of Political Science  
Associate Director, Office of Institutional Research  
Phone: (518) 437-4791  
Cell: 541-579-6610  
E-mail: [jbloom@albany.edu](mailto:jbloom@albany.edu)  
Web: <http://www.albany.edu/ir/>

On Jan 9, 2008 9:22 AM, Paul J Lavrakas PhD <[pjlavrak@optonline.net](mailto:pjlavrak@optonline.net)> =  
wrote:

> We all miss Warren's wisdom, but let's remember that the accuracy of =  
the  
> pre-election polls is the issue, not the exit polling data. It's been  
> long  
> known that pre-primary election polls are notoriously difficult to get  
> right  
> for many reasons beyond the researchers' control. That's not to say =  
there  
> were not improvements that the pre-primary poll methods that =  
could/should  
> have made and I trust (and hope) that the errors in NH will help the  
> pollsters improve their future 2008 pre-primary polling.  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Santos, Rob

> Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2008 9:13 AM  
> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
> Subject: Re: I was going to post a witty multiple choice question . . =  
..  
>  
> I miss Warren...  
>  
> Rob Santos  
> The Urban Institute  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta  
> Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2008 9:04 AM  
> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
> Subject: I was going to post a witty multiple choice question . . . .  
>  
> but this covers the basics.  
>  
>  
> New Hampshire's Polling Fiasco  
> Gary Langer  
> ABC News  
>  
> There will be a serious, critical look at the final pre-election polls =  
in  
> the Democratic presidential primary in New Hampshire; that is =  
essential.  
> It  
> is simply unprecedented for so many polls to have been so wrong. We =  
need  
> to  
> know why.  
>  
> But we need to know it through careful, empirically based analysis.  
> There will be a lot of claims about what happened - about respondents =  
who  
> reputedly lied, about alleged difficulties polling in biracial =  
contests.  
> That may be so. It also may be a smokescreen - a convenient foil for  
> pollsters who'd rather fault their respondents than own up to other  
> possibilities - such as their own failings in sampling and likely =  
voter  
> modeling.  
>  
> SNIP  
>  
> <http://blogs.abcnews.com/thenumbers/2008/01/new-hampshires.html>  
> or  
> <http://tinyurl.com/2haxoe>  
>  
>  
> --  
> Leo G. Simonetta  
> Director of Research

> Art & Science Group, LLC  
> 6115 Falls Road, Suite 101  
> Baltimore MD 21209

>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
> [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
> [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
> [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: =  
[aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2008 10:22:18 -0600  
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)>  
Subject: Re: New Hampshire Democratic Polls--dissecting what happened  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[17ee023d0801090639hcca55ewfb899a908cf175d7@mail.gmail.com](mailto:17ee023d0801090639hcca55ewfb899a908cf175d7@mail.gmail.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Two recent examples were in 2006.

Haorld Ford lost the Tennessee senate race and Deval Patrick won the  
Massachusetts race for governor.

Quick check of [at pollingreport.com](http://pollingreport.com) shows no misses by media pollsters.

Nick

Mike O'Neil wrote:

>It has been suggested that perhaps the NH Democratic polling overestimated  
>the vote for a black candidate such as we have seen often in the past  
>(Harvey Gant, Doug Wilder, etc.)  
>  
>Gary Langer's post has suggested that there are numerous more recent  
>examples (though he did not name them) where this effect was not evident.  
>  
>I would reserve judgment.  
>  
>There is an alternative theory that  
>  
>All the last- minute press that the Clinton campaign was imploding (firing  
>staff, might pull out of all states pre-Super Tuesday) triggered the  
>well-known New Hampshire tendency to vote for the candidate that will keep  
>the election in play  
>---but this was picked up in NONE of the pre-election polls, even those done  
>within a day of the election.  
>  
>I would suggest looking at one thing: the exit polls showed a female  
>preference for Clinton that was not evident in Iowa. I would like to know  
>if the pre-election polls in NH showed that same difference. If they did,  
>it would support the "black-vote-overestimate" theory. If they did not, it  
>would seem to indicate that what happened was a last-minute rallying of  
>women voters to a woman who was under savage attack (NY Murdoch paper: "She  
>is Yesterday", etc.). A race-bias effect in vote report would be unlikely  
>to be gender-specific, so if Clinton's increase was primarily among women,  
>it would undermine the race-bias theory.  
>  
>Could someone with access to any of these data comment?  
>  
>Mike O'Neil  
>www.oneilresearch.com  
>  
>Could anyone share the vote by gender in any of the final NH pre-election  
>polls?  
>  
>  
>

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2008 10:07:55 -0700  
Reply-To: Ron Riley <[ron@CHANNELM2.COM](mailto:ron@CHANNELM2.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Ron Riley <[ron@CHANNELM2.COM](mailto:ron@CHANNELM2.COM)>  
Subject: Re: New Hampshire Democratic Polls--dissecting what happened  
Comments: To: Mike O'Neil <[mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU](mailto:mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[17ee023d0801090639hcca55ewfb899a908cf175d7@mail.gmail.com](mailto:17ee023d0801090639hcca55ewfb899a908cf175d7@mail.gmail.com)>



MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Exactly so: No one in the herd mentality media seems aware of it, but there's an old tradition in New Hampshire: "Vote so as to keep the dance going." That's what happened yesterday - at least in large enough numbers to give her a 2% plurality. In that last 24-48 hours, 10-15k voters realized that Clinton was going down the tubes. And a sufficiently large chunk of the vote is sufficiently soft ("Well, I do like BOTH of them, so."), that rationalizing the idea of throwing her a lifeline seems like a brilliant idea: "Why not? Keep the dance going."

So there's probably not a methodological answer to explain the variance between surveys and actual results. All research is done in a social context -- yes?

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Mike O'Neil  
Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2008 7:40 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: New Hampshire Democratic Polls--dissecting what happened

It has been suggested that perhaps the NH Democratic polling overestimated the vote for a black candidate such as we have seen often in the past (Harvey Gant, Doug Wilder, etc.)

Gary Langer's post has suggested that there are numerous more recent examples (though he did not name them) where this effect was not evident.

I would reserve judgment.

There is an alternative theory that

All the last-minute press that the Clinton campaign was imploding (firing staff, might pull out of all states pre-Super Tuesday) triggered the well-known New Hampshire tendency to vote for the candidate that will keep the election in play  
---but this was picked up in NONE of the pre-election polls, even those done within a day of the election.

I would suggest looking at one thing: the exit polls showed a female preference for Clinton that was not evident in Iowa. I would like to know if the pre-election polls in NH showed that same difference. If they did, it would support the "black-vote-overestimate" theory. If they did not, it would seem to indicate that what happened was a last-minute rallying of women voters to a woman who was under savage attack (NY Murdoch paper: "She is Yesterday", etc.). A race-bias effect in vote report would be unlikely to be gender-specific, so if Clinton's increase was primarily among women, it would undermine the race-bias theory.

Could someone with access to any of these data comment?

Mike O'Neil  
www.oneilresearch.com

Could anyone share the vote by gender in any of the final NH pre-election polls?

--

Mike O'Neil

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2008 10:10:55 -0700  
Reply-To: Mike O'Neil <[mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU](mailto:mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mike O'Neil <[mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU](mailto:mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: New Hampshire Democratic Polls--dissecting what happened  
Comments: To: Nick Panagakis <[mail@marketsharescorp.com](mailto:mail@marketsharescorp.com)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[4784F4BA.6030600@marketsharescorp.com](mailto:4784F4BA.6030600@marketsharescorp.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Content-Disposition: inline

I checked [realclearpolitics.com](http://realclearpolitics.com) and found to immediate pre-primary polls and found only two with a gender breakdown.

One showed a pre-primary female preference for Hillary; the other did not.

Unfortunately, none of the others reported gender breakdowns.

Remember, a female-only movement towards Hillary would tend to disprove the racial reporting theory; an across-the-board movement would be indeterminate.

I would tentatively reject the theory (based on less evidence than I would like) based on

1. this mixed evidence
2. the fact that this has NOT been a racially-charged race (race seemed to have loomed larger in races where this effect was evident. And, has been pointed out, those races tend to be back a bit further in time. Maybe that is my hopeful side, but I hope/think we are actually getting race behind us).

Mike O'Neil

On Jan 9, 2008 9:22 AM, Nick Panagakis <mail@marketsharescorp.com> wrote:

> Two recent examples were in 2006.

>

> Haorld Ford lost the Tennessee senate race and Deval Patrick won the

> Massachusetts race for governor.

>

> Quick check of at pollingreport.com shows no misses by media pollsters.

>

> Nick

>

> Mike ONeil wrote:

>

>>It has been suggested that perhaps the NH Democratic polling

> overestimated

>>the vote for a black candidate such as we have seen often in the past

>>(Harvey Gant, Doug Wilder, etc.)

>>

>>Gary Langer's post has suggested that there are numerous more recent

>>examples (though he did not name them) where this effect was not evident.

>>

>>I would reserve judgment.

>>

>>There is an alternative theory that

>>

>>All the last- minute press that the Clinton campaign was imploding

> (firing

>>staff, might pull out of all states pre-Super Tuesday) triggerred the

>>well-known New Hampshire tendency to vote for the candidate that will

> keep

>>the election in play

>>---but this was picked up in NONE of the pre-election polls, even those

> done

>>within a day of the election.

>>

>>I would suggest looling at one thing: the exit polls showed a female

>>preference for Clinton that was not evident in Iowa. I would like to

> know

>>if the pre-election polls in NH showed that same difference. If they

> did,

>>it would support the "black-vote-overestimate" theory. If they did not,

> it

>>would seem to indicate that what happened was a last-minute rallying of

>>women voters to a woman who was under savage attack (NY Murdoch paper:

> "She

>>is Yesterday", etc.). A race-bias effect in vote report would be

> unlikely

>>to be gender-specific, so if Clinton's increase was primarily among

> women,

>>it would undermine the race-bias theory.

>>

>>Could someone with access to any of these data comment?

>>

>>Mike O'Neil  
>>www.oneilresearch.com  
>>  
>>Could anyone share the vote by gender in any of the final NH pre-election  
>>polls?  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
> [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>

--

Mike O'Neil

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2008 09:24:20 -0800  
Reply-To: "Pollack, Lance" <[Lance.Pollack@UCSF.EDU](mailto:Lance.Pollack@UCSF.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Pollack, Lance" <[Lance.Pollack@UCSF.EDU](mailto:Lance.Pollack@UCSF.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: New Hampshire Democratic Polls--dissecting what happened  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: A<[17ee023d0801090639hcca55eewfb899a908cf175d7@mail.gmail.com](mailto:A17ee023d0801090639hcca55eewfb899a908cf175d7@mail.gmail.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Iowa was a caucus that involved a tiny proportion of the Iowa electorate. You cannot even generalize to Iowa from caucus goers. New Hampshire is a primary where 40-something percent of the electorate is independent, so they don't even determine which primary they will vote in until they get to the polling place. I would not go comparing New Hampshire and Iowa on ANYTHING! It's a complete apples-and-oranges difference.

Second, given the large number of independents in New Hampshire and the fact they can vote in either primary, how can you possibly model potential voters for either primary with any degree of accuracy? The independents who said they intended to vote probably did, but did they in fact vote in the same primary they told the pre-election poll they would vote in, or did they switch to the other primary? If this were a small piece of the electorate then it probably would not affect the polls much, but over 40%!!!

Finally, the conventional wisdom had been that with the compressed primary schedule that we would not see the swings in momentum seen with previous elections because there would not be enough time for waxing and waning. I think the evidence so far is that consideration was dead wrong. The waxing and waning is still occurring, but on a more compressed schedule in parallel with the election schedule.

Lance M. Pollack, PhD  
University of California, San Francisco  
Center for AIDS Prevention Studies (CAPS)  
50 Beale Street, Suite 1300  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
tel: 415-597-9302  
fax: 415-597-9213  
email: Lance.Pollack@ucsf.edu

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Mike O'Neil  
Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2008 6:40 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: New Hampshire Democratic Polls--dissecting what happened

It has been suggested that perhaps the NH Democratic polling overestimated the vote for a black candidate such as we have seen often in the past (Harvey Gant, Doug Wilder, etc.)

Gary Langer's post has suggested that there are numerous more recent examples (though he did not name them) where this effect was not evident.

I would reserve judgment.

There is an alternative theory that

All the last-minute press that the Clinton campaign was imploding (firing staff, might pull out of all states pre-Super Tuesday) triggered the well-known New Hampshire tendency to vote for the candidate that will keep the election in play ---but this was picked up in NONE of the pre-election polls, even those done within a day of the election.

I would suggest looking at one thing: the exit polls showed a female preference for Clinton that was not evident in Iowa. I would like to know if the pre-election polls in NH showed that same difference. If they did, it would support the "black-vote-overestimate" theory. If they did not, it would seem to indicate that what happened was a last-minute rallying of

women voters to a woman who was under savage attack (NY Murdoch paper: "She is Yesterday", etc.). A race-bias effect in vote report would be unlikely to be gender-specific, so if Clinton's increase was primarily among women, it would undermine the race-bias theory.

Could someone with access to any of these data comment?

Mike O'Neil  
www.oneilresearch.com

Could anyone share the vote by gender in any of the final NH pre-election polls?

--

Mike O'Neil

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
[aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2008 12:34:23 -0500  
Reply-To: David Wilson <[dcwilson@UDEL.EDU](mailto:dcwilson@UDEL.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: David Wilson <[dcwilson@UDEL.EDU](mailto:dcwilson@UDEL.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: New Hampshire Democratic Polls--dissecting what happened  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[20080109170819.8E17928E060C@bcnet2.asu.edu](mailto:20080109170819.8E17928E060C@bcnet2.asu.edu)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Here are some facts and questions to consider:

1. Based on the WMUR polls in NH, for the most part Clinton was leading or a virtual tie with Obama in NH prior to IOWA. We saw the Obama double digit (10%) lead in the Jan. 5-6 poll.
2. The WMUR polls in NH report a MOE of 5% for Dems. This was for the entire study, not just the valid responses.
3. Throughout the fall and winter, the undecideds ("no opinion" + "someone else") were never less than 6%.

4. Obama had 39% of the Dem. Vote in the Jan. 5-6 poll (add some error, 34% - 44%). So, his estimates make "sense" (which is not a fact).

5. Clinton had 29% of the Dem. Vote in the Jan. 5-6 poll (add some error, 24% - 34%). So, her estimates don't make sense.

6. Assuming they voted, the "undecided" Democrats (some 6%-10%) (and Independents) moved their support to candidates. That is, they are now in the numerator of the % for candidates.

7. Question: Were the pre-election poll undecided Democrats mainly women? If so, could they produce the push that explains the results for Clinton?

8. The conspiracy about NH traditionally "keeping the party going.": I imagine this would take a large movement among traditionalists in NH. Are these folks also women?

David

David C. Wilson  
Assistant Professor  
Department of Political Science &  
International Relations  
University of Delaware  
dcwilson@udel.edu

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Ron Riley  
Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2008 12:08 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: New Hampshire Democratic Polls--dissecting what happened

Exactly so: No one in the herd mentality media seems aware of it, but there's an old tradition in New Hampster: "Vote so as to keep the dance going." That's what happened yesterday - at least in large enough numbers to give her a 2% plurality. In that last 24-48 hours, 10-15k voters realized that Clinton was going down the tubes. And a sufficiently large chunk of the vote is sufficiently soft ("Well, I do like BOTH of them, so."), that rationalizing the idea of throwing her a lifeline seems like a brilliant idea: "Why not? Keep the dance going."

So there's probably not a methodological answer to explain the variance between surveys and actual results. All research is done in a social context -- yes?

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Mike ONeil  
Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2008 7:40 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: New Hampshire Democratic Polls--dissecting what happened

It has been suggested that perhaps the NH Democratic polling overestimated the vote for a black candidate such as we have seen often in the past (Harvey Gant, Doug Wilder, etc.)

Gary Langer's post has suggested that there are numerous more recent examples (though he did not name them) where this effect was not evident.

I would reserve judgment.

There is an alternative theory that

All the last-minute press that the Clinton campaign was imploding (firing staff, might pull out of all states pre-Super Tuesday) triggered the well-known New Hampshire tendency to vote for the candidate that will keep the election in play ---but this was picked up in NONE of the pre-election polls, even those done within a day of the election.

I would suggest looking at one thing: the exit polls showed a female preference for Clinton that was not evident in Iowa. I would like to know if the pre-election polls in NH showed that same difference. If they did, it would support the "black-vote-overestimate" theory. If they did not, it would seem to indicate that what happened was a last-minute rallying of women voters to a woman who was under savage attack (NY Murdoch paper: "She is Yesterday", etc.). A race-bias effect in vote report would be unlikely to be gender-specific, so if Clinton's increase was primarily among women, it would undermine the race-bias theory.

Could someone with access to any of these data comment?

Mike O'Neil  
www.oneilresearch.com

Could anyone share the vote by gender in any of the final NH pre-election polls?

--

Mike O'Neil

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.



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

---

Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2008 12:51:13 -0500  
Reply-To: David Wilson <dcwilson@UDEL.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: David Wilson <dcwilson@UDEL.EDU>  
Subject: Re: New Hampshire Democratic Polls--dissecting what happened  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
In-Reply-To: <17ee023d0801090910h3b587ce5xbb4ac1bb39f32a00@mail.gmail.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Also, let's not be quick to discount the "isms" (race and sex, etc.). Voters and states are still characterized by their racial identification and composition respectively, and at least 3 candidates are consistently framed as "seeking to become the first" [Woman, African American, and Hispanic] presidents.

Many of us understand how accessible information becomes when primed (in many ways), and race is one of the more easily accessible (both automatic and controlled) constructs. Race may not be "in front" of us, but it's certainly not "behind" us. It's probably right "next to" us. Racial cues need not be negative or overt to have an effect, they only need to activate ideas consistent with stereotypes (e.g., women are more emotional) or beliefs (e.g., saying what other blacks/women/Hispanics want to hear).

David

David C. Wilson  
Assistant Professor  
Department of Political Science &  
International Relations  
University of Delaware  
dcwilson@udel.edu

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Mike O'Neil  
Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2008 12:11 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: New Hampshire Democratic Polls--dissecting what happened

I checked realclearpolitics.com and found to immediate pre-primary polls and found only two with a gender breakdown.

One showed a pre-primary female preference for Hillary; the other did not.

Unfortunately, none of the others reported gender breakdowns.

Remember, a female-only movement towards Hillary would tend to disprove the racial reporting theory; an across-the-board movement would be indeterminate.

I would tentatively reject the theory (based on less evidence than I would like) based on

1. this mixed evidence
2. the fact that this has NOT been a racially-charged race (race seemed to have loomed larger in races where this effect was evident. And, has been pointed out, those races tend to be back a bit further in time. Maybe that is my hopeful side, but I hope/think we are actually getting race behind us).

Mike O'Neil

On Jan 9, 2008 9:22 AM, Nick Panagakis <mail@marketsharescorp.com> wrote:

- > Two recent examples were in 2006.
- >
- > Harold Ford lost the Tennessee senate race and Deval Patrick won the
- > Massachusetts race for governor.
- >
- > Quick check of at [pollingreport.com](http://pollingreport.com) shows no misses by media pollsters.
- >
- > Nick
- >
- > Mike O'Neil wrote:
- >
- >> It has been suggested that perhaps the NH Democratic polling
- > overestimated
- >> the vote for a black candidate such as we have seen often in the past
- >> (Harvey Gant, Doug Wilder, etc.)
- >>
- >> Gary Langer's post has suggested that there are numerous more recent
- >> examples (though he did not name them) where this effect was not evident.
- >>
- >> I would reserve judgment.
- >>
- >> There is an alternative theory that
- >>
- >> All the last-minute press that the Clinton campaign was imploding
- > (firing
- >> staff, might pull out of all states pre-Super Tuesday) triggered the
- >> well-known New Hampshire tendency to vote for the candidate that will
- > keep
- >> the election in play
- >> ---but this was picked up in NONE of the pre-election polls, even those
- > done
- >> within a day of the election.
- >>
- >> I would suggest looking at one thing: the exit polls showed a female
- >> preference for Clinton that was not evident in Iowa. I would like to
- > know

>>if the pre-election polls in NH showed that same difference. If they  
> did,  
>>it would support the "black-vote-overestimate" theory. If they did not,  
> it  
>>would seem to indicate that what happened was a last-minute rallying of  
>>women voters to a woman who was under savage attack (NY Murdoch paper:  
> "She  
>>is Yesterday", etc.). A race-bias effect in vote report would be  
> unlikely  
>>to be gender-specific, so if Clinton's increase was primarily among  
> women,  
>>it would undermine the race-bias theory.

>>  
>>Could someone with access to any of these data comment?

>>  
>>Mike O'Neil  
>>www.oneilresearch.com

>>  
>>Could anyone share the vote by gender in any of the final NH pre-election  
>>polls?

>>  
>>  
>>  
>

> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
> [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>

--  
  
Mike O'Neil

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2008 13:03:33 -0500  
Reply-To: [gladwin@fiu.edu](mailto:gladwin@fiu.edu)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Hugh Gladwin <[gladwin@FIU.EDU](mailto:gladwin@FIU.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: New Hampshire Democratic Polls--dissecting what happened  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Sent this earlier but it seems to have bounced -- sorry if you get it twice

Yes we need to look at this carefully...but also need to keep in mind only the last few days of polls were off, in Obama's last minute boomlet [ <http://www.pollster.com/08-NH-Dem-Pres-Primary.php> ] -- a boomlet which in part could be attributed to almost a reverse Bradley effect, white women exhilarated among other things by the possibility that America could elect a Black president. Hillary's teary moment may have had some effect jolting them back to what they had been saying to pollsters all along, but the main effect I think was in the booth they got back to what 80% of the Facebook people said was most important and yet was ignored in the ABC debate questions -- it's the economy, stupid. And in a state like NH a ground machine like Hillary's really makes a difference.

Hugh Gladwin

Florida International University

---- Original message ----

>Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2008 09:24:20 -0800

>From: "Pollack, Lance" <Lance.Pollack@UCSF.EDU>

>Subject: Re: New Hampshire Democratic Polls--dissecting what happened

>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

>

>Iowa was a caucus that involved a tiny proportion of the Iowa  
>electorate. You cannot even generalize to Iowa from caucus goers. New  
>Hampshire is a primary where 40-something percent of the electorate is  
>independent, so they don't even determine which primary they will vote  
>in until they get to the polling place. I would not go comparing New  
>Hampshire and Iowa on ANYTHING! It's a complete apples-and-oranges  
>difference.

>

>Second, given the large number of independents in New Hampshire and the  
>fact they can vote in either primary, how can you possibly model  
>potential voters for either primary with any degree of accuracy? The  
>independents who said they intended to vote probably did, but did they  
>in fact vote in the same primary they told the pre-election poll they  
>would vote in, or did they switch to the other primary? If this were a  
>small piece of the electorate then it probably would not affect the  
>polls much, but over 40%!!!

>

>Finally, the conventional wisdom had been that with the compressed  
>primary schedule that we would not see the swings in momentum seen with  
>previous elections because there would not be enough time for waxing and  
>waning. I think the evidence so far is that consideration was dead  
>wrong. The waxing and waning is still occurring, but on a more  
>compressed schedule in parallel with the election schedule.

>

>Lance M. Pollack, PhD

>University of California, San Francisco

>Center for AIDS Prevention Studies (CAPS)

>50 Beale Street, Suite 1300

>San Francisco, CA 94105

>tel: 415-597-9302  
>fax: 415-597-9213  
>email: Lance.Pollack@ucsf.edu

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

>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Mike O'Neil  
>Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2008 6:40 AM  
>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
>Subject: New Hampshire Democratic Polls--dissecting what happened

>It has been suggested that perhaps the NH Democratic polling  
>overestimated  
>the vote for a black candidate such as we have seen often in the past  
>(Harvey Gant, Doug Wilder, etc.)

>Gary Langer's post has suggested that there are numerous more recent  
>examples (though he did not name them) where this effect was not  
>evident.

>I would reserve judgment.

>There is an alternative theory that

>All the last-minute press that the Clinton campaign was imploding  
>(firing  
>staff, might pull out of all states pre-Super Tuesday) triggered the  
>well-known New Hampshire tendency to vote for the candidate that will  
>keep  
>the election in play  
>---but this was picked up in NONE of the pre-election polls, even those  
>done  
>within a day of the election.

>I would suggest looking at one thing: the exit polls showed a female  
>preference for Clinton that was not evident in Iowa. I would like to  
>know  
>if the pre-election polls in NH showed that same difference. If they  
>did,  
>it would support the "black-vote-overestimate" theory. If they did not,  
>it  
>would seem to indicate that what happened was a last-minute rallying of  
>women voters to a woman who was under savage attack (NY Murdoch paper:  
>"She  
>is Yesterday", etc.). A race-bias effect in vote report would be  
>unlikely  
>to be gender-specific, so if Clinton's increase was primarily among  
>women,  
>it would undermine the race-bias theory.

>Could someone with access to any of these data comment?

>Mike O'Neil

>www.oneilresearch.com

>

>Could anyone share the vote by gender in any of the final NH  
>pre-election  
>polls?  
>  
>--  
>  
>Mike O'Neil  
>

>-----  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
>aapornet-request@asu.edu  
>

>-----  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu  
=====

Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2008 13:17:23 -0500  
Reply-To: martin plissner <plissner@VERIZON.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: martin plissner <plissner@VERIZON.NET>  
Subject: FW: New Hampshire Democratic Polls--dissecting what happened  
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

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

From: martin plissner [mailto:plissner@verizon.net]  
Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2008 1:14 PM  
To: 'AAPOR-info@goamp.com'  
Subject: FW: New Hampshire Democratic Polls--dissecting what happened

Any comparison to Iowa becomes even sillier when you consider that the Iowa polls of "likely Democratic caucus-goers" don't even claim to predict the only thing that is ever tabulated and reported as "results" from the caucuses: not the preferences of the participants but the outcome of a quirky game of musical chairs based on thresholds, second and third as well as first choices and subsequently weighted to the most recent vote for governor in both the precinct, county and Congressional District (among some other things.) Only God, if he hasn't better things to do, knows how close to perfection Jo-Ann's survey on the Democratic side may have been -- though it's a fair guess by a mortal that it came closer than the New Hampshire surveys.

Marty Plissner

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Pollack, Lance

Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2008 12:24 PM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: Re: New Hampshire Democratic Polls--dissecting what happened

Iowa was a caucus that involved a tiny proportion of the Iowa electorate. You cannot even generalize to Iowa from caucus goers. New Hampshire is a primary where 40-something percent of the electorate is independent, so they don't even determine which primary they will vote in until they get to the polling place. I would not go comparing New Hampshire and Iowa on ANYTHING! It's a complete apples-and-oranges difference.

Second, given the large number of independents in New Hampshire and the fact they can vote in either primary, how can you possibly model potential voters for either primary with any degree of accuracy? The independents who said they intended to vote probably did, but did they in fact vote in the same primary they told the pre-election poll they would vote in, or did they switch to the other primary? If this were a small piece of the electorate then it probably would not affect the polls much, but over 40%!!!

Finally, the conventional wisdom had been that with the compressed primary schedule that we would not see the swings in momentum seen with previous elections because there would not be enough time for waxing and waning. I think the evidence so far is that consideration was dead wrong. The waxing and waning is still occurring, but on a more compressed schedule in parallel with the election schedule.

Lance M. Pollack, PhD  
University of California, San Francisco  
Center for AIDS Prevention Studies (CAPS)  
50 Beale Street, Suite 1300  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
tel: 415-597-9302  
fax: 415-597-9213  
email: Lance.Pollack@ucsf.edu

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Mike O'Neil

Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2008 6:40 AM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: New Hampshire Democratic Polls--dissecting what happened

It has been suggested that perhaps the NH Democratic polling overestimated the vote for a black candidate such as we have seen often in the past (Harvey Gant, Doug Wilder, etc.)

Gary Langer's post has suggested that there are numerous more recent examples (though he did not name them) where this effect was not evident.

I would reserve judgment.

There is an alternative theory that

All the last-minute press that the Clinton campaign was imploding (firing staff, might pull out of all states pre-Super Tuesday) triggered the well-known New Hampshire tendency to vote for the candidate that will keep the election in play ---but this was picked up in NONE of the pre-election polls, even those done within a day of the election.

I would suggest looking at one thing: the exit polls showed a female preference for Clinton that was not evident in Iowa. I would like to know if the pre-election polls in NH showed that same difference. If they did, it would support the "black-vote-overestimate" theory. If they did not, it would seem to indicate that what happened was a last-minute rallying of women voters to a woman who was under savage attack (NY Murdoch paper: "She is Yesterday", etc.). A race-bias effect in vote report would be unlikely to be gender-specific, so if Clinton's increase was primarily among women, it would undermine the race-bias theory.

Could someone with access to any of these data comment?

Mike O'Neil  
www.oneilresearch.com

Could anyone share the vote by gender in any of the final NH pre-election polls?

--

Mike O'Neil

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
[aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)



-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2008 13:53:01 -0500  
Reply-To: [scheuren@AOL.COM](mailto:scheuren@AOL.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Fritz Scheuren <[scheuren@AOL.COM](mailto:scheuren@AOL.COM)>  
Subject: Re: I was going to post a witty multiple choice question . . . .  
Comments: To: [RSantos@UI.URBAN.ORG](mailto:RSantos@UI.URBAN.ORG), [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[0F96478603980B46AAAFBA77069582ED03F66BE0@UIEXCH.urban.org](mailto:0F96478603980B46AAAFBA77069582ED03F66BE0@UIEXCH.urban.org)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Dear Rob:

We all miss Warren. And 2008 is just beginning.

Fritz

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

From: Santos, Rob <[RSantos@UI.URBAN.ORG](mailto:RSantos@UI.URBAN.ORG)>  
To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Sent: Wed, 9 Jan 2008 9:13 am  
Subject: Re: I was going to post a witty multiple choice question . . . .

I miss Warren...

Rob Santos  
The Urban Institute

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta  
Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2008 9:04 AM  
To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Subject: I was going to post a witty multiple choice question . . . .

but this covers the basics.

New Hampshire's Polling Fiasco  
Gary Langer  
ABC News

There will be a serious, critical look at the final pre-election polls in the Democratic presidential primary in New Hampshire; that is essential. It is simply unprecedented for so many polls to have been so wrong. We need to know why.

But we need to know it through careful, empirically based analysis. There will be a lot of claims about what happened - about respondents who reputedly lied, about alleged difficulties polling in biracial contests. That may be so. It also may be a smokescreen - a convenient foil for pollsters who'd rather fault their respondents than own up to other possibilities - such as their own failings in sampling and likely voter modeling.

SNIP

<http://blogs.abcnews.com/thenumbers/2008/01/new-hampshires.html>  
or  
<http://tinyurl.com/2haxoe>

--

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

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
[aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

More new features than ever. Check out the new AOL Mail ! -  
<http://webmail.aol.com>

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2008 13:30:48 -0600  
Reply-To: Mary Currin-Percival <[mcurrinp@D.UMN.EDU](mailto:mcurrinp@D.UMN.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mary Currin-Percival <[mcurrinp@D.UMN.EDU](mailto:mcurrinp@D.UMN.EDU)>  
Subject: the polls...  
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

Hi everyone,

I know that some of this has already been discussed, but I wanted to take a look at the numbers too. I watched the pollsters take some serious heat last night, but I think there is so much more to the story that didn't get anywhere near the coverage that the "horse race" did. I looked at the 21 polls listed on pollster.com that were fielded on January 4th or later and I saw some stuff that vindicates the pollsters too. I don't have information on all of the polls-some info is a little harder to obtain, especially whether questions on strength of support were asked. But here is a summary of what I did find:

=20  
1. Suffolk (1/6-1/7) Clinton 34% Obama 39% 8% undecided=20

In a competitive race, 8% undecided is a big deal (and margin of error was +/- 4.38). I don't think this one was conclusive.

=20  
2. ARG (1/6-1/7) I don't have much on this one other than it looks like Clinton's numbers were increasing over the last couple of days.

=20  
3. Reuters/CSPAN/Zogby I have nothing on these two.

4. Rasmussen=20

=20  
5. CNN/WMUR/UNH (1/5-1/6) Clinton 30% Obama 39% =20

This one has 6% undecided or "no opinion." But the really interesting story here is strength of support. About 53% of likely voters said they definitely decided, 25% were leaning toward a candidate, and 20% were still trying to decide. If I'm looking at this =

right, 45% of likely voters in the Dem primary were open to persuasion = here (putting aside the "no opinion" voters too).

=20

=20

6. CBS (1/5-1/6) Clinton 28% Obama 35% 9% undecided

28% of the likely voters said they might change their mind. = 36% of Clinton supporters and 26% of Obama voters said that they liked = their candidate "a great deal better" than the other Dem candidates. = 22% of Obama supporters and 11% of Clinton supporters said that they = liked their candidate "only a little better" than the other Dems. "The = race is still fluid" is one of the bulleted points on the front page of = the CBS Poll report. =20

=20

7. Rasmussen-no info

=20

8. Marist (1/5-1/6) Clinton 28% Obama 36% = 4% undecided

88% of Clinton supporters and 77% of Obama supporters say = they strongly support their candidate. 8% of Clinton supporters and 16% = of Obama supporters say they somewhat support their candidate. 4% of = Clinton supporters and 7% of Obama voters say that they might vote = differently. =20

=20

9. ARG some increase in Clinton's support

=20

10. Suffolk (1/5-1/6) within margin of error

=20

11. CNN/WMUR/UNH (1/5-1/6) Clinton 29% Obama 39% = 5% undecided

55% definitely decided; 25% leaning toward their candidate; = 20% still trying to decide.

=20

12. Fox (1/4-1/6) Clinton 32% Obama 28% 12% undecided

Results look to be within the margin of error, but the 12% = undecided is a big deal. In addition, about 20% of Obama and Clinton =

supporters said they might change their mind.

=20

=20

Of the other nine polls since Iowa on pollster.com, four are within the =  
margin or error.=20

=20

=20

I think that overall our conclusion should be that many of the polls =  
told us that there were a lot of votes still in play. I think the most =  
important conclusion that we can make is that campaigns matter. =  
Clinton's performance in the last debate could persuade undecided voters =  
and those not strongly attached to Obama and her quite human moment =  
might have swayed latent supporters who had concerns about her ability =  
to be more "real." I think that there is no evidence to support the =  
argument that the pollsters blew this one; I think we need to be sure we =  
look at all of the information in the polls. I also think that the news =  
media need to reexamine the horse race coverage and look deeper into =  
what these polls are saying-the campaigns in New Hampshire mattered and =  
they will continue to matter throughout the primary season.

=20

I look forward to reading more of your comments and analysis of the =  
polls and the election.

Best wishes,=20

Mary Currin-Percival

Dr. Mary Currin-Percival  
Assistant Professor of Political Science  
University of Minnesota, Duluth  
1123 University Drive  
Cina Hall 309  
Duluth, MN 55812  
Office Phone 218-726-8629

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2008 14:55:36 -0500  
Reply-To: Kathleen Tobin-Flusser <Kathleen.Tobin-Flusser@MARIST.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Kathleen Tobin-Flusser <Kathleen.Tobin-Flusser@MARIST.EDU>  
Subject: FW: THE NEW HAMPSHIRE PRE-ELECTION POLLS: FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:  
WEDNESDAY JANUARY 9, 2008

Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=UTF-8

Content-transfer-encoding: base64

DQoNCi0tLS0tT3JpZ2luYWwgTWVzc2FnZS0tLS0tDQpGcm9tOiAiTWfyaXN0UG9sbCIgPE1hcmlz  
dFBvbGxAbWFyaXN0LmVkdT4NCIRvOiAiTWfyaXN0IFBvbGwRw1haWwgMUEiIDxNYXJpc3QgUG9s  
bCBFbWfpcCAxQT4NCINlbnQ6IDEvOS8wOCAXOjU0IFBNDQpTdWJqZWN0OiBUSEUgTkVXIEhBTvBT  
SEISRSBQUkUtRUxFAQ1RJT04gUE9MTFM6IEZPUiBJTU1FREIBVEUgUkVMRUFTRToNCldFRE5FU0RB  
WSBKQU5VQVJZIDksIDIwMDgNCg0KRk9SIEINTUVESUFURSBSRUxvFQVNF0iAgV0VETkVtREFZIEpB  
TIVBUikgOSwgMjAwOA0KVEhFIE5FVyBIQU1QU0hJukUgUFJFLUVMRUNUSU9OIFBPTExTDQoNCkNP  
TIRBQ1Q6DQpEU4gTEVFIE0uIE1JUKlOR09GRg0KRfIUeJBuKJBUkEgTC4gQ0FSVkfMSE8Nck1B  
UkITVCBDT0xMRUdFDQo4NDUuNTc1LjUwNTANCg0KDQoNCINvLCB3aGF0IGV4YWN0bHkgaGFwcGVu  
ZWQgbGFzdCBuaWdodCBpbjBOZXcgSGFtcHNoaXJIPyAgRGlkIEhpbGxhenkNckNsaW50b24gaGF2  
ZSBhIHN0dW5uaW5nIGNvbWVvYWNrIGluIHRoZSBjbG9zaW5nIGhvdXJzIG9mIHRoZSBjYW1wYWln  
biBvcg0Kd2VyZSB0aGUgcG9sbHN0ZXJzIGFuZCBwdW5kaXRzIGFsaWtlIGp1c3QgZGVhZCB3cm9u  
ZyBhbGwgYWxvbmcm/ICBxZWxsLCBmb3INCmFuc3dlcnMsiHdIIGF0IHRoZSBNYXJpc3QgUG9sbCB0  
b29rIGebG9vayBhdCB0aGUgbnVtYmVycy4NCg0KRm9yIHN0YXJ0ZXJzLCB0aGUgY29udGVzdCBv  
biB0aGUgUmVwdWJsaWNhbiBzaWRlIHBSYXJlZCBvdXQgdHJ1ZSB0bW0KZXhwZW50YXRpb25zLiAg  
Qm9sc3RlcmVklGJ5IGluZGVwZW5kZW50IHZvdGVycywgU2VuYXRvciBkb2huIE1jQ2FpbjBiZWf0  
DQpmb3JtZXIgtWfzc2FjaHVzXZR0cyBHb3Zlcm5vciBNaXR0IFJvbW5leS4gIE1jQ2FpbjBoYXMG  
YWx3YXJzIGJlZW4gYSBnb29kDQpmaXQgd2l0aCBOZXcgSGFtcHNoaXJlIFJlcHVibGljYW4gcHJp  
bWFyeSB2b3RlcnMgd2l0aCBoaXMGIlN0cmFpZ2h0IFRhbGsNckV4cHJlc3MuLiAgSGUGd29uIHRo  
ZSBzdGF0ZSBlaWdodCB5ZWfycyBhZ28gYWdhaW5zdCBHZW9yZ2UgQnVzaCBvbmx5IHRvDQpmYWx0  
ZXIgaW4gU291dGggQ2Fyb2xpbmEuDQoNCk1dCwg2hhdCB0YXBwZW5lZCBvbiB0aGUgRGVtb2Ny  
YXRpYyBzaWRlIG9mIHRoZSBsZWRnZXI/ICBfZGl0b3JpYXxseSwgdGhlDQpwb2xscyBtaXNzZWQg  
dGhlIG1hcmsuICBjbiBvdGhlcjB3b3JkcywgdGhleSB0b3V0ZWQgcG9sbCB3YXRjaGVycyBpbjB0  
aGUNCndyb25nIGRpcmVjdGlvb3BzdWdnZXN0aW5nIFNlbnF0b3IgQmFyYWNrIE9iYW1hIHdhecyBw  
b3NpdGlvb3BvIHRvIHd3b3B3Zl0KSW50ZXJlc3RpbmdseSwgd2l0aCBOZXcgZXhjaXB0aW9uecyw  
bW9zdCBwb2xscyB3ZXJlIGFjY3VyYXRlIGluIG11YXN1cm1uZw0KT2JhbWHigJlZIGxldmVsIG9m  
IHN1cHBvcnQgaW4gdGhlIHN0YXRlLiAgVGhllE1hcmlzdCBQb2xslGhhZCB0aW0gcmVjZWl2aW5n  
DQozNiUgb2YgdGhlIHZvdGUgYW5kIGVpZ2h0IG9mIHRoZSBwb2xscyBjb25kdWN0ZWQgb3ZlciB0  
aGUgbGFzdCBkYXJzIG9mIHRoZQ0KY2FtcGFpZ24gaGFkIGhpbSB3aXRoaW4gdGhlIHN0YXRpc3Rp  
Y2FsiHJhbmdlIG9mIGhpcyBmaW5hbCB2b3RlLiAgV2hhdA0KdGhleSB1bmRlcmVzdGltYXRlZCB3  
YXMGdGhlIHN1cHBvcnQgU2VuYXRvciBlaWxsYXJ5IE5aW50b24gd291bGQgZ2Fyb3VydQpmb3Rl  
IE5ldyBIYW1wc2hpcmUgRGVtb2NyYXRpYyBwcm1tYXJ5IHZvdGVycy4NCg0KQWxsIG9mIHRoZSB  
ZW1vY3JhdGllIGNhb3RpbmZGF0ZXMgd2VyZSB3ZWxsIGxpa2VklGluIE5ldyBIYW1wc2hpcmUgW0dh  
bGx1cA0KUG9sbF0uICBEedXJpbmcmgdGhlIGZpbmFslGRheXMGb2YgdGhlIGNhbXBhaWduLCBEZ  
W1vY3JhdGllIHByaW1hcnkgdm90ZXJzDQp3ZXJlIGRlY2lkaW5nIHd0b20gdG8gdm90ZSBmb3JgYW1v  
bmcgY2FuZGllYXRlcyB0aGV5IGxpa2VklHd3dGggbmVhcmx5DQpmb3VyIG91dCBvZiB0ZW4gbWFr  
aW5nIHVwIHRoZWlyIGl3pbmRzIGluIHRoZSBsYXN0IHRocmVlIGRheXMGYWNjb3JkaW5nIHRvDQp0  
aGUgZXhpdCBwb2xscy4gIFRoZXkgd2VyZW7igJl0IHZvdGluZyBhZ2FpbmN0IGFueSBvZiB0aGVt  
Lg0KDQpBcyBwb2xsc3RlcnMsiHdIIIGNhbiByZS1ldmFsdWF0ZSBvdXlgbW9kZWxzIGFuZCBvZWNh  
bGN1bGF0ZSB0aGUgbnVtYmVycy4NCk1dCwg2hhdCB0aGUgd2Vla2VuZCBwb2xscyBmb3VuZCB3  
YXMGYW4gT2JhbWEgbGVhZCBhecyBwcm1tYXJ5IGRheQ0KYXBwcm9hY2hlZC4gIFdoYXQgdGhleSBk  
byBub3QgcmVmbGVjdCBpcyB3aGF0IHdhecyBhcHBhemVudCB0ZXJlIGluIE5ldw0KSGFtcHNoaXJl  
LiAgVGhllIGNvbnRleHQgb2YgdGhlIGNhbXBhaWduIHdhecyBjaGFuZ2luZy4gIFRoZSBsYXN0IGh



---

Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2008 15:58:56 -0500  
Reply-To: Linda Piekarski <linda\_piekarski@SURVEYSAMPLING.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Linda Piekarski <linda\_piekarski@SURVEYSAMPLING.COM>  
Subject: Position Opening for Sr. Methodologist  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Senior Methodologist and Researcher

Join our Winning Team!=20

Survey Sampling International located in Fairfield, CT is a premier global supplier of sampling services and solutions to support the research industry. We serve 45 of the 50 largest market research firms in the world, and another 1,800 clients worldwide, in both consumer and business-to-business environments. We have European offices in Rotterdam, London, Paris, Madrid, and Frankfurt, with several more on the way. We're also in Canada, China, Australia, and Japan. Our workforce consists of more than 300 people representing 19 countries and 25 languages, who are smart, energetic, and passionate about being the best in our industry.

As the leading supplier of samples for survey research, we have experienced consistent and exciting growth and now have an opening in our expanding organization. =20

The Senior Methodologist and Researcher will:

- o Provide knowledge leadership to SSI in methodology and research design and execution.
- o Design and direct research on research studies to support SSI's business goals.
- o Ensure the quality of SSI's databases through the development of quality standards and assist in implementing those standards.=20
- o Provide training for sales, operations and support staff on methodology, research and database issues.
- o Represent SSI at industry associations to learn, present and promote SSI on issues of research quality and methodologies.
- o Provide knowledge leadership within the company, especially in the areas of phone and multi-mode methodologies and contribute to the effective sharing of that knowledge throughout the organization globally.
- o Consult on new product development

The person we are seeking will possess:

- o Significant experience in the research industry. =20
- o Substantial experience in designing, directing and executing research studies, including data analysis using SPSS
- o Familiarity with all modes of sampling, particularly telephone and internet sampling
- o A keen business sense and ability to communicate effectively to



non-academic audiences and present engagingly at conferences.

Our new colleague will have the opportunity to work in a fast paced and global culture, where we welcome feedback and ideas from our colleagues.

We offer a competitive compensation package including excellent benefits, tuition reimbursement, and growth opportunities in an informal, exciting high-tech marketing environment.=20

Send resume and salary history to [opportunities@surveysampling.com](mailto:opportunities@surveysampling.com). Please indicate the title of the position you are applying for in the subject line of your email. =20

---

Linda B. Piekarski  
Vice President Database and Research  
Survey Sampling International, LLC  
Direct: 203.455.0436  
203.255.4200.358=20  
[www.surveysampling.com](http://www.surveysampling.com) <<http://www.surveysampling.com/>>=20

1977-2007: Your trusted partner in sampling for 30 years

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2008 16:21:44 -0500  
Reply-To: Pat Lewis <[plewis@AAPOR.ORG](mailto:plewis@AAPOR.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Pat Lewis <[plewis@AAPOR.ORG](mailto:plewis@AAPOR.ORG)>  
Subject: AAPOR on New Hampshire Polls & Primary Results - Asks and answers

the question of what, if anything, went wrong.

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

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=WINDOWS-1252

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: inline

AAPOR statement --

In the wake of the New Hampshire primary, much press coverage has been focused on the pre-election polls, in particular on the Democratic presidential primary. Headlines indicate that pre-election polls were misleading or wrong. Yes, all of the pre-election polls showed Senator Obama ahead in the final pre-election polls. Clearly, on this count, they

all failed to reflect the eventual outcome. But the polls also were surprisingly accurate in measuring support for candidates other than Senator Clinton (with estimates of around 36% for Senator Obama, 19% for Senator Edwards, and 6% for Governor Richardson (compared to final estimates of 36%, 17% and 5%, respectively). They went astray in the case of Senator Clinton's final vote.

The final pre-election poll estimates reinforce several points:

95 Polling is a scientific process that attempts to capture information about individual attitudes and behaviors, both of which are subject to variation over time. Events following the conduct of a survey or poll can result in opinion and behavior changes.

95 Polls and surveys are subject to multiple sources of error including failure to sample all the voters and social desirability bias just to mention two.

95 The role of undecideds in a close election is difficult to understand in advance. As late as Monday, January 7, polls indicated that up to 10% of Democratic voters were still undecided and the CBS News Polls cited that "28% of Democratic voters say their minds could still change."

95 Understanding the methodology related to the conduct of the poll, the allocation of undecideds, and the likely voter models becomes increasingly important when elections are close.

95 All polls are subject to effects due to missing some randomly selected respondents because they are not at home when called, refuse to be interviewed, or are unavailable for other reasons. In most past election polling, this problem has not appeared to affect estimates appreciably. However, there is always the possibility that an effect may occur in a particular election.

The forces shaping the discrepancies between the pre-election polls and the actual outcomes in New Hampshire deserve immediate and thorough examination and analysis, if we are to understand what happened there and apply that understanding to state primaries to follow. The American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) supports the disclosure of polling methodology and as advocated by [www.pollster.com](http://www.pollster.com) -- including the disclosure of information related to questions used in the poll, sample size, response rates, as well as the likely voter models and undecided allocations used by the pollster. Only when the data are fully available to scholars of

pre-election polls will we understand the effects of alternative models and design, as well as the potential impact of any bias, on pre-election poll estimates.

AAPOR strongly supports the recommendation made by Gary Langer of ABC News<<http://blogs.abcnews.com/thenumbers/2008/01/new-hampshires.html>>(and an AAPOR member) when he advocated for the producers of the New Hampshire pre-election polls "to look at the data, and to look at it closely, and to do it without prejudging." Clearly, the NH pre-election polls warrant more analysis and research before we attempt to draw even tentative conclusions.

[Note: \*Public Opinion Quarterly\*, the journal of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, has published three articles that address some causes of error in self-reports of voting or vote intention in races involving minorities and women. They do not "explain" what happened in NH, but they offer some background for considering poll results in that primary and ones to come. The articles are available on the AAPOR web site<<http://www.aapor.org/>>.]

--=20  
Pat Lewis  
Communications Director  
American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR)  
1405 North George Mason Drive  
Arlington, Virginia  
703.527-5245  
cell 703.201.5070  
[www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org)

AAPOR -- the leading association of public opinion and survey research professionals.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2008 16:43:16 -0500

Reply-To: Rachel Davis <reda@UMICH.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Rachel Davis <reda@UMICH.EDU>  
Subject: Surveying Mexican Americans  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi, folks -

Can anyone recommend an outfit that does good work conducting telephone surveys with a bilingual, Mexican American sample? I am particularly interested in groups that can provide bilingual interviewers whose Spanish is associated with a Mexican dialect. Thanks!

Rachel

Rachel Davis, MPH  
Doctoral Candidate, Department of Health Behavior and Health Education  
Eat for Life Project Director, Center for Health Communications Research  
University of Michigan  
(734) 647-9013

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2008 16:46:20 -0500  
Reply-To: Pat Lewis <plewis@AAPOR.ORG>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Pat Lewis <plewis@AAPOR.ORG>  
Subject: Public Agenda --Are we asking survey research to do the wrong thing?

Comments: To: aapor net <aapornet@asu.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Content-Disposition: inline

Public Agenda Alert -- Jan. 9, 2008  
\* Feel Like Bashing Pollsters? Take a Number

[http://www.publicagenda.org/headlines/headlines\\_blog.cfm](http://www.publicagenda.org/headlines/headlines_blog.cfm) (full post)

(excerpt)

It's not quite "Dewey Defeats Truman," but Sen. Hillary Clinton's victory in the New Hampshire Democratic primary last night is probably going to rank a close second in the history of polling, considering that pre-election polls

had Sen. Barack Obama ahead by double digits. "It is simply unprecedented for so many polls to have been so wrong," ABC News polling director Gary Langer wrote this morning.

There are lots of technical explanations for this flying around this morning -- in addition to Langer's piece, there are excellent posts by veteran political pollster John Zogby and Gallup Poll editor Frank Newport. Public Agenda doesn't do "horserace" election surveys, but at first glance the theory that a lot of voters made up their minds at the last minute seems most likely to us.

But the fundamental problem may be that we're asking survey research to do the wrong things. Even worse, people are becoming more skeptical of what surveys can do because of what they can't do.

--

Pat Lewis  
Communications Director  
American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR)  
1405 North George Mason Drive  
Arlington, Virginia  
703.527-5245  
cell 703.201.5070  
www.aapor.org

AAPOR -- the leading association of public opinion and survey research professionals.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2008 16:04:55 -0600  
Reply-To: Traci Capesius <[traci@PDASTATS.COM](mailto:traci@PDASTATS.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Traci Capesius <[traci@PDASTATS.COM](mailto:traci@PDASTATS.COM)>  
Subject: Florida-based survey company  
Comments: To: "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Hello all,

We need to find Florida-based companies to conduct two types of surveys: 1) an RDD survey of Florida residents (1,600 completes) and 2) a survey of program participants (1,200 completes).

Can anyone recommend some companies? Any help would be greatly appreciated.

Thanks,

Traci

Traci R. Capesius, M.P.H.  
Evaluation Specialist  
Professional Data Analysts, Inc.  
St. Anthony Main  
219 Main Street SE, Suite 302  
Minneapolis, MN 55414  
phone: 612-623-9110  
fax: 612-623-8807  
e-mail: traci@pdastats.com  
www.pdastats.com

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2008 16:56:31 -0600  
Reply-To: [amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU](mailto:amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Allan L. McCutcheon" <[amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU](mailto:amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Public Agenda --Are we asking survey research to do the  
wrong

thing?

Comments: To: Pat Lewis <[plewis@AAPOR.ORG](mailto:plewis@AAPOR.ORG)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[843d88cd0801091346t24be1002w7968c7f988a949d8@mail.gmail.com](mailto:843d88cd0801091346t24be1002w7968c7f988a949d8@mail.gmail.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; DelSp="Yes"; format="flowed"  
Content-Disposition: inline  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

"...the fundamental problem may be that we're asking survey research to do  
the wrong things." Pre-election polling?

George H. Gallup must be rolling over in his grave.

Best,  
Allan

--  
Donald O. Clifton Chair of Survey Science  
Professor of Statistics &  
Survey Research and Methodology  
tel. +402.458.2036  
fax +402.458.2038

Quoting Pat Lewis <[plewis@AAPOR.ORG](mailto:plewis@AAPOR.ORG)>:

> Public Agenda Alert -- Jan. 9, 2008  
> \* Feel Like Bashing Pollsters? Take a Number  
>  
> [http://www.publicagenda.org/headlines/headlines\\_blog.cfm](http://www.publicagenda.org/headlines/headlines_blog.cfm) (full post)  
>

> (excerpt)  
>  
>  
> It's not quite "Dewey Defeats Truman," but Sen. Hillary Clinton's victory in  
> the New Hampshire Democratic primary last night is probably going to rank a  
> close second in the history of polling, considering that pre-election polls  
> had Sen. Barack Obama ahead by double digits. "It is simply unprecedented  
> for so many polls to have been so wrong," ABC News polling director Gary  
> Langer wrote this morning.  
>  
> There are lots of technical explanations for this flying around this morning  
> -- in addition to Langer's piece, there are excellent posts by veteran  
> political pollster John Zogby and Gallup Poll editor Frank Newport. Public  
> Agenda doesn't do "horserace" election surveys, but at first glance the  
> theory that a lot of voters made up their minds at the last minute seems  
> most likely to us.  
>  
> But the fundamental problem may be that we're asking survey research to do  
> the wrong things. Even worse, people are becoming more skeptical of what  
> surveys can do because of what they can't do.  
>  
> --  
> Pat Lewis  
> Communications Director  
> American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR)  
> 1405 North George Mason Drive  
> Arlington, Virginia  
> 703.527-5245  
> cell 703.201.5070  
> www.aapor.org  
>  
> AAPOR -- the leading association of public opinion and survey research  
> professionals.  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2008 19:40:37 -0500  
Reply-To: "Sosin, Jennifer" <[jsosin@KRCRESEARCH.COM](mailto:jsosin@KRCRESEARCH.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Sosin, Jennifer" <[jsosin@KRCRESEARCH.COM](mailto:jsosin@KRCRESEARCH.COM)>  
Subject: Job openings - Washington and Boston  
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

## Job Openings: Director, Senior Analyst at KRC Research

KRC Research is a full-service communications research firm, conducting both qualitative and quantitative opinion research for many of the most respected (and interesting) corporations, associations, coalitions and nations in the world. A unit of the Interpublic Group of Companies (NYSE: IPG), KRC is headquartered in Washington, D.C., with offices in Boston, New York and London. For more information, see [www.krcresearch.com](http://www.krcresearch.com).=20

We are currently seeking a Director and/or Senior Analyst who will be based in Washington or Boston. Directors' responsibilities include designing and managing projects, supervising analytic staff, and playing a role in continuing to build our fast-growing company. Senior analysts' provide support for both research logistics and analysis, and often manage smaller projects. Responsibilities include writing proposals, instruments, reports, as well as supervising data collection and tabulation.=20

### Qualifications:=20

- Experience conducting opinion and marketing research using both quantitative and qualitative methodologies (2-4+ years for Senior Analysts, 5-7+ years for Directors);=20
- Experience with a variety of quantitative and qualitative research methodologies and analytic tools;=20
- Very strong writing skills;=20
- Ability to create clear and compelling presentations of findings;=20
- Excellent communications and time-management skills;=20
- A collaborative work style.=20

### Additional qualifications for Directors:=20

- 2-3+ years' experience managing research projects, including supervising both staff and vendors;=20
- At least one year in a multi-client market research agency, with simultaneous responsibilities for multiple projects;=20
- Experience and skill in moderating focus groups and conducting executive interviews;=20
- Strong verbal presentation and public speaking skills.=20

For immediate consideration, please send cover letter, resume and salary requirements to [jobs@krcresearch.com](mailto:jobs@krcresearch.com).

KRC Research is an equal opportunity employer.=20

-----  
Jennifer Sosin  
President  
KRC Research  
700 13th Street NW  
Washington, DC 20005



-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Wed, 9 Jan 2008 22:08:11 -0800  
Reply-To: Phil Trounstine <[phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU](mailto:phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Phil Trounstine <[phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU](mailto:phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU)>  
Subject: Truth about Bradley  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To:  
<[3248A9B21DD5574785FE5E2C8E5216849CB6D5@exchange.local.artscience.com](mailto:3248A9B21DD5574785FE5E2C8E5216849CB6D5@exchange.local.artscience.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I am so sick of listening to people on TV spewing misinformation about =  
the  
so-called Bradley Effect. I'm not saying that a hidden racial effect ha=  
sn't  
affected the outcome of some elections. That may well be the case in so=  
me  
select general elections. But that was not the case for Tom Bradley in =  
the  
1982 California governor's race. For all the details, contact Mark  
DiCamillo or Merv Field, but here are the basics:

In the vote cast on election day -- which is what the pre-election poll=  
s  
and exit polls had measured -- Tom Bradley WON. There was no hidden rac=  
ial  
vote. Deukmejian won the election because the Gun Owners of California =  
had  
mounted a huge absentee ballot campaign to defeat a gun-control measure=  
  
that was on the ballot. The absentees put Deukmejian over in the final  
count. That's why the Field Poll missed the mark in their final  
pre-election poll and why, since then in final polling, they always ask=  
if  
people have already voted absentee. They haven't missed since then.

Moreover, to the extent that it has occurred, the so-called Bradley Eff=  
ect  
has occurred in GENERAL elections, not in Democratic primaries. The bla=  
ck  
candidates had already won their party's nomination. If anyone is aware=  
of  
this phenomenon happening in a primary, I'd like to hear about it.

---

Philip J. Trounstine, Director  
Survey and Policy Research Institute

at San Jose State University  
408-924-6993=

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 07:53:47 +0100  
Reply-To: [direct@zuma-mannheim.de](mailto:direct@zuma-mannheim.de)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mohler <[mohler@ZUMA-MANNHEIM.DE](mailto:mohler@ZUMA-MANNHEIM.DE)>  
Subject: Re: AAPOR on New Hampshire Polls & Primary Results  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[843d88cd0801091321p327a9bf2t419f3fa0914a7fb6@mail.gmail.com](mailto:843d88cd0801091321p327a9bf2t419f3fa0914a7fb6@mail.gmail.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=windows-1252; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

greetings from the other side of the Atlantic. Thanks for the AAPOR statement which I feel is really helpful.

Just to add two points..

a. there is some literature on pre-election polling. I remember one published in POQ many years ago.

The bottom line of this meta-analysis was like this:

pre-election polls are almost always very accurate. If they fail once in a while, all polls in that country tend to fail simultaneously in a similar fashion - just as it happend in NH.

b. failure of prediction is, that is my experience from German pre-election polls, seemingly more likely in times of political change which often goes together with mobilization of the electorate, as it seems to happen now in the US.

Looking forward to the indepth search for enlightenment ....

Peter Mohler

Pat Lewis schrieb:

> AAPOR statement --

>

>

> In the wake of the New Hampshire primary, much press coverage has been  
> focused on the pre-election polls, in particular on the Democratic  
> presidential primary. Headlines indicate that pre-election polls were  
> misleading or wrong. Yes, all of the pre-election polls showed Senator  
> Obama ahead in the final pre-election polls. Clearly, on this count, they  
> all failed to reflect the eventual outcome. But the polls also were  
> surprisingly accurate in measuring support for candidates other than Senator  
> Clinton —with estimates of around 36% for Senator Obama, 19% for Senator  
> Edwards, and 6% for Governor Richardson (compared to final estimates of 36%,  
> 17% and 5%, respectively). They went astray in the case of Senator  
> Clinton's final vote.

>

>

>

- > The final pre-election poll estimates reinforce several points:
  - >
  - >
  - >
  - > • Polling is a scientific process that attempts to capture
    - > information about individual attitudes and behaviors, both of which are
    - > subject to variation over time. Events following the conduct of a survey or
    - > poll can result in opinion and behavior changes.
  - >
  - > • Polls and surveys are subject to multiple sources of
    - > error—including failure to sample all the voters and social desirability
    - > bias just to mention two.
  - >
  - > • The role of undecideds in a close election is difficult to
    - > understand in advance. As late as Monday, January 7, polls indicated that
    - > up to 10% of Democratic voters were still undecided and the CBS News Polls
    - > cited that "28% of Democratic voters say their minds could still change."
  - >
  - > • Understanding the methodology related to the conduct of the
    - > poll, the allocation of undecideds, and the likely voter models becomes
    - > increasingly important when elections are close.
  - >
  - > • All polls are subject to effects due to missing some randomly
    - > selected
    - > respondents because they are not at home when called, refuse to be
    - > interviewed, or are unavailable for other reasons. In most past election
    - > polling, this problem has not appeared to affect estimates appreciably.
    - > However, there is always the possibility that an effect may occur in a
    - > particular election.
  - >
  - >
  - >
  - > The forces shaping the discrepancies between the pre-election polls and the
    - > actual outcomes in New Hampshire deserve immediate and thorough examination
    - > and analysis, if we are to understand what happened there and apply that
    - > understanding to state primaries to follow. The American Association for
    - > Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) supports the disclosure of polling
    - > methodology—and as advocated by [www.pollster.com](http://www.pollster.com) -- including the disclosure
    - > of information related to questions used in the poll, sample size, response
    - > rates, as well as the likely voter models and undecided allocations used by
    - > the pollster. Only when the data are fully available to scholars of
    - > pre-election polls will we understand the effects of alternative models and
    - > design, as well as the potential impact of any bias, on pre-election poll
    - > estimates.
  - >
  - >
  - >
  - > AAPOR strongly supports the recommendation made by Gary Langer of ABC
    - > News<<http://blogs.abcnews.com/thenumbers/2008/01/new-hampshires.html>>(and
    - > an AAPOR member) when he advocated for the producers of the New
    - > Hampshire pre-election polls "to look at the data, and to look at it
    - > closely, and to do it without prejudging." Clearly, the NH pre-election
    - > polls warrant more analysis and research before we attempt to draw even
    - > tentative conclusions.

>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> [Note: \*Public Opinion Quarterly\*, the journal of the American Association  
> for Public Opinion Research, has published three articles that address some  
> causes  
> of error in self-reports of voting or vote intention in races involving  
> minorities and women. They do not "explain" what happened in NH, but they  
> offer some background for considering poll results in that primary and ones  
> to come. The articles are available on the AAPOR web  
> site<<http://www.aapor.org/>>  
> .]  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 04:44:13 -0800  
Reply-To: Robert Worcester <[rmworcester@YAHOO.COM](mailto:rmworcester@YAHOO.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Robert Worcester <[rmworcester@YAHOO.COM](mailto:rmworcester@YAHOO.COM)>  
Subject: The British take on New Hampshire  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

The Sun's Political Editor commissioned me to write a personal "Why the polls got it wrong in New Hampshire" article for the Sun, Britain's best selling national daily newspaper, specifically in "Sunspeak".

Here's the text as written. Here's the link to what appeared in The Sun

"There were twenty-one polls over the five days of frenzied campaigning between the Iowa caucus and the vote on Tuesday. The final two days there were seven polls. They had Obama ahead of Clinton by an average of seven points.

(Former British Prime Minister) Harold Wilson famously said, "A week is a long time in politics".

Over that week, the media elected Obama.

The voters chose Clinton.

In New Hampshire, voters are known to be an independent bunch.

American primaries are funny things. They are like by-elections in Britain.

Voters know it's not the real thing.

American elections are popularity contests right up to 4 November when the real contest takes place.

That's when the fat lady sings.

In New Hampshire, as happens in Iowa, the four voters in ten who describe themselves as independent of either party can choose to vote in either the Democrat or Republican primary.

They are a volatile bunch.

Some speculate that independent voters who expected a clear Obama win opted to vote in the Republican primary to support Senator McCain over Governor Romney.

In Iowa more women supported Obama than Clinton.

Women in New Hampshire voted by 4-3 for Clinton.

The polls didn't catch all the swing back from double digit leads on the weekend.

Hillary changed her tune in the final two days. She "found her voice". She cut up rough.

She nearly burst into tears at one point. She's a tough lady.

But she showed she's human.

Clinton was hoping that the States would fall like dominos. First Iowa, then New Hampshire. Now Michigan on the 15th, Nevada Caucuses, South Carolina's Democratic primary, then Florida on the 29th, then superduper Tuesday on 5 February.

It's likely both candidates will likely be chosen then. To start the real race for the White House.

The pollsters didn't get it entirely wrong. On the Republican side, they called McCain over Romney. They had Huckabee, the surprise winner in Iowa, languishing in third place.

Pundits talk about Obama as the "new Reagan". I don't. To me it recalls the "flower-power" days of the forgotten Senator Eugene McCarthy in 1968. He was the Obama of his day. He flowered and then faded.

It was the machine candidate Hubert Humphrey who was the Democratic candidate in the 1968 Presidential election not Senator Eugene McCarthy."

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

From: Jim Smithers (Lark-FD) <Jsmithers@thekmgroup.co.uk>

To: Bob Worcester <Bob.Worcester@Ipsos-MORI.com>

Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 9:21:55 AM

Subject: Hillary Clinton

Bob, How come the pollsters got it so wrong in New Hampshire? Too many undecided?

Jim

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

From: Allan L. McCutcheon <amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU>

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Sent: Wednesday, January 9, 2008 10:56:31 PM

Subject: Re: Public Agenda --Are we asking survey research to do the wrong thing?

"...the fundamental problem may be that we're asking survey research to do the wrong things." Pre-election polling?

George H. Gallup must be rolling over in his grave.

Best,  
Allan

--

Donald O. Clifton Chair of Survey Science

Professor of Statistics &

Survey Research and Methodology

tel. +402.458.2036

fax +402.458.2038

Quoting Pat Lewis <plewis@AAPOR.ORG>:

> Public Agenda Alert -- Jan. 9, 2008

> \* Feel Like Bashing Pollsters? Take a Number

>

> [http://www.publicagenda.org/headlines/headlines\\_blog.cfm](http://www.publicagenda.org/headlines/headlines_blog.cfm) (full post)

>

> (excerpt)

>

>

> It's not quite "Dewey Defeats Truman," but Sen. Hillary Clinton's victory in  
> the New Hampshire Democratic primary last night is probably going to rank a  
> close second in the history of polling, considering that pre-election polls

> had Sen. Barack Obama ahead by double digits. "It is simply unprecedented  
> for so many polls to have been so wrong," ABC News polling director Gary  
> Langer wrote this morning.

>  
> There are lots of technical explanations for this flying around this morning  
> -- in addition to Langer's piece, there are excellent posts by veteran  
> political pollster John Zogby and Gallup Poll editor Frank Newport. Public  
> Agenda doesn't do "horserace" election surveys, but at first glance the  
> theory that a lot of voters made up their minds at the last minute seems  
> most likely to us.

>  
> But the fundamental problem may be that we're asking survey research to do  
> the wrong things. Even worse, people are becoming more skeptical of what  
> surveys can do because of what they can't do.

>  
> --  
> Pat Lewis  
> Communications Director  
> American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR)  
> 1405 North George Mason Drive  
> Arlington, Virginia  
> 703.527-5245  
> cell 703.201.5070  
> www.aapor.org

>  
> AAPOR -- the leading association of public opinion and survey research  
> professionals.

>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Be a better friend, newshound, and  
know-it-all with Yahoo! Mobile. Try it now.  
[http://mobile.yahoo.com/;\\_ylt=Ahu06i62sR8HDtDypao8Wcj9tAcJ](http://mobile.yahoo.com/;_ylt=Ahu06i62sR8HDtDypao8Wcj9tAcJ)

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 08:14:25 -0500  
Reply-To: Bruce Mendelsohn <bruce.mendelsohn@MRA-NET.ORG>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Bruce Mendelsohn <bruce.mendelsohn@MRA-NET.ORG>  
Subject: Leading Research Organization Explains Difference in NH Primary  
Projections vs. Results  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
In-Reply-To: A<OF03356426.1CF56E7D-ON882573CC.0021B563-  
882573CC.0021B56B@sjsu.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

In a press release distributed nationally this morning at 8:07, the Marketing Research Association distributed the following information. The information drew in part from AAPOR.

Leading Research Organization Explains Difference in NH Primary Projections vs. Results

GLASTONBURY, Conn., Jan. 10 /PRNewswire-USNewswire/ -- With the exception of Senator Clinton's results, New Hampshire's pre-primary polls were surprisingly accurate --- with estimates of around 36% for Senator Obama, 19% for Senator Edwards, and 6% for Governor Richardson (compared to final estimates of 36%, 17% and 5%, respectively). There is now a focus on the "inaccuracy" of pre-election polls, especially those of the Democratic presidential primary. While the research profession will review the results to better understand why Senator Clinton's poll numbers were wrong, the Marketing Research Association (<http://www.mra-net.org>) wants to emphasize that these results should not question the validity nor the value of research.

MRA issues this release to help explain the forces shaping the discrepancies between the pre-election polls and the actual outcomes in New Hampshire --- and to apply that understanding to upcoming state primaries. MRA agrees with many points made by AAPOR.

\* Polling is a scientific process that attempts to capture information about individual attitudes and behaviors, both of which can vary over time.

Events that occur after a survey or poll is taken can cause changes in opinion and behavior.

\* Polls and surveys are subject to multiple sources of error --- including social desirability bias --- that some have suggested may lead to inflated estimates for some candidates.



\* The role of undecideds in a close election is difficult to predict. As late as Monday, January 7, polls indicated that up to 10% of Democratic voters were still undecided and the CBS News Polls cited that "28% of Democratic voters say their minds could still change."  
\* "Margins of error" must be considered when evaluating surveys. "Margins of error" are attributable to polling questions, methodologies, and sample.

While political surveys take a snapshot of the electorate at a specific point in time, they are not an election. Campaigns are fluid entities; activities/occurrences can change the way people view candidates after surveys are conducted.

Note: American Association of Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) shared some of these points with MRA. For more information, visit <http://www.aapor.org>.

Marketing Research Association is the leading and largest association of the opinion and marketing research profession, a multi-billion dollar a year industry dedicated to providing valuable information to guide the decisions of companies that provide products and services to consumers and businesses. For more information, visit <http://www.mra-net.org>

Bruce R. Mendelsohn  
Director of Communications  
Marketing Research Association, Inc.  
110 National Drive; Glastonbury, CT 06033  
P: 860-682-1000 (ext. 310)  
F: 860-682-1010  
[www.mra-net.org](http://www.mra-net.org)

Have confidence in your next business partner. MRA's Exchange Evaluation Program (EEP) lets users rate their experience with a former business partner and view the ratings on a potential partner. Register today at [www.mra-net.org](http://www.mra-net.org) and find your company's match.

Have you renewed your Blue Book listing for 2008? Visit ListQuick now at [www.bluebook.org](http://www.bluebook.org).

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)] On Behalf Of Phil Trounstine  
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 1:08 AM  
To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Subject: Truth about Bradley

I am so sick of listening to people on TV spewing misinformation about the so-called Bradley Effect. I'm not saying that a hidden racial effect

hasn't affected the outcome of some elections. That may well be the case in some select general elections. But that was not the case for Tom Bradley in the 1982 California governor's race. For all the details, contact Mark DiCamillo or Merv Field, but here are the basics:

In the vote cast on election day -- which is what the pre-election polls and exit polls had measured -- Tom Bradley WON. There was no hidden racial vote. Deukmejian won the election because the Gun Owners of California had mounted a huge absentee ballot campaign to defeat a gun-control measure that was on the ballot. The absentees put Deukmejian over in the final count. That's why the Field Poll missed the mark in their final pre-election poll and why, since then in final polling, they always ask if people have already voted absentee. They haven't missed since then.

Moreover, to the extent that it has occurred, the so-called Bradley Effect has occurred in GENERAL elections, not in Democratic primaries. The black candidates had already won their party's nomination. If anyone is aware of this phenomenon happening in a primary, I'd like to hear about it.

---

Philip J. Trounstine, Director  
Survey and Policy Research Institute  
at San Jose State University  
408-924-6993

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
[aapornet-request@asu.edu](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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 08:37:08 -0500  
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: Kohut  
Comments: To: aapornet aapornet <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>

Mime-Version: 1.0 (Apple Message framework v753)

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=WINDOWS-1252; delpsp=yes; format=flowed

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

It does seem like everyone wants to get race off the hook - which, I suppose, is part of Obama's appeal: we're all post-race now! I don't think we are, but it's a pleasant fantasy. And Andrew Kohut doesn't think so either.

New York Times - January 10, 2008

<<http://www.nytimes.com/2008/01/10/opinion/10kohut.html>>

Getting It Wrong

By ANDREW KOHUT

Washington

THE failure of the New Hampshire pre-election surveys to mirror the outcome of the Democratic race is one of the most significant miscues in modern polling history. All the published polls, including those that surveyed through Monday, had Senator Barack Obama comfortably ahead with an average margin of more than 8 percent. These same polls showed no signs that Senator Hillary Clinton might close that gap, let alone win.

While it will take time for those who conducted the New Hampshire tracking polls to undertake rigorous analyses of their surveys, a number of things are immediately apparent.

First, the problem was not a general failure of polling methodology. These same pollsters did a superb job on the Republican side. Senator John McCain won by 5.5 percent. The last wave of polls found a margin of 5.3 percent. So whatever the problem was, it was specific to Mrs. Clinton versus Mr. Obama.

Second, the inaccuracies don't seem related to the subtleties of polling methods. The pollsters who overestimated Mr. Obama's margin ranged from CBS and Gallup (who have the most rigorous voter screens and sampling designs, and have sterling records in presidential elections) to local and computerized polling operations, whose methods are a good deal less refined. Everyone got it wrong.

Third, the mistakes were not the result of a last-minute trend going Mrs. Clinton's way. Yes, according to exit polls the 17 percent of voters who said they made their decision on Election Day chose Mrs. Clinton a little more than those who decided in the past two or three weeks. But the margin was very small — 39 percent of the late deciders went for Mrs. Clinton and 36 percent went for Mr. Obama. This gap is obviously too narrow to explain the wide lead for Mr. Obama that kept showing up in pre-election polls.

Fourth, some have argued that the unusually high turnout may have caused a problem for the pollsters. It's possible, but unlikely.

While participation was higher than in past New Hampshire primaries, the demographic and political profile of the vote remains largely

unchanged. In particular, the mix of Democrats to independents — 54 percent to 44 percent respectively — is close to what it was in 2000, the most recent New Hampshire primary without an incumbent in the race.

To my mind all these factors deserve further study. But another possible explanation cannot be ignored — the longstanding pattern of pre-election polls overstating support for black candidates among white voters, particularly white voters who are poor.

In exploring this factor, it is useful to look closely at the nature of the constituencies for the two candidates in New Hampshire, which were divided along socio-economic lines.

Mrs. Clinton beat Mr. Obama by 12 points (47 percent to 35 percent) among those with family incomes below \$50,000. By contrast, Mr. Obama beat Mrs. Clinton by five points (40 percent to 35 percent) among those earning more than \$50,000.

There was an education gap, too. College graduates voted for Mr. Obama 39 percent to 34 percent; Mrs. Clinton won among those who had never attended college, 43 percent to 35 percent.

Of course these are not the only patterns in Mrs. Clinton's support in New Hampshire. Women rallied to her (something they did not do in Iowa), while men leaned to Mr. Obama. Mrs. Clinton also got stronger support from older voters, while Mr. Obama pulled in more support among younger voters. But gender and age patterns tend not to be as confounding to pollsters as race, which to my mind was a key reason the polls got New Hampshire so wrong.

Poorer, less well-educated white people refuse surveys more often than affluent, better-educated whites. Polls generally adjust their samples for this tendency. But here's the problem: these whites who do not respond to surveys tend to have more unfavorable views of blacks than respondents who do the interviews.

I've experienced this myself. In 1989, as a Gallup pollster, I overestimated the support for David Dinkins in his first race for New York City mayor against Rudolph Giuliani; Mr. Dinkins was elected, but with a two percentage point margin of victory, not the 15 I had predicted. I concluded, eventually, that I got it wrong not so much because respondents were lying to our interviewers but because poorer, less well-educated voters were less likely to agree to answer our questions. That was a decisive factor in my miscalculation.

Certainly, we live in a different world today. The Pew Research Center has conducted analyses of elections between candidates of different races in 2006 and found that polls now do a much better job estimating the support for black candidates than they did in the past. However, the difficulties in interviewing the poor and the less well-educated persist.

Why didn't this problem come up in Iowa? My guess is that Mr. Obama may have posed less of a threat to white voters in Iowa because he

wasn't yet the front-runner. Caucuses are also plainly different from primaries.

In New Hampshire, the ballots are still warm, so it's hard to pinpoint the exact cause for the primary poll flop. But given the dearth of obvious explanations, serious consideration has to be given to the difficulties that race and class present to survey methodology.

Andrew Kohut is the president of the Pew Research Center.

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====  
Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 09:07:34 -0500

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: Kohut

Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

In-Reply-To: A<[4754A615-2FAC-449C-BCDB-3717D92EC3BE@panix.com](mailto:4754A615-2FAC-449C-BCDB-3717D92EC3BE@panix.com)>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

This morning on NPR he said that Pew was conducting further research to try to tease out the effects of race in N.H.

--

Leo G. Simonetta

Director of Research

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: Thursday, January 10, 2008 8:37 AM

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

> Subject: Kohut

>

> It does seem like everyone wants to get race off the hook -

> which, I suppose, is part of Obama's appeal: we're all

> post-race now! I don't think we are, but it's a pleasant

> fantasy. And Andrew Kohut doesn't think so either.

>

> New York Times - January 10, 2008

> <<http://www.nytimes.com/2008/01/10/opinion/10kohut.html>>

>  
> Getting It Wrong  
> By ANDREW KOHUT  
> Washington  
>  
> THE failure of the New Hampshire pre-election surveys to  
> mirror the outcome of the Democratic race is one of the most  
> significant miscues in modern polling history. All the  
> published polls, including those that surveyed through  
> Monday, had Senator Barack Obama comfortably ahead with an  
> average margin of more than 8 percent. These same polls  
> showed no signs that Senator Hillary Clinton might close that  
> gap, let alone win.  
>  
> While it will take time for those who conducted the New  
> Hampshire tracking polls to undertake rigorous analyses of  
> their surveys, a number of things are immediately apparent.  
>  
> First, the problem was not a general failure of polling methodology.  
> These same pollsters did a superb job on the Republican side.  
> Senator John McCain won by 5.5 percent. The last wave of  
> polls found a margin of 5.3 percent. So whatever the problem  
> was, it was specific to Mrs.  
> Clinton versus Mr. Obama.  
>  
> Second, the inaccuracies don't seem related to the subtleties  
> of polling methods. The pollsters who overestimated Mr.  
> Obama's margin ranged from CBS and Gallup (who have the most  
> rigorous voter screens and sampling designs, and have  
> sterling records in presidential  
> elections) to local and computerized polling operations,  
> whose methods are a good deal less refined. Everyone got it wrong.  
>  
> Third, the mistakes were not the result of a last-minute  
> trend going Mrs. Clinton's way. Yes, according to exit polls  
> the 17 percent of voters who said they made their decision on  
> Election Day chose Mrs.  
> Clinton a little more than those who decided in the past two  
> or three weeks. But the margin was very small - 39 percent of  
> the late deciders went for Mrs. Clinton and 36 percent went  
> for Mr. Obama.  
> This gap is obviously too narrow to explain the wide lead for Mr.  
> Obama that kept showing up in pre-election polls.  
>  
> Fourth, some have argued that the unusually high turnout may  
> have caused a problem for the pollsters. It's possible, but  
> unlikely.  
> While participation was higher than in past New Hampshire  
> primaries, the demographic and political profile of the vote  
> remains largely unchanged. In particular, the mix of  
> Democrats to independents - 54 percent to 44 percent  
> respectively - is close to what it was in 2000, the most  
> recent New Hampshire primary without an incumbent in the race.  
>

> To my mind all these factors deserve further study. But  
> another possible explanation cannot be ignored - the  
> longstanding pattern of pre-election polls overstating  
> support for black candidates among white voters, particularly  
> white voters who are poor.  
>  
> In exploring this factor, it is useful to look closely at the  
> nature of the constituencies for the two candidates in New  
> Hampshire, which were divided along socio-economic lines.  
>  
> Mrs. Clinton beat Mr. Obama by 12 points (47 percent to 35  
> percent) among those with family incomes below \$50,000. By  
> contrast, Mr. Obama beat Mrs. Clinton by five points (40  
> percent to 35 percent) among those earning more than \$50,000.  
>  
> There was an education gap, too. College graduates voted for Mr.  
> Obama 39 percent to 34 percent; Mrs. Clinton won among those  
> who had never attended college, 43 percent to 35 percent.  
>  
> Of course these are not the only patterns in Mrs. Clinton's  
> support in New Hampshire. Women rallied to her (something  
> they did not do in Iowa), while men leaned to Mr. Obama. Mrs.  
> Clinton also got stronger support from older voters, while  
> Mr. Obama pulled in more support among younger voters. But  
> gender and age patterns tend not to be as confounding to  
> pollsters as race, which to my mind was a key reason the  
> polls got New Hampshire so wrong.  
>  
> Poorer, less well-educated white people refuse surveys more  
> often than affluent, better-educated whites. Polls generally  
> adjust their samples for this tendency. But here's the  
> problem: these whites who do not respond to surveys tend to  
> have more unfavorable views of blacks than respondents who do  
> the interviews.  
>  
> I've experienced this myself. In 1989, as a Gallup pollster,  
> I overestimated the support for David Dinkins in his first  
> race for New York City mayor against Rudolph Giuliani; Mr.  
> Dinkins was elected, but with a two percentage point margin  
> of victory, not the 15 I had predicted. I concluded,  
> eventually, that I got it wrong not so much because  
> respondents were lying to our interviewers but because  
> poorer, less well-educated voters were less likely to agree  
> to answer our questions. That was a decisive factor in my miscalc.  
>  
> Certainly, we live in a different world today. The Pew  
> Research Center has conducted analyses of elections between  
> candidates of different races in 2006 and found that polls  
> now do a much better job estimating the support for black  
> candidates than they did in the past. However, the  
> difficulties in interviewing the poor and the less  
> well-educated persist.  
>  
> Why didn't this problem come up in Iowa? My guess is that Mr.

> Obama may have posed less of a threat to white voters in Iowa  
> because he wasn't yet the front-runner. Caucuses are also  
> plainly different from primaries.  
>  
> In New Hampshire, the ballots are still warm, so it's hard to  
> pinpoint the exact cause for the primary poll flop. But given  
> the dearth of obvious explanations, serious consideration has  
> to be given to the difficulties that race and class present  
> to survey methodology.  
>  
> Andrew Kohut is the president of the Pew Research Center.  
>  
> -----  
> 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 this: set aapornet mail Please ask  
> authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> 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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 09:07:43 -0500  
Reply-To: Richard Clark <[clark@CVIOG.UGA.EDU](mailto:clark@CVIOG.UGA.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Richard Clark <[clark@CVIOG.UGA.EDU](mailto:clark@CVIOG.UGA.EDU)>  
Organization: Carl Vinson Institute of Government  
Subject: Re: Kohut  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[4754A615-2FAC-449C-BCDB-3717D92EC3BE@panix.com](mailto:4754A615-2FAC-449C-BCDB-3717D92EC3BE@panix.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=windows-1252; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I find the op ed by Andrew Kohut very interesting, but as the release yesterday from the Marist Poll points out, pollsters did not overestimate Obama's support, as suggested in this op ed; Sen. Clinton's support was underestimated.

We've neither had such a compacted primary schedule, with New Hampshire following so closely on the heels of the Iowa caucuses, nor have we seen such intense media coverage of the process (at least by my perception). New Hampshire residents polled over the weekend may have been as overwhelmed by the torrent of information (understandably), and it would take a couple days to sort things out.



--Rich Clark

Doug Henwood wrote:

- > It does seem like everyone wants to get race off the hook - which, I
- > suppose, is part of Obama's appeal: we're all post-race now! I don't
- > think we are, but it's a pleasant fantasy. And Andrew Kohut doesn't
- > think so either.
- >
- > New York Times - January 10, 2008
- > <<http://www.nytimes.com/2008/01/10/opinion/10kohut.html>>
- >
- > Getting It Wrong
- > By ANDREW KOHUT
- > Washington
- >
- > THE failure of the New Hampshire pre-election surveys to mirror the
- > outcome of the Democratic race is one of the most significant miscues
- > in modern polling history. All the published polls, including those
- > that surveyed through Monday, had Senator Barack Obama comfortably
- > ahead with an average margin of more than 8 percent. These same polls
- > showed no signs that Senator Hillary Clinton might close that gap,
- > let alone win.
- >
- > While it will take time for those who conducted the New Hampshire
- > tracking polls to undertake rigorous analyses of their surveys, a
- > number of things are immediately apparent.
- >
- > First, the problem was not a general failure of polling methodology.
- > These same pollsters did a superb job on the Republican side. Senator
- > John McCain won by 5.5 percent. The last wave of polls found a margin
- > of 5.3 percent. So whatever the problem was, it was specific to Mrs.
- > Clinton versus Mr. Obama.
- >
- > Second, the inaccuracies don't seem related to the subtleties of
- > polling methods. The pollsters who overestimated Mr. Obama's margin
- > ranged from CBS and Gallup (who have the most rigorous voter screens
- > and sampling designs, and have sterling records in presidential
- > elections) to local and computerized polling operations, whose
- > methods are a good deal less refined. Everyone got it wrong.
- >
- > Third, the mistakes were not the result of a last-minute trend going
- > Mrs. Clinton's way. Yes, according to exit polls the 17 percent of
- > voters who said they made their decision on Election Day chose Mrs.
- > Clinton a little more than those who decided in the past two or three
- > weeks. But the margin was very small — 39 percent of the late
- > deciders went for Mrs. Clinton and 36 percent went for Mr. Obama.
- > This gap is obviously too narrow to explain the wide lead for Mr.
- > Obama that kept showing up in pre-election polls.
- >
- > Fourth, some have argued that the unusually high turnout may have
- > caused a problem for the pollsters. It's possible, but unlikely.
- > While participation was higher than in past New Hampshire primaries,

> the demographic and political profile of the vote remains largely  
> unchanged. In particular, the mix of Democrats to independents — 54  
> percent to 44 percent respectively — is close to what it was in 2000,  
> the most recent New Hampshire primary without an incumbent in the race.  
>  
> To my mind all these factors deserve further study. But another  
> possible explanation cannot be ignored — the longstanding pattern of  
> pre-election polls overstating support for black candidates among  
> white voters, particularly white voters who are poor.  
>  
> In exploring this factor, it is useful to look closely at the nature  
> of the constituencies for the two candidates in New Hampshire, which  
> were divided along socio-economic lines.  
>  
> Mrs. Clinton beat Mr. Obama by 12 points (47 percent to 35 percent)  
> among those with family incomes below \$50,000. By contrast, Mr. Obama  
> beat Mrs. Clinton by five points (40 percent to 35 percent) among  
> those earning more than \$50,000.  
>  
> There was an education gap, too. College graduates voted for Mr.  
> Obama 39 percent to 34 percent; Mrs. Clinton won among those who had  
> never attended college, 43 percent to 35 percent.  
>  
> Of course these are not the only patterns in Mrs. Clinton's support  
> in New Hampshire. Women rallied to her (something they did not do in  
> Iowa), while men leaned to Mr. Obama. Mrs. Clinton also got stronger  
> support from older voters, while Mr. Obama pulled in more support  
> among younger voters. But gender and age patterns tend not to be as  
> confounding to pollsters as race, which to my mind was a key reason  
> the polls got New Hampshire so wrong.  
>  
> Poorer, less well-educated white people refuse surveys more often  
> than affluent, better-educated whites. Polls generally adjust their  
> samples for this tendency. But here's the problem: these whites who  
> do not respond to surveys tend to have more unfavorable views of  
> blacks than respondents who do the interviews.  
>  
> I've experienced this myself. In 1989, as a Gallup pollster, I  
> overestimated the support for David Dinkins in his first race for New  
> York City mayor against Rudolph Giuliani; Mr. Dinkins was elected,  
> but with a two percentage point margin of victory, not the 15 I had  
> predicted. I concluded, eventually, that I got it wrong not so much  
> because respondents were lying to our interviewers but because  
> poorer, less well-educated voters were less likely to agree to answer  
> our questions. That was a decisive factor in my miscalculation.  
>  
> Certainly, we live in a different world today. The Pew Research  
> Center has conducted analyses of elections between candidates of  
> different races in 2006 and found that polls now do a much better job  
> estimating the support for black candidates than they did in the  
> past. However, the difficulties in interviewing the poor and the less  
> well-educated persist.  
>  
> Why didn't this problem come up in Iowa? My guess is that Mr. Obama

> may have posed less of a threat to white voters in Iowa because he  
> wasn't yet the front-runner. Caucuses are also plainly different from  
> primaries.  
>  
> In New Hampshire, the ballots are still warm, so it's hard to  
> pinpoint the exact cause for the primary poll flop. But given the  
> dearth of obvious explanations, serious consideration has to be given  
> to the difficulties that race and class present to survey methodology.  
>  
> Andrew Kohut is the president of the Pew Research Center.  
>  
> -----  
> 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 this: set aapornet mail  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

--

---

Richard L. Clark, Ph.D.  
Survey Research Unit  
Governmental Services and Research Division  
Carl Vinson Institute of Government  
University of Georgia  
201 N. Milledge Avenue  
Athens, GA 30602  
Phone: 706-542-9404  
FAX: 706-542-9301

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 09:57:40 -0500  
Reply-To: Paul Braun <[pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM](mailto:pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Paul Braun <[pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM](mailto:pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Kohut  
Comments: To: Richard Clark <[clark@CUIOG.UGA.EDU](mailto:clark@CUIOG.UGA.EDU)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[478626AF.9000300@cviog.uga.edu](mailto:478626AF.9000300@cviog.uga.edu)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Richard,

I can only add this anecdotally and not scientifically as we were making  
calls into NH on Primary Day and last night and we are not finished with the

study. The early in the evening results on Primary Day reflected closer to what everyone else was getting, while later in the evening and the next day more Clinton support was shown. I suspect that most undecideds made up their minds within hours of voting or maybe in the voting booth. I would think asking that question post primary (When did you make up your mind?) would be a good question and move everyone towards an answer to this. In the studies we completed in Iowa, it seems minds were made up more in advance.

I hope this helps.

Regards

Paul

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Richard Clark

Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 9:08 AM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: Re: Kohut

I find the op ed by Andrew Kohut very interesting, but as the release yesterday from the Marist Poll points out, pollsters did not overestimate Obama's support, as suggested in this op ed; Sen. Clinton's support was underestimated.

We've neither had such a compacted primary schedule, with New Hampshire following so closely on the heels of the Iowa caucuses, nor have we seen such intense media coverage of the process (at least by my perception). New Hampshire residents polled over the weekend may have been as overwhelmed by the torrent of information (understandably), and it would take a couple days to sort things out.

--Rich Clark

Doug Henwood wrote:

> It does seem like everyone wants to get race off the hook - which, I  
> suppose, is part of Obama's appeal: we're all post-race now! I don't  
> think we are, but it's a pleasant fantasy. And Andrew Kohut doesn't  
> think so either.

>

> New York Times - January 10, 2008

> <<http://www.nytimes.com/2008/01/10/opinion/10kohut.html>>

>

> Getting It Wrong

> By ANDREW KOHUT

> Washington

>

> THE failure of the New Hampshire pre-election surveys to mirror the

> outcome of the Democratic race is one of the most significant miscues  
> in modern polling history. All the published polls, including those  
> that surveyed through Monday, had Senator Barack Obama comfortably  
> ahead with an average margin of more than 8 percent. These same polls  
> showed no signs that Senator Hillary Clinton might close that gap, let  
> alone win.  
>  
> While it will take time for those who conducted the New Hampshire  
> tracking polls to undertake rigorous analyses of their surveys, a  
> number of things are immediately apparent.  
>  
> First, the problem was not a general failure of polling methodology.  
> These same pollsters did a superb job on the Republican side. Senator  
> John McCain won by 5.5 percent. The last wave of polls found a margin  
> of 5.3 percent. So whatever the problem was, it was specific to Mrs.  
> Clinton versus Mr. Obama.  
>  
> Second, the inaccuracies don't seem related to the subtleties of  
> polling methods. The pollsters who overestimated Mr. Obama's margin  
> ranged from CBS and Gallup (who have the most rigorous voter screens  
> and sampling designs, and have sterling records in presidential  
> elections) to local and computerized polling operations, whose methods  
> are a good deal less refined. Everyone got it wrong.  
>  
> Third, the mistakes were not the result of a last-minute trend going  
> Mrs. Clinton's way. Yes, according to exit polls the 17 percent of  
> voters who said they made their decision on Election Day chose Mrs.  
> Clinton a little more than those who decided in the past two or three  
> weeks. But the margin was very small - 39 percent of the late deciders  
> went for Mrs. Clinton and 36 percent went for Mr. Obama. This gap is  
> obviously too narrow to explain the wide lead for Mr. Obama that kept  
> showing up in pre-election polls.  
>  
> Fourth, some have argued that the unusually high turnout may have  
> caused a problem for the pollsters. It's possible, but unlikely. While  
> participation was higher than in past New Hampshire primaries, the  
> demographic and political profile of the vote remains largely  
> unchanged. In particular, the mix of Democrats to independents - 54  
> percent to 44 percent respectively - is close to what it was in 2000,  
> the most recent New Hampshire primary without an incumbent in the  
> race.  
>  
> To my mind all these factors deserve further study. But another  
> possible explanation cannot be ignored - the longstanding pattern of  
> pre-election polls overstating support for black candidates among  
> white voters, particularly white voters who are poor.  
>  
> In exploring this factor, it is useful to look closely at the nature  
> of the constituencies for the two candidates in New Hampshire, which  
> were divided along socio-economic lines.  
>  
> Mrs. Clinton beat Mr. Obama by 12 points (47 percent to 35 percent)  
> among those with family incomes below \$50,000. By contrast, Mr. Obama  
> beat Mrs. Clinton by five points (40 percent to 35 percent) among

> those earning more than \$50,000.  
>  
> There was an education gap, too. College graduates voted for Mr. Obama  
> 39 percent to 34 percent; Mrs. Clinton won among those who had never  
> attended college, 43 percent to 35 percent.  
>  
> Of course these are not the only patterns in Mrs. Clinton's support in  
> New Hampshire. Women rallied to her (something they did not do in  
> Iowa), while men leaned to Mr. Obama. Mrs. Clinton also got stronger  
> support from older voters, while Mr. Obama pulled in more support  
> among younger voters. But gender and age patterns tend not to be as  
> confounding to pollsters as race, which to my mind was a key reason  
> the polls got New Hampshire so wrong.  
>  
> Poorer, less well-educated white people refuse surveys more often than  
> affluent, better-educated whites. Polls generally adjust their samples  
> for this tendency. But here's the problem: these whites who do not  
> respond to surveys tend to have more unfavorable views of blacks than  
> respondents who do the interviews.  
>  
> I've experienced this myself. In 1989, as a Gallup pollster, I  
> overestimated the support for David Dinkins in his first race for New  
> York City mayor against Rudolph Giuliani; Mr. Dinkins was elected, but  
> with a two percentage point margin of victory, not the 15 I had  
> predicted. I concluded, eventually, that I got it wrong not so much  
> because respondents were lying to our interviewers but because poorer,  
> less well-educated voters were less likely to agree to answer our  
> questions. That was a decisive factor in my miscalculation.  
>  
> Certainly, we live in a different world today. The Pew Research Center  
> has conducted analyses of elections between candidates of different  
> races in 2006 and found that polls now do a much better job estimating  
> the support for black candidates than they did in the past. However,  
> the difficulties in interviewing the poor and the less well-educated  
> persist.  
>  
> Why didn't this problem come up in Iowa? My guess is that Mr. Obama  
> may have posed less of a threat to white voters in Iowa because he  
> wasn't yet the front-runner. Caucuses are also plainly different from  
> primaries.  
>  
> In New Hampshire, the ballots are still warm, so it's hard to pinpoint  
> the exact cause for the primary poll flop. But given the dearth of  
> obvious explanations, serious consideration has to be given to the  
> difficulties that race and class present to survey methodology.  
>  
> Andrew Kohut is the president of the Pew Research Center.  
>  
> -----  
> 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 this: set aapornet mail  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

--

---

Richard L. Clark, Ph.D.  
Survey Research Unit  
Governmental Services and Research Division  
Carl Vinson Institute of Government  
University of Georgia  
201 N. Milledge Avenue  
Athens, GA 30602  
Phone: 706-542-9404  
FAX: 706-542-9301

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET. 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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 10:09:16 -0500  
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: Race and New Hampshire  
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: 8bit

The NYT article by Andy Kohut deserves emphasis with regard to the possible impact of race on the New Hampshire polling debacle. Prior to February 8, I expected Obama to gain more than he would lose on the basis of race, and this may still be the case in South Carolina. But the pattern of results from New Hampshire makes it impossible to put aside the hypothesis of an important negative effect due to race, especially on less educated white voters.

There have been enormous changes in this country over the past half century--else Obama would not even be a realistic candidate--but this does not mean that every potential white voter has changed, especially given cohort effects from the past. With the large "undecided" proportion in the days before the vote (some of whom were genuinely undecided, some simply unwilling to confide in callers), movement away from Obama on the basis of race is a real possibility and one that needs open-minded investigation. Fortunately this is one hypothesis that can

be explored experimentally in upcoming Primaries, unlike many of the speculations about February 8 that are largely personal guesses.

The inability of highly educated journalists, pollsters, and AAPOR members even to entertain the hypothesis about race is itself a reflection of the correlation of racial antipathy with education (and its probable interaction with age) in this country. hs

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====  
Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 09:49:01 -0600

Reply-To: [amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU](mailto:amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU)

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

From: "Allan L. McCutcheon" <[amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU](mailto:amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU)>

Subject: Re: Race and New Hampshire

Comments: To: howard schuman <[hschuman@UMICH.EDU](mailto:hschuman@UMICH.EDU)>

Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

In-Reply-To: <[4786351C.4050405@umich.edu](mailto:4786351C.4050405@umich.edu)>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=UTF-8; DelSp="Yes"; format="flowed"

Content-Disposition: inline

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Andy Kohut's argument that race may have played a role certainly should be investigated, but there is reason to doubt that this is all (or even much) of the story.

First, Obama's (and Edwards') pre-election poll numbers were fairly consistent with their primary numbers. The only real surprise was with Clinton's "surprising" performance--though she had been polling well ahead of both Obama and Edwards just a few of weeks before.

The record turnout in voting in the Democratic primary included both more independents (disproportionately Obama supporters) and a startlingly 2/3's of registered Democrats (shameless plug, see my blog on "Polling by the Nubers" at <http://www.exit-poll.net/pbtn.html>).

Better educated, higher income Democrats have long supported the "change" candidates, while rank and file have a long history of supporting the more traditional (experienced?) candidate. Clinton's vote correlated with Kerry's vote from 2004, while Obama's vote correlated with Dean's vote from 2004. To suggest that what happened in NH somehow reflects race seems to ignore recent Democratic primary history.

Best,  
Allan



--  
Donald O. Clifton Chair of Survey Science  
Professor of Statistics &  
Survey Research and Methodology  
tel. +402.458.2036  
fax +402.458.2038

Quoting howard schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>:

> The NYT article by Andy Kohut deserves emphasis with regard to the  
> possible impact of race on the New Hampshire polling debacle. Prior to  
> February 8, I expected Obama to gain more than he would lose on the  
> basis of race, and this may still be the case in South Carolina. But  
> the pattern of results from New Hampshire makes it impossible to put  
> aside the hypothesis of an important negative effect due to race,  
> especially on less educated white voters.  
>  
> There have been enormous changes in this country over the past half  
> century--else Obama would not even be a realistic candidate--but  
> this does not mean that every potential white voter has changed,  
> especially given cohort effects from the past. With the large  
> "undecided" proportion in the days before the vote (some of whom  
> were genuinely undecided, some simply unwilling to confide in  
> callers), movement away from Obama on the basis of race is a real  
> possibility and one that needs open-minded investigation.  
> Fortunately this is one hypothesis that can be explored  
> experimentally in upcoming Primaries, unlike many of the  
> speculations about February 8 that are largely personal guesses.  
>  
> The inability of highly educated journalists, pollsters, and AAPOR  
> members even to entertain the hypothesis about race is itself a  
> reflection of the correlation of racial antipathy with education (and  
> its probable interaction with age) in this country. hs  
>  
> -----  
> 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 this: set aapornet mail  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> 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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 11:00:52 -0500  
Reply-To: David Wilson <[dcwilson@UDEL.EDU](mailto:dcwilson@UDEL.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>

From: David Wilson <dcwilson@UDEL.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Kohut  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
In-Reply-To: <478626AF.9000300@cviog.uga.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

What is especially interesting is how easily race can easily become a story, regardless of if it is or is not the "chief" factor. The AAPORNET discussion shows how we all have opinions related to race that don't take much elaboration (i.e., it's an easy, and emotional issue). Don't think the effect is unnoticed by the media; controversy sells and we (the public) buy...for whatever virtuous or sordid reasons we choose.

Just to add to the discussion/controversy. Since Obama's actual vote was within the MOE, let's also think about the public (phone conversations) vs. private (in the booth) psychological effects related to Clinton.

Social desirability associated with supporting/opposing political candidates are not limited to race. Streb et al. (2007) have a recent article in POQ dealing with gender related considerations. The effects they discuss are slightly reversed (from the NH outcome), but the effect is there nonetheless.

Matthew J. Streb, Barbara Burrell, Brian Frederick, Michael A. Genovese (2007) "Social Desirability Effects and Support for a Female American President." Public Opinion Quarterly.

Link: <http://poq.oxfordjournals.org/papbyrecent.dtl>

David

David C. Wilson  
Assistant Professor  
Department of Political Science &  
International Relations  
University of Delaware  
dcwilson@udel.edu

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Richard Clark  
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 9:08 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Kohut

I find the op ed by Andrew Kohut very interesting, but as the release yesterday from the Marist Poll points out, pollsters did not overestimate Obama's support, as suggested in this op ed; Sen. Clinton's support was underestimated.

We've neither had such a compacted primary schedule, with New Hampshire following so closely on the heels of the Iowa caucuses, nor have we seen such intense media coverage of the process (at least by my perception). New Hampshire residents polled over the weekend may have been as overwhelmed by the torrent of information (understandably), and it would take a couple days to sort things out.

--Rich Clark

Doug Henwood wrote:

> It does seem like everyone wants to get race off the hook - which, I  
> suppose, is part of Obama's appeal: we're all post-race now! I don't  
> think we are, but it's a pleasant fantasy. And Andrew Kohut doesn't  
> think so either.  
>  
> New York Times - January 10, 2008  
> <<http://www.nytimes.com/2008/01/10/opinion/10kohut.html>>  
>  
> Getting It Wrong  
> By ANDREW KOHUT  
> Washington  
>  
> THE failure of the New Hampshire pre-election surveys to mirror the  
> outcome of the Democratic race is one of the most significant miscues  
> in modern polling history. All the published polls, including those  
> that surveyed through Monday, had Senator Barack Obama comfortably  
> ahead with an average margin of more than 8 percent. These same polls  
> showed no signs that Senator Hillary Clinton might close that gap,  
> let alone win.  
>  
> While it will take time for those who conducted the New Hampshire  
> tracking polls to undertake rigorous analyses of their surveys, a  
> number of things are immediately apparent.  
>  
> First, the problem was not a general failure of polling methodology.  
> These same pollsters did a superb job on the Republican side. Senator  
> John McCain won by 5.5 percent. The last wave of polls found a margin  
> of 5.3 percent. So whatever the problem was, it was specific to Mrs.  
> Clinton versus Mr. Obama.  
>  
> Second, the inaccuracies don't seem related to the subtleties of  
> polling methods. The pollsters who overestimated Mr. Obama's margin  
> ranged from CBS and Gallup (who have the most rigorous voter screens  
> and sampling designs, and have sterling records in presidential  
> elections) to local and computerized polling operations, whose  
> methods are a good deal less refined. Everyone got it wrong.  
>  
> Third, the mistakes were not the result of a last-minute trend going  
> Mrs. Clinton's way. Yes, according to exit polls the 17 percent of  
> voters who said they made their decision on Election Day chose Mrs.  
> Clinton a little more than those who decided in the past two or three  
> weeks. But the margin was very small - 39 percent of the late  
> deciders went for Mrs. Clinton and 36 percent went for Mr. Obama.

> This gap is obviously too narrow to explain the wide lead for Mr.  
> Obama that kept showing up in pre-election polls.  
>  
> Fourth, some have argued that the unusually high turnout may have  
> caused a problem for the pollsters. It's possible, but unlikely.  
> While participation was higher than in past New Hampshire primaries,  
> the demographic and political profile of the vote remains largely  
> unchanged. In particular, the mix of Democrats to independents - 54  
> percent to 44 percent respectively - is close to what it was in 2000,  
> the most recent New Hampshire primary without an incumbent in the race.  
>  
> To my mind all these factors deserve further study. But another  
> possible explanation cannot be ignored - the longstanding pattern of  
> pre-election polls overstating support for black candidates among  
> white voters, particularly white voters who are poor.  
>  
> In exploring this factor, it is useful to look closely at the nature  
> of the constituencies for the two candidates in New Hampshire, which  
> were divided along socio-economic lines.  
>  
> Mrs. Clinton beat Mr. Obama by 12 points (47 percent to 35 percent)  
> among those with family incomes below \$50,000. By contrast, Mr. Obama  
> beat Mrs. Clinton by five points (40 percent to 35 percent) among  
> those earning more than \$50,000.  
>  
> There was an education gap, too. College graduates voted for Mr.  
> Obama 39 percent to 34 percent; Mrs. Clinton won among those who had  
> never attended college, 43 percent to 35 percent.  
>  
> Of course these are not the only patterns in Mrs. Clinton's support  
> in New Hampshire. Women rallied to her (something they did not do in  
> Iowa), while men leaned to Mr. Obama. Mrs. Clinton also got stronger  
> support from older voters, while Mr. Obama pulled in more support  
> among younger voters. But gender and age patterns tend not to be as  
> confounding to pollsters as race, which to my mind was a key reason  
> the polls got New Hampshire so wrong.  
>  
> Poorer, less well-educated white people refuse surveys more often  
> than affluent, better-educated whites. Polls generally adjust their  
> samples for this tendency. But here's the problem: these whites who  
> do not respond to surveys tend to have more unfavorable views of  
> blacks than respondents who do the interviews.  
>  
> I've experienced this myself. In 1989, as a Gallup pollster, I  
> overestimated the support for David Dinkins in his first race for New  
> York City mayor against Rudolph Giuliani; Mr. Dinkins was elected,  
> but with a two percentage point margin of victory, not the 15 I had  
> predicted. I concluded, eventually, that I got it wrong not so much  
> because respondents were lying to our interviewers but because  
> poorer, less well-educated voters were less likely to agree to answer  
> our questions. That was a decisive factor in my miscall.  
>  
> Certainly, we live in a different world today. The Pew Research  
> Center has conducted analyses of elections between candidates of

- > different races in 2006 and found that polls now do a much better job
- > estimating the support for black candidates than they did in the
- > past. However, the difficulties in interviewing the poor and the less
- > well-educated persist.
- >
- > Why didn't this problem come up in Iowa? My guess is that Mr. Obama
- > may have posed less of a threat to white voters in Iowa because he
- > wasn't yet the front-runner. Caucuses are also plainly different from
- > primaries.
- >
- > In New Hampshire, the ballots are still warm, so it's hard to
- > pinpoint the exact cause for the primary poll flop. But given the
- > dearth of obvious explanations, serious consideration has to be given
- > to the difficulties that race and class present to survey methodology.
- >
- > Andrew Kohut is the president of the Pew Research Center.
- >
- > -----
- > 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 this: set aapornet mail
- > Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
- > Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

--

---

Richard L. Clark, Ph.D.  
Survey Research Unit  
Governmental Services and Research Division  
Carl Vinson Institute of Government  
University of Georgia  
201 N. Milledge Avenue  
Athens, GA 30602  
Phone: 706-542-9404  
FAX: 706-542-9301

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 11:01:31 -0500

Reply-To: howard schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: howard schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>  
Subject: The Mutual Exclusiveness Fallacy  
Comments: To: aapor <aapornet@asu.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

It is perfectly possible that two or more forces created the NH debacle, e.g., some potential voters were suspicious of a black (of course, really black/white) candidate; some were attracted to Clinton's last minute humanized appeal; and some were both. The important point is: we need to investigate, not just speculate.

The notion that because the polls predicted Obama's final vote but not Clinton's somehow finesses the problem is not a viable path to take.

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 11:11:03 -0500  
Reply-To: John Mitchell <[john@BUZZBACK.COM](mailto:john@BUZZBACK.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: John Mitchell <[john@BUZZBACK.COM](mailto:john@BUZZBACK.COM)>  
Subject: Re: The Mutual Exclusiveness Fallacy  
Comments: To: howard schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Patients is almost ready, we are just rechecking.

John Mitchell  
Business Development  
BuzzBack  
646-278-7979

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

From: howard schuman [<mailto:hschuman@UMICH.EDU>]  
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 11:03 AM Eastern Standard Time  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: The Mutual Exclusiveness Fallacy

It is perfectly possible that two or more forces created the NH debacle, =  
e.g., some potential voters were suspicious of a black (of course,=20  
really black/white) candidate; some were attracted to Clinton's last=20  
minute humanized appeal; and some were both. The important point is: we=20

need to investigate, not just speculate.

The notion that because the polls predicted Obama's final vote but not=20 Clinton's somehow finesses the problem is not a viable path to take.

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 11:13:15 -0500  
Reply-To: John Mitchell <[john@BUZZBACK.COM](mailto:john@BUZZBACK.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: John Mitchell <[john@BUZZBACK.COM](mailto:john@BUZZBACK.COM)>  
Subject: Re: The Mutual Exclusiveness Fallacy  
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

Sorry about that. Hit reply to the wrong email!

John Mitchell  
Business Development  
BuzzBack  
646-278-7979

-----Original Message-----  
From: John Mitchell [<mailto:john@BUZZBACK.COM>]  
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 11:12 AM Eastern Standard Time  
To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Subject: Re: The Mutual Exclusiveness Fallacy

Patients is almost ready, we are just rechecking.

John Mitchell  
Business Development  
BuzzBack  
646-278-7979

-----Original Message-----  
From: howard schuman [<mailto:hschuman@UMICH.EDU>]

Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 11:03 AM Eastern Standard Time  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: The Mutual Exclusiveness Fallacy

It is perfectly possible that two or more forces created the NH debacle, =

e.g., some potential voters were suspicious of a black (of course,=20 really black/white) candidate; some were attracted to Clinton's last=20 minute humanized appeal; and some were both. The important point is: we=20 need to investigate, not just speculate.

The notion that because the polls predicted Obama's final vote but not=20 Clinton's somehow finesses the problem is not a viable path to take.

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 11:17:45 -0500  
Reply-To: Andrew A Beveridge <[aabeveridge@GMAIL.COM](mailto:aabeveridge@GMAIL.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Andrew A Beveridge <[aabeveridge@GMAIL.COM](mailto:aabeveridge@GMAIL.COM)>  
Subject: Re: The Mutual Exclusiveness Fallacy  
Comments: To: howard schuman <[hschuman@UMICH.EDU](mailto:hschuman@UMICH.EDU)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[4786415B.9090800@umich.edu](mailto:4786415B.9090800@umich.edu)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Dear All:

A slight elaboration upon the Kohut-Schuman hypothesis would be (and I think



the comparison of the exit poll returns bears this out to some extent) is that Hillary was seen as under attack by the media for "tearing-up" and for the way she was pummeled in the debate, so women, especially older women, may have come back to Hillary. Often in politics one tries not to pull-out your opposition, and the way the campaign went in NH with the debate and the media saying she was not eligible to be President because she had teared-up may have been seen by some older women (do we dare still call them feminists?) as an attack on the advancement of women.

For instance, I live with such a woman, who was incensed by the way this was spun by the media. (She is an Obama supporter, or was.) NOW supports Hillary for just the reason that she would be the first woman President.

When considering the less education, less well-off white Dems in NH, the men among them might prefer a woman to a somewhat black man.

I hope the polls can be analyzed, as Langer and Kohut indicate, without getting into the defensiveness (after all there is money at stake) that is more the province of a trade association (c.f., the MRA response.)

Did anybody else see Zogby on the Daily Show, by the way?

Andy Beveridge

Andrew A. Beveridge  
Prof of Sociology Queens College and Grad Ctr CUNY  
Chair Queens College Sociology Dept  
Office: 718-997-2848  
Email: [andrew.beveridge@qc.cuny.edu](mailto:andrew.beveridge@qc.cuny.edu)  
252A Powdermaker Hall  
65-30 Kissena Blvd  
Flushing, NY 11367-1597  
[www.socialexplorer.com](http://www.socialexplorer.com)

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of howard schuman  
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 11:02 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: The Mutual Exclusiveness Fallacy

It is perfectly possible that two or more forces created the NH debacle, e.g., some potential voters were suspicious of a black (of course, really black/white) candidate; some were attracted to Clinton's last minute humanized appeal; and some were both. The important point is: we need to investigate, not just speculate.

The notion that because the polls predicted Obama's final vote but not Clinton's somehow finesses the problem is not a viable path to take.

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail Please ask authors before  
quoting outside AAPORNET.  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 08:34:23 -0800  
Reply-To: Phil Trounstine <[phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU](mailto:phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Phil Trounstine <[phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU](mailto:phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU)>  
Subject: NH, Kohut, etc.  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[033131AB4310364FB652738936135D00D1384D@exchange.hypotenuse.com](mailto:033131AB4310364FB652738936135D00D1384D@exchange.hypotenuse.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Andrew Kohut makes an interesting and informative argument. And I am not  
one to argue that we live in a post-racial world. If there's a race effect  
happening, I want to know about it. My caution is not about trying to make  
a utopian argument. Only that we should have some facts before we suggest  
that there's a race effect happening in a Democratic primary. Re. Mr.  
Kohut's article:

1. His experience in New York was in a general election, not a primary.

Have we ever seen hidden racial voting in a Democratic primary?

2. Obama's vote was not over-estimated; Clinton's vote was under-estimated.

3. He says "Poorer, less well-educated white people refuse surveys more often than affluent, better-educated whites. Polls generally adjust their samples for this tendency." This argues that surveys may not have included adequate numbers of some voters (but not very many, I suspect) more likely to vote for Clinton. But this is not evidence, per se, of some hidden racial effect. To prove that, wouldn't we have to know the difference in

racial attitudes among respondents and non-respondents in this cohort? Otherwise, the argument would suggest, without evidence, that poor, less-educated whites who intended to vote for Clinton systematically refused to participate in surveys but did turn out to vote. Not only would that seem not to provide enough votes, but it's a lot further-fetched than other, more logical explanations, like a significant post-survey shift among undecideds, a break to Clinton among women, more independents than predicted taking GOP ballots (to help McCain), and what we might call the Right-to-Rebel Effect of New Hampshire voters in the face of a media avalanche for Obama.

---

Philip J. Trounstine, Director  
Survey and Policy Research Institute  
at San Jose State University  
408-924-6993

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 10:35:43 -0600  
Reply-To: [rday@rdresearch.com](mailto:rday@rdresearch.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Richard Day <[rday@RDRESEARCH.COM](mailto:rday@RDRESEARCH.COM)>  
Organization: Richard Day Research  
Subject: Re: Race and New Hampshire  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <20080110094901.ryl6l1holc4o088s@wm-imp-2.unl.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The preelection polls in IA understated the Obama vote by about 10% and then NH overestimated it by about 10%, My review tells me the following:

in the preelection polling one can only guess who will vote and they underestimated the first time voters in IA (nearly a doubling of the turnout compared to '04 in the Dem caucus) Then in NH they overestimated the first time voters (about a 33% turnout increase).

Obama's base is new voters and Independents.... Then factor in McCain. He was no factor in IA so the Independents largely went to Obama. In NH McCain was a large presence

costing Obama votes.

The more "regular " the vote and turn out the better for Clinton.

There was also the Obama bounce from IA that began to settle right before the election but tracking polls can't fully capture such last "minute" swings.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Allan L. McCutcheon  
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 9:49 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Race and New Hampshire

Andy Kohut's argument that race may have played a role certainly should be investigated, but there is reason to doubt that this is all (or even much) of the story.

First, Obama's (and Edwards') pre-election poll numbers were were fairly consistent with their primary numbers. The only real surprise was with Clinton's "surprising" performance--though she had been polling well ahead of both Obama and Edwards just a few of weeks before.

The record turnout in voting in the Democratic primary included both more independents (disproportionately Obama supporters) and a startlingly 2/3's of registered Democrats (shameless plug, see my blog on "Polling by the Nubers" at <http://www.exit-poll.net/pbtn.html>).

Better educated, higher income Democrats have long supported the "change" candidates, while rank and file have a long history of supporting the more traditional (experienced?) candidate. Clinton's vote correlated with Kerry's vote from 2004, while Obama's vote correlated with Dean's vote from 2004. To suggest that what happened in NH somehow reflects race seems to ignore recent Democratic primary history.

Best,  
Allan

--

Donald O. Clifton Chair of Survey Science Professor of Statistics & Survey Research and Methodology tel. +402.458.2036  
fax +402.458.2038

Quoting howard schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>:

> The NYT article by Andy Kohut deserves emphasis with regard to the  
> possible impact of race on the New Hampshire polling debacle. Prior to  
> February 8, I expected Obama to gain more than he would lose on the  
> basis of race, and this may still be the case in South Carolina. But  
> the pattern of results from New Hampshire makes it impossible to put  
> aside the hypothesis of an important negative effect due to race,  
> especially on less educated white voters.

>  
> There have been enormous changes in this country over the past half  
> century--else Obama would not even be a realistic candidate--but  
> this does not mean that every potential white voter has changed,  
> especially given cohort effects from the past. With the large  
> "undecided" proportion in the days before the vote (some of whom  
> were genuinely undecided, some simply unwilling to confide in  
> callers), movement away from Obama on the basis of race is a real  
> possibility and one that needs open-minded investigation.  
> Fortunately this is one hypothesis that can be explored  
> experimentally in upcoming Primaries, unlike many of the  
> speculations about February 8 that are largely personal guesses.  
>  
> The inability of highly educated journalists, pollsters, and AAPOR  
> members even to entertain the hypothesis about race is itself a  
> reflection of the correlation of racial antipathy with education (and  
> its probable interaction with age) in this country.   hs  
>  
> -----  
> 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 this: set aapornet mail  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> 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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 10:44:52 -0600  
Reply-To: Nancy Mathiowetz <[nancym2@UWM.EDU](mailto:nancym2@UWM.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nancy Mathiowetz <[nancym2@UWM.EDU](mailto:nancym2@UWM.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Kohut  
Comments: To: David Wilson <[dcwilson@UDEL.EDU](mailto:dcwilson@UDEL.EDU)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[000101c853a1\\$f9f6a4b0\\$ede3ee10\\$@edu](mailto:000101c853a1$f9f6a4b0$ede3ee10$@edu)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Please note that the article referenced by David, as well as two others that have appeared in POQ on the issue of race and pre-election polling, are now available on the AAPOR web site for the general public to access:

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

Nancy

Quoting David Wilson <dcwilson@UDEL.EDU>:

> What is especially interesting is how easily race can easily become a story,  
> regardless of if it is or is not the "chief" factor. The AAPORNET discussion  
> shows how we all have opinions related to race that don't take much  
> elaboration (i.e., it's an easy, and emotional issue). Don't think the  
> effect is unnoticed by the media; controversy sells and we (the public)  
> buy...for whatever virtuous or sordid reasons we choose.

>  
> Just to add to the discussion/controversy. Since Obama's actual vote was  
> within the MOE, let's also think about the public (phone conversations) vs.  
> private (in the booth) psychological effects related to Clinton.

>  
> Social desirability associated with supporting/opposing political candidates  
> are not limited to race. Streb et al. (2007) have a recent article in POQ  
> dealing with gender related considerations. The effects they discuss are  
> slightly reversed (from the NH outcome), but the effect is there  
> nonetheless.

>  
> Matthew J. Streb, Barbara Burrell, Brian Frederick, Michael A. Genovese  
> (2007) "Social Desirability Effects and Support for a Female American  
> President." Public Opinion Quarterly.

> Link: <http://poq.oxfordjournals.org/papbyrecent.dtl>

> David

> David C. Wilson  
> Assistant Professor  
> Department of Political Science &  
> International Relations  
> University of Delaware  
> [dcwilson@udel.edu](mailto:dcwilson@udel.edu)

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

> From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Richard Clark  
> Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 9:08 AM  
> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
> Subject: Re: Kohut

>

> I find the op ed by Andrew Kohut very interesting, but as the release  
> yesterday from the Marist Poll points out, pollsters did not  
> overestimate Obama's support, as suggested in this op ed; Sen. Clinton's  
> support was underestimated.  
>  
>  
> We've neither had such a compacted primary schedule, with New Hampshire  
> following so closely on the heels of the Iowa caucuses, nor have we seen  
> such intense media coverage of the process (at least by my perception).  
> New Hampshire residents polled over the weekend may have been as  
> overwhelmed by the torrent of information (understandably), and it would  
> take a couple days to sort things out.

>  
>  
> --Rich Clark

> Doug Henwood wrote:

>> It does seem like everyone wants to get race off the hook - which, I  
>> suppose, is part of Obama's appeal: we're all post-race now! I don't  
>> think we are, but it's a pleasant fantasy. And Andrew Kohut doesn't  
>> think so either.

>>  
>> New York Times - January 10, 2008  
>> <<http://www.nytimes.com/2008/01/10/opinion/10kohut.html>>

>>  
>> Getting It Wrong  
>> By ANDREW KOHUT  
>> Washington

>>  
>> THE failure of the New Hampshire pre-election surveys to mirror the  
>> outcome of the Democratic race is one of the most significant miscues  
>> in modern polling history. All the published polls, including those  
>> that surveyed through Monday, had Senator Barack Obama comfortably  
>> ahead with an average margin of more than 8 percent. These same polls  
>> showed no signs that Senator Hillary Clinton might close that gap,  
>> let alone win.

>>  
>> While it will take time for those who conducted the New Hampshire  
>> tracking polls to undertake rigorous analyses of their surveys, a  
>> number of things are immediately apparent.

>>  
>> First, the problem was not a general failure of polling methodology.  
>> These same pollsters did a superb job on the Republican side. Senator  
>> John McCain won by 5.5 percent. The last wave of polls found a margin  
>> of 5.3 percent. So whatever the problem was, it was specific to Mrs.  
>> Clinton versus Mr. Obama.

>>  
>> Second, the inaccuracies don't seem related to the subtleties of  
>> polling methods. The pollsters who overestimated Mr. Obama's margin  
>> ranged from CBS and Gallup (who have the most rigorous voter screens  
>> and sampling designs, and have sterling records in presidential  
>> elections) to local and computerized polling operations, whose  
>> methods are a good deal less refined. Everyone got it wrong.

>>

>> Third, the mistakes were not the result of a last-minute trend going  
>> Mrs. Clinton's way. Yes, according to exit polls the 17 percent of  
>> voters who said they made their decision on Election Day chose Mrs.  
>> Clinton a little more than those who decided in the past two or three  
>> weeks. But the margin was very small - 39 percent of the late  
>> deciders went for Mrs. Clinton and 36 percent went for Mr. Obama.  
>> This gap is obviously too narrow to explain the wide lead for Mr.  
>> Obama that kept showing up in pre-election polls.  
>>  
>> Fourth, some have argued that the unusually high turnout may have  
>> caused a problem for the pollsters. It's possible, but unlikely.  
>> While participation was higher than in past New Hampshire primaries,  
>> the demographic and political profile of the vote remains largely  
>> unchanged. In particular, the mix of Democrats to independents - 54  
>> percent to 44 percent respectively - is close to what it was in 2000,  
>> the most recent New Hampshire primary without an incumbent in the race.  
>>  
>> To my mind all these factors deserve further study. But another  
>> possible explanation cannot be ignored - the longstanding pattern of  
>> pre-election polls overstating support for black candidates among  
>> white voters, particularly white voters who are poor.  
>>  
>> In exploring this factor, it is useful to look closely at the nature  
>> of the constituencies for the two candidates in New Hampshire, which  
>> were divided along socio-economic lines.  
>>  
>> Mrs. Clinton beat Mr. Obama by 12 points (47 percent to 35 percent)  
>> among those with family incomes below \$50,000. By contrast, Mr. Obama  
>> beat Mrs. Clinton by five points (40 percent to 35 percent) among  
>> those earning more than \$50,000.  
>>  
>> There was an education gap, too. College graduates voted for Mr.  
>> Obama 39 percent to 34 percent; Mrs. Clinton won among those who had  
>> never attended college, 43 percent to 35 percent.  
>>  
>> Of course these are not the only patterns in Mrs. Clinton's support  
>> in New Hampshire. Women rallied to her (something they did not do in  
>> Iowa), while men leaned to Mr. Obama. Mrs. Clinton also got stronger  
>> support from older voters, while Mr. Obama pulled in more support  
>> among younger voters. But gender and age patterns tend not to be as  
>> confounding to pollsters as race, which to my mind was a key reason  
>> the polls got New Hampshire so wrong.  
>>  
>> Poorer, less well-educated white people refuse surveys more often  
>> than affluent, better-educated whites. Polls generally adjust their  
>> samples for this tendency. But here's the problem: these whites who  
>> do not respond to surveys tend to have more unfavorable views of  
>> blacks than respondents who do the interviews.  
>>  
>> I've experienced this myself. In 1989, as a Gallup pollster, I  
>> overestimated the support for David Dinkins in his first race for New  
>> York City mayor against Rudolph Giuliani; Mr. Dinkins was elected,  
>> but with a two percentage point margin of victory, not the 15 I had  
>> predicted. I concluded, eventually, that I got it wrong not so much



>> because respondents were lying to our interviewers but because  
>> poorer, less well-educated voters were less likely to agree to answer  
>> our questions. That was a decisive factor in my miscall.  
>>  
>> Certainly, we live in a different world today. The Pew Research  
>> Center has conducted analyses of elections between candidates of  
>> different races in 2006 and found that polls now do a much better job  
>> estimating the support for black candidates than they did in the  
>> past. However, the difficulties in interviewing the poor and the less  
>> well-educated persist.  
>>  
>> Why didn't this problem come up in Iowa? My guess is that Mr. Obama  
>> may have posed less of a threat to white voters in Iowa because he  
>> wasn't yet the front-runner. Caucuses are also plainly different from  
>> primaries.  
>>  
>> In New Hampshire, the ballots are still warm, so it's hard to  
>> pinpoint the exact cause for the primary poll flop. But given the  
>> dearth of obvious explanations, serious consideration has to be given  
>> to the difficulties that race and class present to survey methodology.  
>>  
>> Andrew Kohut is the president of the Pew Research Center.  
>>  
>> -----  
>> 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 this: set aapornet mail  
>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>  
> --  
>  
> -----  
> Richard L. Clark, Ph.D.  
> Survey Research Unit  
> Governmental Services and Research Division  
> Carl Vinson Institute of Government  
> University of Georgia  
> 201 N. Milledge Avenue  
> Athens, GA 30602  
> Phone: 706-542-9404  
> FAX: 706-542-9301  
>  
> -----  
> 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 this: set aapornet mail  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> 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 this: set aapornet mail  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu  
>

--

Nancy A. Mathiowetz  
President, American Association for Public Opinion Research  
www.aapor.org

Chair, Sociology Department  
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee  
Room 778 Bolton Hall  
P.O. Box 413  
Milwaukee, WI 53201  
Voice: 414-229-2216

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

=====  
Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 11:52:53 -0500  
Reply-To: [allenbarton@mindspring.com](mailto:allenbarton@mindspring.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Allen Barton <[allenbarton@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:allenbarton@MINDSPRING.COM)>  
Subject: Re: NH, Kohut, etc.  
Comments: To: Phil Trounstine <[phil.trounstine@sjsu.edu](mailto:phil.trounstine@sjsu.edu)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

If the vote for Obama was not underestimated, but Clinton's was, what categories were OVER-estimated? Her "additional" votes must have told the polls something else - what?

> [Original Message]  
> From: Phil Trounstine <[phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU](mailto:phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU)>  
> To: <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
> Date: 1/10/2008 11:35:10 AM  
> Subject: NH, Kohut, etc.  
>  
> Andrew Kohut makes an interesting and informative argument. And I am not  
> one to argue that we live in a post-racial world. If there's a race effect  
> happening, I want to know about it. My caution is not about trying to make  
> a utopian argument. Only that we should have some facts before we suggest  
> that there's a race effect happening in a Democratic primary. Re. Mr.  
> Kohut's article:  
>

- > 1. His experience in New York was in a general election, not a primary.
- > Have we ever seen hidden racial voting in a Democratic primary?
- >
- > 2. Obama's vote was not over-estimated; Clinton's vote was under-estimated.
- >
- > 3. He says "Poorer, less well-educated white people refuse surveys more often than affluent, better-educated whites. Polls generally adjust their samples for this tendency." This argues that surveys may not have included adequate numbers of some voters (but not very many, I suspect) more likely to vote for Clinton. But this is not evidence, per se, of some hidden racial effect. To prove that, wouldn't we have to know the difference in racial attitudes among respondents and non-respondents in this cohort? Otherwise, the argument would suggest, without evidence, that poor, less-educated whites who intended to vote for Clinton systematically refused to participate in surveys but did turn out to vote. Not only would that seem not to provide enough votes, but it's a lot further-fetched than other, more logical explanations, like a significant post-survey a shift among undecideds, a break to Clinton among women, more independents than predicted taking GOP ballots (to help McCain), and what we might call the Right-to-Rebel Effect of New Hampshire voters in the face of a media avalanche for Obama.

---

> Philip J. Trounstine, Director  
> Survey and Policy Research Institute  
> at San Jose State University  
> 408-924-6993

- 
- > 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 this: set aapornet mail
  - > Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
  - > 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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 12:10:54 -0500  
Reply-To: Joel Bloom <[joeldbloom@GMAIL.COM](mailto:joeldbloom@GMAIL.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Joel Bloom <[joeldbloom@GMAIL.COM](mailto:joeldbloom@GMAIL.COM)>  
Subject: OK, so it wasn't the write-ins  
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  
Content-Disposition: inline

Since I put this idea out there, it's my responsibility to put out the correction/retraction:

Obama did get more Republican write-ins than Clinton, but just barely:

Final Republican New Hampshire Vote, including all write-ins (source: <http://www.sos.nh.gov/presprim2008/rpressum.htm>)

McCain 88570 37.07% Romney 75546 31.62% Huckabee 26859 11.24% Giuliani 20439 8.55% Paul 18307 7.66% Thompson 2890 1.21% Other Republicans 2011 0.84% Obama 1665 0.70% Clinton 1593 0.67% Edwards 633 0.26% Other Democrats 211 0.09% Other, Scattered 191 0.08% Total 238915 100.00%

In comparison, by the way, Republicans received far fewer write-in votes in the Democratic primary, both in raw numbers and as a percentage. The top Republican vote-getters were McCain (788), Romney (510), Paul (229), Huckabee (209), and Giuliani (134). Combined, all Republicans received 1,889 write-in votes, or 0.66%, compared to 4,102 Democratic candidates written in on the Republican side, or 1.72%. (Source: <http://www.sos.nh.gov/presprim2008/dpressum.htm>)

But again, none of this could in any way, shape or form have had anything to do with the polling problems.

At this point I would guess the polling errors were caused by a combination of factors, in order of importance:

- Missing the late Clinton surge because of not calling (or not calling enough) after Sunday;
- Late deciders (especially primary day deciders) breaking for Clinton;
- Independents not tilting as heavily toward the Democratic primary as expected;
- Weighting down the women too much from their apparent 57% in the Democratic primary electorate (although this wouldn't account for much more than one percentage point);
- The misnamed "Bradley Effect" (OK, let's call it the "Dinkins/Wilder Effect"); again, I wouldn't expect this to be much more than a percentage point.

So what is there to learn from this? Who knows? Sometimes voters change their mind rapidly in primaries. It happens. Yes, more pollsters could have continued calling on Monday -- that's probably a good idea. But there is clearly no justification for calling on primary day itself; that would be absurd. So maybe having the final poll be Sunday/Monday would be a good idea, with enough Monday respondents to detect any very late movement -- and if there is, include that in the report, with the appropriate caveats about sample size, one-day results and sampling error.

But parts of this just fall into the category of things over which we have no control. Guessing the percentage of independents in each party's primary? At best it's an educated guess, but there's no getting around the fact that we have to do it. Guessing the percentage of women/men so that we can weight for the fact that all telephone polls underrepresent men and overrepresent

women? Again, we have to do it, but it's at best an educated guess. In a year like this with an extraordinary turnout, our educated guesses have less to go on than usual, so things like this could have caused larger error than usual.

For the most part, though, I think the polls pretty accurately captured voter intentions through Saturday, which for most elections is good enough. The suggestion that polling isn't good at predicting election results goes way beyond the evidence; overall the vast preponderance of evidence, presented over a period of decades by a great many eminent scholars, shows that we do a pretty good job, or even a very good job.

So my only suggestion is to have the final polls include Monday, or for polls that already include Monday, include larger sub-samples from Monday. Other than that, let's relax and keep on doing what we do.

Cheers!

-- Joel

--

Joel David Bloom, Ph.D.  
The University at Albany, SUNY

Research Assistant Professor, Dept. of Political Science  
Associate Director, Office of Institutional Research  
Phone: (518) 437-4791  
Cell: 541-579-6610  
E-mail: [jbloom@albany.edu](mailto:jbloom@albany.edu)  
Web: <http://www.albany.edu/ir/>

---

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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 12:15:57 -0500  
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: Race and New Hampshire  
Comments: To: [aapornet](mailto:aapornet) [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[4786351C.4050405@umich.edu](mailto:4786351C.4050405@umich.edu)>  
Mime-Version: 1.0 (Apple Message framework v752.2)  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII; delsp=yes; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

On Jan 10, 2008, at 10:09 AM, howard schuman wrote:

> The inability of highly educated journalists, pollsters, and AAPOR  
> members even to entertain the hypothesis about race is itself a

> reflection of the correlation of racial antipathy with education  
> (and its probable interaction with age) in this country.

But it's also a key to Obama's appeal: upscale voters, and those are his people, love to hear a black guy saying that race doesn't matter anymore. It makes them feel good about themselves, and they can stop thinking about the whole thing, which makes them uncomfortable.

Hillary's appeal to the downscale is a remarkable thing. A friend who does organizing for the Working Families Party in New York said that despite his personal distaste for her DLC-style politics, the Party had to endorse her because so many of their black members and staffers adore her. And in NH, she carried the under-\$50,000 HHs by a wide margin. I don't really get why. Her politics aren't terribly redistributionist - Edwards is to her left, and should have more appeal on policy terms. Does anyone have any insights on this?

Doug Henwood  
Left Business Observer  
38 Greene St - 4th fl.  
New York NY 10013-2505 USA  
<dhenwood@panix.com>  
<<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>>

voice +1-212-219-0010  
cell +1-917-865-2813

producer, Behind the News  
Thursdays, 5-6 PM, WBAI, New York 99.5 FM  
<<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Radio.html>>  
podcast: <<http://shout.lbo-talk.org/lbo/radio-feed.php>>  
iTunes: <<http://phobos.apple.com/WebObjects/MZStore.woa/wa/viewPodcast?id=73801817>>

-----  
download my book Wall Street (for free!) at  
<<http://www.wallstreetthebook.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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 12:23:42 -0500  
Reply-To: David Moore <[dmoore62@COMCAST.NET](mailto:dmoore62@COMCAST.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: David Moore <[dmoore62@COMCAST.NET](mailto:dmoore62@COMCAST.NET)>  
Subject: Re: NH, Kohut, etc.

Comments: To: Phil Trounstine <phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
In-Reply-To: <OF47E70433.15F7A228-ON882573CC.005B0A19-882573CC.005B0A27@sjsu.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Phil Trounstine's comments cut to the heart of the race argument. There is no social desirability factor in a primary that might produce an over-estimate of Obama's support (which, as Phil notes, did not occur in NH anyway). In the case of Dinkins in NY and Wilder in VA, it was assumed that Democrats did not want to admit they wouldn't vote for their own party's nominee, causing polls to overestimate these candidates' support. In a primary, that "problem" does not exist, since there's no group that would be assumed in favor of Obama.

A note: In his NYT article, Andy cites his experience with polls on David Dinkins in 1989 that now lead him to suspect a race factor in NH. Four years after that, in 1993, was Dinkins' re-election run, and in that campaign I was responsible for overseeing Gallup's polling. That year, Gallup was right on the exact percentages -- showing Dinkins losing to Giuliani -- and suggesting that voters were willing to tell the truth about their vote intentions, regardless of the race of the candidate. Also, from what I understand, there has never been a problem with polls on over-estimating Obama's support before this election, so to assume there is one now is a bit of a leap (especially, since the polls in NH did not overestimate Obama's support anyway).

The polls all underestimated Clinton's support, giving rise to perhaps a new phenomenon, the Hillary Factor, that competes with the old Bradley/Dinkins/Wilder factor...but in reverse: People who don't want to admit (in a poll) they are going to vote for a woman, but do so anyway. Now THAT's something we can all mull over ad infinitum...or just accept the easier explanation that many NH voters were simply undecided and were highly influenced in their late decisions by the events that occurred in the last 48 hours before the New Hampshire Primary.

David

David W. Moore, Ph.D.  
Senior Fellow, The Carsey Institute  
73 Main Street, Huddleston Hall  
The University of New Hampshire  
Durham, NH 03824

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Phil Trounstine  
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 11:34 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: NH, Kohut, etc.

Andrew Kohut makes an interesting and informative argument. And I am not one to argue that we live in a post-racial world. If there's a race effect happening, I want to know about it. My caution is not about trying to make a utopian argument. Only that we should have some facts before we suggest that there's a race effect happening in a Democratic primary. Re. Mr. Kohut's article:

1. His experience in New York was in a general election, not a primary. Have we ever seen hidden racial voting in a Democratic primary?
2. Obama's vote was not over-estimated; Clinton's vote was under-estimated.
3. He says "Poorer, less well-educated white people refuse surveys more often than affluent, better-educated whites. Polls generally adjust their samples for this tendency." This argues that surveys may not have included adequate numbers of some voters (but not very many, I suspect) more likely to vote for Clinton. But this is not evidence, per se, of some hidden racial effect. To prove that, wouldn't we have to know the difference in racial attitudes among respondents and non-respondents in this cohort? Otherwise, the argument would suggest, without evidence, that poor, less-educated whites who intended to vote for Clinton systematically refused to participate in surveys but did turn out to vote. Not only would that seem not to provide enough votes, but it's a lot further-fetched than other, more logical explanations, like a significant post-survey a shift among undecideds, a break to Clinton among women, more independents than predicted taking GOP ballots (to help McCain), and what we might call the Right-to-Rebel Effect of New Hampshire voters in the face of a media avalanche for Obama.

---

Philip J. Trounstine, Director  
Survey and Policy Research Institute  
at San Jose State University  
408-924-6993

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 12:39:51 -0500  
Reply-To: "Murray, Patrick" <[pdmurray@MONMOUTH.EDU](mailto:pdmurray@MONMOUTH.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Murray, Patrick" <[pdmurray@MONMOUTH.EDU](mailto:pdmurray@MONMOUTH.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: NH, Kohut, etc.



Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
In-Reply-To: A<OF47E70433.15F7A228-ON882573CC.005B0A19-882573CC.005B0A27@sjsu.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I side with Phil's caution here.

What most worries me is Andy's statement that non respondents are more racist than their comparable respondents, i.e. "whites who do not respond to surveys tend to have more unfavorable views of blacks than respondents who do the interviews." I'm unaware of the literature on this type of relationship between respondents and non-respondents of the same social class (and I understand you can't add bibliography to a NYT Op-Ed -- so anyone who has the citations, please share).

I just re-ran some numbers from a poll I did in the fall in New Jersey which included both primary questions and questions on immigration. Admittedly it's not race and it is New Jersey, but...

Among all white adults in the NJ general pop sample, the unweighted opinion on immigration was 33% positive to 46% negative. And sure enough, whites who did not attend college had more negative views on immigration than most other age/education groups. But of course those groups were up-weighted (since they tend to be more non-responsive). Now, some of this negativity towards non-whites dissipates when I just look at the results for white, less educated likely Democratic primary voters -- but not by a huge amount, and at any rate you would expect that when you exclude white respondents who are Republican or don't vote from the analysis.

In the end, I'm just having a hard time buying the argument that the group of white, less-educated, Democratic, likely voters that choose NOT to participate in my polls are \*significantly\* more racist than the group of white, less-educated, Democratic, likely voters who do.

Patrick Murray  
Director  
Polling Institute  
Monmouth University  
West Long Branch, NJ 07764-1898  
ph: (732) 263-5858  
fx: (732) 263-5859  
[www.monmouth.edu/polling](http://www.monmouth.edu/polling)

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Phil Trounstine  
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 11:34 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: NH, Kohut, etc.

Andrew Kohut makes an interesting and informative argument. And I am not

one to argue that we live in a post-racial world. If there's a race effect happening, I want to know about it. My caution is not about trying to make a utopian argument. Only that we should have some facts before we suggest that there's a race effect happening in a Democratic primary. Re. Mr. Kohut's article:

1. His experience in New York was in a general election, not a primary. Have we ever seen hidden racial voting in a Democratic primary?
2. Obama's vote was not over-estimated; Clinton's vote was under-estimated.
3. He says "Poorer, less well-educated white people refuse surveys more often than affluent, better-educated whites. Polls generally adjust their samples for this tendency." This argues that surveys may not have included adequate numbers of some voters (but not very many, I suspect) more likely to vote for Clinton. But this is not evidence, per se, of some hidden racial effect. To prove that, wouldn't we have to know the difference in racial attitudes among respondents and non-respondents in this cohort? Otherwise, the argument would suggest, without evidence, that poor, less-educated whites who intended to vote for Clinton systematically refused to participate in surveys but did turn out to vote. Not only would that seem not to provide enough votes, but it's a lot further-fetched than other, more logical explanations, like a significant post-survey a shift among undecideds, a break to Clinton among women, more independents than predicted taking GOP ballots (to help McCain), and what we might call the Right-to-Rebel Effect of New Hampshire voters in the face of a media avalanche for Obama.

---

Philip J. Trounstine, Director  
Survey and Policy Research Institute  
at San Jose State University  
408-924-6993

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 11:41:52 -0600  
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>  
Subject: Re: NH, Kohut, etc.  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
In-Reply-To: <OF47E70433.15F7A228-ON882573CC.005B0A19-882573CC.005B0A27@sjsu.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

1. Has this theoretical effect been observed in this century, or even after 1992?  
Since then, there are even more African-Americans running for office.

2. In 1992 and earlier, was this effect observed anywhere outside of urban areas and states?

Nick

Phil Trounstine wrote:

>Andrew Kohut makes an interesting and informative argument. And I am not  
>one to argue that we live in a post-racial world. If there's a race effect  
>happening, I want to know about it. My caution is not about trying to make  
>a utopian argument. Only that we should have some facts before we suggest  
>that there's a race effect happening in a Democratic primary. Re. Mr.  
>Kohut's article:  
>  
>1. His experience in New York was in a general election, not a primary.  
>Have we ever seen hidden racial voting in a Democratic primary?  
>  
>2. Obama's vote was not over-estimated; Clinton's vote was under-estimated.  
>  
>3. He says "Poorer, less well-educated white people refuse surveys more  
>often than affluent, better-educated whites. Polls generally adjust their  
>samples for this tendency." This argues that surveys may not have included  
>adequate numbers of some voters (but not very many, I suspect) more likely  
>to vote for Clinton. But this is not evidence, per se, of some hidden  
>racial effect. To prove that, wouldn't we have to know the difference in  
>racial attitudes among respondents and non-respondents in this cohort?  
>Otherwise, the argument would suggest, without evidence, that poor,  
>less-educated whites who intended to vote for Clinton systematically  
>refused to participate in surveys but did turn out to vote. Not only would  
>that seem not to provide enough votes, but it's a lot further-fetched than  
>other, more logical explanations, like a significant post-survey a shift  
>among undecideds, a break to Clinton among women, more independents than  
>predicted taking GOP ballots (to help McCain), and what we might call the  
>Right-to-Rebel Effect of New Hampshire voters in the face of a media  
>avalanche for Obama.

>  
>-----  
>Philip J. Trounstine, Director  
>Survey and Policy Research Institute  
>at San Jose State University  
>408-924-6993  
>-----

>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 this: set aapornet mail  
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 12:42:50 -0500  
Reply-To: Phil Meyer <[pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU](mailto:pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Phil Meyer <[pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU](mailto:pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: NH, Kohut, etc.  
Comments: To: [allenbarton@mindspring.com](mailto:allenbarton@mindspring.com)  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[380-220081410165253813@mindspring.com](mailto:380-220081410165253813@mindspring.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I was waiting for somebody to bring that up. It's a zero-sum game and the underestimate of Clinton's vote has to be offset by overestimates elsewhere on the ticket. The AAPOR press release doesn't reflect that, and I think it's because the poll numbers that it compares still have the undecideds in the base. This amounts to assuming that 100 percent of the undecideds went for Hillary. That's an old, tired excuse for polls gone wrong, but I've seen it since I started paying attention to polls back in the 1960s.

Phil Meyer  
Chapel Hill

Allen Barton wrote:

> If the vote for Obama was not underestimated, but Clinton's was, what  
> categories were OVER-estimated? Her "additional" votes must have told the  
> polls something else - what?

>  
>  
>  
>> [Original Message]  
>> From: Phil Trounstine <[phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU](mailto:phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU)>  
>> To: <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
>> Date: 1/10/2008 11:35:10 AM

>> Subject: NH, Kohut, etc.

>>

>> Andrew Kohut makes an interesting and informative argument. And I am not  
>> one to argue that we live in a post-racial world. If there's a race effect  
>> happening, I want to know about it. My caution is not about trying to make  
>> a utopian argument. Only that we should have some facts before we suggest  
>> that there's a race effect happening in a Democratic primary. Re. Mr.  
>> Kohut's article:

>>

>> 1. His experience in New York was in a general election, not a primary.  
>> Have we ever seen hidden racial voting in a Democratic primary?

>>

>> 2. Obama's vote was not over-estimated; Clinton's vote was  
>>  
> under-estimated.

>

>> 3. He says "Poorer, less well-educated white people refuse surveys more  
>> often than affluent, better-educated whites. Polls generally adjust their  
>> samples for this tendency." This argues that surveys may not have included  
>> adequate numbers of some voters (but not very many, I suspect) more likely  
>> to vote for Clinton. But this is not evidence, per se, of some hidden  
>> racial effect. To prove that, wouldn't we have to know the difference in  
>> racial attitudes among respondents and non-respondents in this cohort?  
>> Otherwise, the argument would suggest, without evidence, that poor,  
>> less-educated whites who intended to vote for Clinton systematically  
>> refused to participate in surveys but did turn out to vote. Not only would  
>> that seem not to provide enough votes, but it's a lot further-fetched than  
>> other, more logical explanations, like a significant post-survey a shift  
>> among undecideds, a break to Clinton among women, more independents than  
>> predicted taking GOP ballots (to help McCain), and what we might call the  
>> Right-to-Rebel Effect of New Hampshire voters in the face of a media  
>> avalanche for Obama.

>>

>> \_\_\_\_\_  
>> Philip J. Trounstine, Director  
>> Survey and Policy Research Institute  
>> at San Jose State University  
>> 408-924-6993

>> -----

>> 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 this: set aapornet mail  
>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>> 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 this: set aapornet mail  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> 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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 12:55:58 -0500  
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: NH, Kohut, etc.  
Comments: To: aapornet aapornet <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
In-Reply-To: <[646CCA15396FD24586392DB998CCF0210E2FE82C@WLB-EXCH-VS-01.monmouth.edu](mailto:646CCA15396FD24586392DB998CCF0210E2FE82C@WLB-EXCH-VS-01.monmouth.edu)>  
Mime-Version: 1.0 (Apple Message framework v752.2)  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII; delsp=yes; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

On Jan 10, 2008, at 12:39 PM, Murray, Patrick wrote:

> In the end, I'm just having a hard time buying the argument that the  
> group of white, less-educated, Democratic, likely voters that  
> choose NOT  
> to participate in my polls are \*significantly\* more racist than the  
> group of white, less-educated, Democratic, likely voters who do.

Really? Isn't hostility to pollsters part of the know-nothing right-populist package? Bill O'Reilly, who knows that package very well, was railing against the industry just last night - for missing NH! (And he hates immigrants, too.) Opinions are often found in constellations, to use the fancy Frankfurt School term, and it wouldn't surprise me if anti-intellectualism, hostility to social scientists, and racism were all traveling companions.

Doug Henwood  
Left Business Observer  
38 Greene St - 4th fl.  
New York NY 10013-2505 USA  
<[dhenwood@panix.com](mailto:dhenwood@panix.com)>  
<<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>>

voice +1-212-219-0010  
cell +1-917-865-2813

producer, Behind the News  
Thursdays, 5-6 PM, WBAI, New York 99.5 FM  
<<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Radio.html>>  
podcast: <<http://shout.lbo-talk.org/lbo/radio-feed.php>>  
iTunes: <<http://phobos.apple.com/WebObjects/MZStore.woa/wa/viewPodcast?id=73801817>>

-----  
download my book Wall Street (for free!) at  
<<http://www.wallstreetthebook.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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 13:01:48 -0500  
Reply-To: Cristine Delnevo <[delnevo@UMDNJ.EDU](mailto:delnevo@UMDNJ.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Cristine Delnevo <[delnevo@UMDNJ.EDU](mailto:delnevo@UMDNJ.EDU)>  
Subject: Where did Biden's support go?  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[5712bbfc0801100910o53d3f21kba8c84a8d8862fac@mail.gmail.com](mailto:5712bbfc0801100910o53d3f21kba8c84a8d8862fac@mail.gmail.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

This post (What's a Biden Supporter to Do) got me thinking- since the author went for Clinton.  
([http://www.boston.com/news/politics/primaryvoices/2008/01/whats\\_a\\_biden\\_supporter\\_to\\_do.html](http://www.boston.com/news/politics/primaryvoices/2008/01/whats_a_biden_supporter_to_do.html) )

Given the compressed timeline btw Iowa & NH, did any pollsters manage to track where Biden's support (albiet small ~2.5%) went after Iowa led to his dropping out? It did not go to a Biden write-in in large numbers.  
(<http://www.sos.nh.gov/presprim2008/dpressum.htm>)

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 12:11:40 -0600  
Reply-To: [amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU](mailto:amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Allan L. McCutcheon" <[amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU](mailto:amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU)>  
Subject: Race, Gender and New Hampshire  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[006201c853a6\\$d9052a10\\$7400000a@rdresearch.com](mailto:006201c853a6$d9052a10$7400000a@rdresearch.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; DelSp="Yes"; format="flowed"  
Content-Disposition: inline  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Richard Day makes a very important point--the more "regular" the vote, the more we would expect a swing toward Clinton. And that seems a clearly plausible hypothesis as to what happened on Tuesday.

On Tuesday, 287,637 voters participated in NH's Democratic primary, and the exit polls indicated that 6% were newly registered, so 270,578 voters in the Democratic primary were already registered voters.

Of these 270,379--the exit polls indicate that 52% (140,597) were registered Democrats. That amounts to 62.3% of NH's (225,728) registered Democrats--up from 43.3% of NH's registered Democrats voting in the 2004 primary. It also means that 34.8% of NH's (372,934) registered independents voted in the Democratic primary--up from 33.5% of NH's independents in the 2004 primary.

Given that the Republican's 2008 primary almost certainly attracted more independents than the 2004 Republican primary, it is somewhat surprising that there was an increased proportion of independents who participated in the Democratic primary, even if only by 1.3%

The really surprising increase was the 19% increase in participation among registered Democrats--the "regular" vote in a Democratic primary.

Clearly, more research is already underway to find out why we saw this unanticipated increase among Democrats (and independents) in the Democratic primary.

Hopefully, these investigations will attempt to explore issues in addition to race and gender. The explanation that race bias explains why rank-and-file Democrats--the same who supported other "experience" candidates (e.g., Kerry, Gore) in previous years--now support Clinton is simply speculation without data. And this speculation is no more supportable than the notion that upscale male Democrats--the same as those who supported previous "change" candidates (e.g., Bradley, Dean)--are somehow threatened by a woman candidate.

Best,  
Allan

--

Donald O. Clifton Chair of Survey Science  
Professor of Statistics &  
Survey Research and Methodology  
tel. +402.458.2036  
fax +402.458.2038

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====



Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 10:34:50 -0800  
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>  
Subject: Re: Race, Gender and New Hampshire  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
In-Reply-To: <20080110121140.z6617b6mpwgcgwwso@wm-imp-2.unl.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I suppose it might as well be known that there is already talk on the internet about how there's voter fraud. The theory I've heard is that Diebold threw the election to Clinton because the republicans think she's more beatable. They use the polling discrepancies as evidence and add in things like:

The districts where Clinton was unexpectedly ahead of Obama were only the districts that used Diebold optical scanners.

The number of people who voted was less than the number of votes counted, by a few thousand.

Just so you should know...don't shoot the messenger!

leora

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

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

From: Allan L. McCutcheon [mailto:amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU]  
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 10:12 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: [AAPORNET] Race, Gender and New Hampshire

Richard Day makes a very important point--the more "regular" the vote, the more we would expect a swing toward Clinton. And that seems a clearly plausible hypothesis as to what happened on Tuesday.

On Tuesday, 287,637 voters participated in NH's Democratic primary, and the exit polls indicated that 6% were newly registered, so 270,578 voters in the Democratic primary were already registered voters.

Of these 270,379--the exit polls indicate that 52% (140,597) were registered Democrats. That amounts to 62.3% of NH's (225,728) registered Democrats--up from 43.3% of NH's registered Democrats voting in the 2004 primary. It also means that 34.8% of NH's

(372,934) registered independents voted in the Democratic primary--up from 33.5% of NH's independents in the 2004 primary.

Given that the Republican's 2008 primary almost certainly attracted more independents than the 2004 Republican primary, it is somewhat surprising that there was an increased proportion of independents who participated in the Democratic primary, even if only by 1.3%

The really surprising increase was the 19% increase in participation among registered Democrats--the "regular" vote in a Democratic primary.

Clearly, more research is already underway to find out why we saw this unanticipated increase among Democrats (and independents) in the Democratic primary.

Hopefully, these investigations will attempt to explore issues in addition to race and gender. The explanation that race bias explains why rank-and-file Democrats--the same who supported other "experience" candidates (e.g., Kerry, Gore) in previous years--now support Clinton is simply speculation without data. And this speculation is no more supportable than the notion that upscale male Democrats--the same as those who supported previous "change" candidates (e.g., Bradley, Dean)--are somehow threatened by a woman candidate.

Best,  
Allan

--  
Donald O. Clifton Chair of Survey Science  
Professor of Statistics &  
Survey Research and Methodology  
tel. +402.458.2036  
fax +402.458.2038

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 13:29:36 -0500  
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: an interesting datum on race

Comments: To: aapor <aapornet@asu.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

In 1991--not so long ago--337 white residents of the state of Michigan sent money (ranging from \$2. to \$1,000, median \$25)to David Duke's campaign to become Governor of Louisiana. Contrary to our expectation, these contributors were not disproportionately from the South, though they were older and more often male than their neighbors. Those living in the Metropolitan Detroit area were not clustered, but scattered randomly across neighborhoods, apparently connected if at all only by their attraction to what Duke (associated with both the Ku Klux Klan and the American Nazi Party) represented to them. Sending money to a political campaign in another state 1000 miles away must be rather rare, but it also probably reflects the views of some others who did not go so far as sending money to the Duke campaign. (H. Schuman & M. Krysan, "A Study of Far Right 'Ressentiment' in America" Int J of Public Opinion 1996 8:9-30).

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 14:04:05 EST  
Reply-To: [GBANDASSOC@AOL.COM](mailto:GBANDASSOC@AOL.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Gene Bregman <[GBANDASSOC@AOL.COM](mailto:GBANDASSOC@AOL.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Truth about Bradley  
Comments: To: [phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU](mailto:phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU), [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I agree with Phil and others who have raised questions about racial bias in primary election voting.

However, back in 1972 I was working on Bradley's polling after he had lost one election for Mayor of LA but before winning in 1973. We did a large door-to-door sample (at least 1200, maybe more) where half the people were shown pictures of Bradley and Mayor Yorty and half were not. As I recall, there was about a 6%-7% difference with, of course, those who saw the pictures being less supportive of Bradley and more supportive of Yorty. When George Deukmejian's campaign manager said that a 5% or so deficit in the polls a few weeks before the 1982 election meant that Deukmejian would win, we felt he was probably correct. Both elections are a long time ago, but interesting nonetheless.

Gene Bregman  
Gene Bregman & Associates  
(415)957-9700

In a message dated 1/9/2008 10:08:43 P.M. Pacific Standard Time,  
phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU writes:

I am so sick of listening to people on TV spewing misinformation about the so-called Bradley Effect. I'm not saying that a hidden racial effect hasn't affected the outcome of some elections. That may well be the case in some select general elections. But that was not the case for Tom Bradley in the 1982 California governor's race. For all the details, contact Mark DiCamillo or Merv Field, but here are the basics:

In the vote cast on election day -- which is what the pre-election polls and exit polls had measured -- Tom Bradley WON. There was no hidden racial vote. Deukmejian won the election because the Gun Owners of California had mounted a huge absentee ballot campaign to defeat a gun-control measure that was on the ballot. The absentees put Deukmejian over in the final count. That's why the Field Poll missed the mark in their final pre-election poll and why, since then in final polling, they always ask if people have already voted absentee. They haven't missed since then.

Moreover, to the extent that it has occurred, the so-called Bradley Effect has occurred in GENERAL elections, not in Democratic primaries. The black candidates had already won their party's nomination. If anyone is aware of this phenomenon happening in a primary, I'd like to hear about it.

---

Philip J. Trounstine, Director  
Survey and Policy Research Institute  
at San Jose State University  
408-924-6993

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

\*\*\*\*\*Start the year off right. Easy ways to stay in shape.  
<http://body.aol.com/fitness/winter-exercise?NCID=aolcmp00300000002489>

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 14:28:33 -0500  
Reply-To: Joe Lenski <jlenski@EDISONRESEARCH.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Joe Lenski <jlenski@EDISONRESEARCH.COM>  
Subject: Please ...  
Comments: To: Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
In-Reply-To: A<001601c853b7\$7c25c5f0\$2211074b@dell2005>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I don't usually want to even discuss these unsubstantiated claims of election fraud. They are usually made by people who want to believe something first and then pick and choose among the tea-leaves for a few random "facts" that could prove their case.

Our preliminary evidence from the New Hampshire Democratic Primary returns on Tuesday night are that Hillary Clinton's strong areas correlated with the areas of the state that went for John Kerry in 2004 and Al Gore in 2000. Barack Obama's strong areas seemed to resemble the areas carried by Howard Dean in 2004 and Bill Bradley in 2000. So unless there has been hidden election fraud in New Hampshire for the last three presidential primaries the "evidence" being used by these fraudsters probably does not hold up to any rigorous statistical analysis.

We don't have the time here to pursue this research because there is a Michigan Primary next week followed by another 20 plus states in the next four weeks.

But if anyone in AAPOR-land has a smart student looking for a quick research project here is an idea for one.

The New Hampshire Secretary of State's web site has the results town-by-town of all the New Hampshire Primaries since 1992.  
<http://www.sos.nh.gov/presprim2008/index.htm>  
<http://www.sos.nh.gov/election%20stats%20and%20districts.html>

It should not take too long to run some statistical analysis comparing the Clinton-Obama, Kerry-Dean and Gore-Bradley contests to find if there is indeed any evidence that the final vote returns this year are out of line. Also on the point that the number of people who voted is less than the number of votes counted one thing to check is that whether those who registered to vote on election day itself (approximately 30,000 according to our exit polls) are included in those counts.

Let us know what you find.

Joe Lenski  
Executive Vice President  
Edison Media Research

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leora Lawton  
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 1:35 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Race, Gender and New Hampshire

I suppose it might as well be known that there is already talk on the internet about how there's voter fraud. The theory I've heard is that Diebold threw the election to Clinton because the republicans think she's more beatable. They use the polling discrepancies as evidence and add in things like:

The districts where Clinton was unexpectedly ahead of Obama were only the districts that used Diebold optical scanners.

The number of people who voted was less than the number of votes counted, by a few thousand.

Just so you should know...don't shoot the messenger!

leora

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

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

From: Allan L. McCutcheon [mailto:amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU]  
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 10:12 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: [AAPORNET] Race, Gender and New Hampshire

Richard Day makes a very important point--the more "regular" the vote, the more we would expect a swing toward Clinton. And that seems a clearly plausible hypothesis as to what happened on Tuesday.

On Tuesday, 287,637 voters participated in NH's Democratic primary, and the exit polls indicated that 6% were newly registered, so 270,578 voters in the Democratic primary were already registered voters.

Of these 270,379--the exit polls indicate that 52% (140,597) were registered Democrats. That amounts to 62.3% of NH's (225,728) registered Democrats--up from 43.3% of NH's registered Democrats voting in the 2004 primary. It also means that 34.8% of NH's (372,934) registered independents voted in the Democratic primary--up from 33.5% of NH's independents in the 2004 primary.

Given that the Republican's 2008 primary almost certainly attracted more independents than the 2004 Republican primary, it is somewhat surprising that there was an increased proportion of independents who participated in the Democratic primary, even if only by 1.3%

The really surprising increase was the 19% increase in participation among registered Democrats--the "regular" vote in a Democratic primary.

Clearly, more research is already underway to find out why we saw this unanticipated increase among Democrats (and independents) in the Democratic primary.

Hopefully, these investigations will attempt to explore issues in addition to race and gender. The explanation that race bias explains why rank-and-file Democrats--the same who supported other "experience" candidates (e.g., Kerry, Gore) in previous years--now support Clinton is simply speculation without data. And this speculation is no more supportable than the notion that upscale male Democrats--the same as those who supported previous "change" candidates (e.g., Bradley, Dean)--are somehow threatened by a woman candidate.

Best,  
Allan

--

Donald O. Clifton Chair of Survey Science  
Professor of Statistics &  
Survey Research and Methodology  
tel. +402.458.2036  
fax +402.458.2038

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
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 this: set aapornet mail

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

---

Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 13:37:03 -0600  
Reply-To: amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Allan L. McCutcheon" <amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU>  
Subject: Sprial of Silence?  
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; DelSp="Yes"; format="flowed"  
Content-Disposition: inline  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

David Moore suggests an interesting hypothesis. Given the tsunami of news coverage following Obama's win in Iowa--"the new jaggernaut," "she's toast," etc.--were some of Clinton's supporters inclined to indicate to pollsters that they were unlikely to vote in the primary, even though they ended up voting?

David Moore wrote:

"The polls all underestimated Clinton's support, giving rise to perhaps a new phenomenon, the Hillary Factor, that competes with the old Bradley/Dinkins/Wilder factor...but in reverse: People who don't want to admit (in a poll) they are going to vote for a woman, but do so anyway. Now THAT's something we can all mull over ad infinitum..."

--

Donald O. Clifton Chair of Survey Science  
Professor of Statistics &  
Survey Research and Methodology  
tel. +402.458.2036  
fax +402.458.2038

---

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

---

Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 13:41:40 -0600  
Reply-To: rday@rdresearch.com  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Richard Day <rday@RDRESEARCH.COM>  
Organization: Richard Day Research  
Subject: Re: Race, Gender and New Hampshire  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <20080110121140.z6617b6mpwgcgwwso@wm-imp-2.unl.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit



Another reason the Bradley effect is nonsense is that if the pre election polling was affected by it why wouldn't the exit polling be affected by it?

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Allan L. McCutcheon  
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 12:12 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Race, Gender and New Hampshire

Richard Day makes a very important point--the more "regular" the vote, the more we would expect a swing toward Clinton. And that seems a clearly plausible hypothesis as to what happened on Tuesday.

On Tuesday, 287,637 voters participated in NH's Democratic primary, and the exit polls indicated that 6% were newly registered, so 270,578 voters in the Democratic primary were already registered voters.

Of these 270,379--the exit polls indicate that 52% (140,597) were registered Democrats. That amounts to 62.3% of NH's (225,728) registered Democrats--up from 43.3% of NH's registered Democrats voting in the 2004 primary. It also means that 34.8% of NH's (372,934) registered independents voted in the Democratic primary--up from 33.5% of NH's independents in the 2004 primary.

Given that the Republican's 2008 primary almost certainly attracted more independents than the 2004 Republican primary, it is somewhat surprising that there was an increased proportion of independents who participated in the Democratic primary, even if only by 1.3%

The really surprising increase was the 19% increase in participation among registered Democrats--the "regular" vote in a Democratic primary.

Clearly, more research is already underway to find out why we saw this unanticipated increase among Democrats (and independents) in the Democratic primary.

Hopefully, these investigations will attempt to explore issues in addition to race and gender. The explanation that race bias explains why rank-and-file Democrats--the same who supported other "experience" candidates (e.g., Kerry, Gore) in previous years--now support Clinton is simply speculation without data. And this speculation is no more supportable than the notion that upscale male Democrats--the same as those who supported previous "change" candidates (e.g., Bradley, Dean)--are somehow threatened by a woman candidate.

Best,  
Allan

--

Donald O. Clifton Chair of Survey Science Professor of Statistics & Survey  
Research and Methodology tel. +402.458.2036  
fax +402.458.2038

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail Please ask authors before  
quoting outside AAPORNET.  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 15:00:14 -0500  
Reply-To: David Moore <[dmoore62@COMCAST.NET](mailto:dmoore62@COMCAST.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: David Moore <[dmoore62@COMCAST.NET](mailto:dmoore62@COMCAST.NET)>  
Subject: Re: Please ...  
Comments: To: Joe Lenski <[jlenski@EDISONRESEARCH.COM](mailto:jlenski@EDISONRESEARCH.COM)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To:  
<[60A5161D2F9EEC43B9E0770312BA29D5E4A87A@emr01.edisonresearch.com](mailto:60A5161D2F9EEC43B9E0770312BA29D5E4A87A@emr01.edisonresearch.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Joe,  
This sounds like a reasonable approach.

Separately, can you respond to AAPORNET whether (as Chris Matthews said last night on Hardball) that even the exit polls showed Obama winning? I've seen some figures suggesting that the unadjusted exit polls showed Obama up by a couple of percentage points. I know that's not far off the final total, but is that correct?

Thanks.  
David

David W. Moore, Ph.D.  
Senior Fellow, The Carsey Institute  
73 Main Street, Huddleston Hall  
The University of New Hampshire  
Durham, NH 03824

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Joe Lenski  
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 2:29 PM  
To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Subject: Please ...

I don't usually want to even discuss these unsubstantiated claims of

election fraud. They are usually made by people who want to believe something first and then pick and choose among the tea-leaves for a few random "facts" that could prove their case.

Our preliminary evidence from the New Hampshire Democratic Primary returns on Tuesday night are that Hillary Clinton's strong areas correlated with the areas of the state that went for John Kerry in 2004 and Al Gore in 2000. Barack Obama's strong areas seemed to resemble the areas carried by Howard Dean in 2004 and Bill Bradley in 2000. So unless there has been hidden election fraud in New Hampshire for the last three presidential primaries the "evidence" being used by these fraudsters probably does not hold up to any rigorous statistical analysis.

We don't have the time here to pursue this research because there is a Michigan Primary next week followed by another 20 plus states in the next four weeks.

But if anyone in AAPOR-land has a smart student looking for a quick research project here is an idea for one.

The New Hampshire Secretary of State's web site has the results town-by-town of all the New Hampshire Primaries since 1992.  
<http://www.sos.nh.gov/presprim2008/index.htm>  
<http://www.sos.nh.gov/election%20stats%20and%20districts.html>

It should not take too long to run some statistical analysis comparing the Clinton-Obama, Kerry-Dean and Gore-Bradley contests to find if there is indeed any evidence that the final vote returns this year are out of line. Also on the point that the number of people who voted is less than the number of votes counted one thing to check is that whether those who registered to vote on election day itself (approximately 30,000 according to our exit polls) are included in those counts.

Let us know what you find.

Joe Lenski  
Executive Vice President  
Edison Media Research

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leora Lawton  
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 1:35 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Race, Gender and New Hampshire

I suppose it might as well be known that there is already talk on the internet about how there's voter fraud. The theory I've heard is that Diebold threw the election to Clinton because the republicans think she's more beatable. They use the polling discrepancies as evidence and add in things like:

The districts where Clinton was unexpectedly ahead of Obama were only the districts that used Diebold optical scanners.

The number of people who voted was less than the number of votes counted, by a few thousand.

Just so you should know...don't shoot the messenger!

leora

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

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

From: Allan L. McCutcheon [mailto:amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU]  
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 10:12 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: [AAPORNET] Race, Gender and New Hampshire

Richard Day makes a very important point--the more "regular" the vote, the more we would expect a swing toward Clinton. And that seems a clearly plausible hypothesis as to what happened on Tuesday.

On Tuesday, 287,637 voters participated in NH's Democratic primary, and the exit polls indicated that 6% were newly registered, so 270,578 voters in the Democratic primary were already registered voters.

Of these 270,379--the exit polls indicate that 52% (140,597) were registered Democrats. That amounts to 62.3% of NH's (225,728) registered Democrats--up from 43.3% of NH's registered Democrats voting in the 2004 primary. It also means that 34.8% of NH's (372,934) registered independents voted in the Democratic primary--up from 33.5% of NH's independents in the 2004 primary.

Given that the Republican's 2008 primary almost certainly attracted more independents than the 2004 Republican primary, it is somewhat surprising that there was an increased proportion of independents who participated in the Democratic primary, even if only by 1.3%

The really surprising increase was the 19% increase in participation among registered Democrats--the "regular" vote in a Democratic primary.

Clearly, more research is already underway to find out why we saw this unanticipated increase among Democrats (and independents) in the Democratic primary.

Hopefully, these investigations will attempt to explore issues in addition to race and gender. The explanation that race bias explains why rank-and-file Democrats--the same who supported other "experience" candidates (e.g., Kerry, Gore) in previous years--now support Clinton is simply speculation without data. And this speculation is no more supportable than the notion that upscale male Democrats--the same as those who supported previous "change" candidates (e.g., Bradley, Dean)--are somehow threatened by a woman candidate.

Best,  
Allan

--

Donald O. Clifton Chair of Survey Science  
Professor of Statistics &  
Survey Research and Methodology  
tel. +402.458.2036  
fax +402.458.2038

---

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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 14:22:15 -0600  
Reply-To: Jeanie Harper <[JHarper@GOAMP.COM](mailto:JHarper@GOAMP.COM)>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Jeanie Harper <JHarper@GOAMP.COM>  
Subject: Job Posting  
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Please post:

=20

Company: Philip Morris USA

Job Title: Principal Analyst Research

Job Location: Richmond, Virginia 23234

=20

The Corporate Responsibility Research Department of Philip Morris USA, the nation's leading tobacco company, is offering an exciting and challenging Principal Research Analyst opportunity at our Headquarters in Richmond, VA. The Corporate Responsibility Research team conducts an array of primary and secondary research to support a broad spectrum of internal departments, including Government Affairs, External Affairs, Corporate Communications and Youth Smoking Prevention. The successful candidate will have primary responsibility for providing research support to the Government Affairs department.

#### Key Responsibilities...

- \* Develop productive working relationships with senior-level clients to understand their business and identify research needs
- \* Design, develop and execute primary research studies (e.g., public opinion surveys, political/public policy polling, focus groups) to support efforts of the Government Affairs team; conduct secondary research to complement primary research as needed
- \* Develop and apply a deep understanding of Company issues to research efforts
- \* Analyze data and information to extract key findings, generate insights and develop recommendations
- \* Prepare research summaries and reports; communicate results and recommendations to clients
- \* Manage a variety of vendors and contracts
- \* Collaborate with internal researchers and other internal business colleagues to conduct additional research to help support broader Corporate Responsibility Research efforts=20

#### Qualifications:=20

Successful Candidates will...

- \* Have a college degree (advanced degree desirable)
- \* Have a minimum of 6+ years of practical, applied experience conducting public opinion and polling research - particularly political and public affairs polling (agency experience a plus)

- \* Have experience designing and conducting qualitative and quantitative research - including survey development - in applied settings
- \* Have strong client and vendor management skills=20
- \* Have a working knowledge of and comfort level with performing basic statistical analyses (experience with more sophisticated analyses a plus)
- \* Have a working knowledge of and comfort level working with technology and various software applications (e.g., MS Word, Excel and PowerPoint; Livelink; Internet navigation)
- \* Have strong organizational skills and attention to detail
- \* Be able to use sound, independent reasoning and judgment to establish work priorities, handle questions and manage client expectations
- \* Be able to write reports and prepare presentations clearly and concisely
- \* Be able to verbally communicate technical information in an easy-to-understand manner
- \* Be willing to work as a member of a team where collaboration with others is critical for success
- \* Be able to work in a fast-paced environment that includes rapid turnaround and changing priorities
- \* Be able to handle multiple assignments=20

Benefits:=20

In addition to the opportunity to apply your skills toward these key business initiatives, we offer an excellent compensation package including a competitive base salary, comprehensive health/vision/dental insurance, relocation, incentive compensation and participation in our deferred profit sharing.=20

For further information regarding Philip Morris USA, visit our website at <http://www.cantbeattheexperience.com>.

=20

TO APPLY ON-LINE, CLICK WEB LINK:

<http://appclix.postmasterlx.com/track.html?pid=3D402881bd172f007b01176073=4c520a56&source=3Daapor> =20

=20

Thanks very much,

Jeanie Harper

Administrative Assistant, AAPOR

=20

=20

Jeanie  
Ext. 4790

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 15:22:32 -0500  
Reply-To: "Leve, Jay" <[jleve@SURVEYUSA.COM](mailto:jleve@SURVEYUSA.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Leve, Jay" <[jleve@SURVEYUSA.COM](mailto:jleve@SURVEYUSA.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Please ... (Hardball citation & Fox graphic w "Obama Wins"  
exit poll #'s)  
Comments: To: David Moore <[dmoore62@COMCAST.NET](mailto:dmoore62@COMCAST.NET)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

David Moore's Hardball Citation is at timestamp:

0:48 (48 seconds into)  
and  
3:05 (3 minutes and 5 seconds into) ...

... this you-tube link:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-Jo4pwCG23c>

Separate source, same topic: Fox News Channel (Brit Hume) at 8:01 pm (1  
minute after NH polls closed) put up a graphic which showed \*Exit\* Poll  
Results of:

Obama 39%  
Clinton 34%

[http://www.surveyusa.com/FNC\\_Exit\\_1\\_9.jpg](http://www.surveyusa.com/FNC_Exit_1_9.jpg)

Hume: "We do not think as of this hour that there was the chance there  
seemed to be earlier of an Obama absolute blowout here."

Jay H Leve  
SurveyUSA  
15 Bloomfield Ave  
Verona NJ 07044  
973-857-8500 x 551  
[jleve@surveyusa.com](mailto:jleve@surveyusa.com)

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



From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of David Moore  
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 3:00 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Please ...

Joe,  
This sounds like a reasonable approach.

Separately, can you respond to AAPORNET whether (as Chris Matthews said last night on Hardball) that even the exit polls showed Obama winning? I've seen some figures suggesting that the unadjusted exit polls showed Obama up by a couple of percentage points. I know that's not far off the final total, but is that correct?

Thanks.  
David

David W. Moore, Ph.D.  
Senior Fellow, The Carsey Institute  
73 Main Street, Huddleston Hall  
The University of New Hampshire  
Durham, NH 03824

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Joe Lenski  
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 2:29 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Please ...

I don't usually want to even discuss these unsubstantiated claims of election fraud. They are usually made by people who want to believe something first and then pick and choose among the tea-leaves for a few random "facts" that could prove their case.

Our preliminary evidence from the New Hampshire Democratic Primary returns on Tuesday night are that Hillary Clinton's strong areas correlated with the areas of the state that went for John Kerry in 2004 and Al Gore in 2000. Barack Obama's strong areas seemed to resemble the areas carried by Howard Dean in 2004 and Bill Bradley in 2000. So unless there has been hidden election fraud in New Hampshire for the last three presidential primaries the "evidence" being used by these fraudsters probably does not hold up to any rigorous statistical analysis.

We don't have the time here to pursue this research because there is a Michigan Primary next week followed by another 20 plus states in the next four weeks.

But if anyone in AAPOR-land has a smart student looking for a quick

research project here is an idea for one.

The New Hampshire Secretary of State's web site has the results town-by-town of all the New Hampshire Primaries since 1992.  
<http://www.sos.nh.gov/presprim2008/index.htm>  
<http://www.sos.nh.gov/election%20stats%20and%20districts.html>

It should not take too long to run some statistical analysis comparing the Clinton-Obama, Kerry-Dean and Gore-Bradley contests to find if there is indeed any evidence that the final vote returns this year are out of line. Also on the point that the number of people who voted is less than the number of votes counted one thing to check is that whether those who registered to vote on election day itself (approximately 30,000 according to our exit polls) are included in those counts.

Let us know what you find.

Joe Lenski  
Executive Vice President  
Edison Media Research

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leora Lawton  
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 1:35 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Race, Gender and New Hampshire

I suppose it might as well be known that there is already talk on the internet about how there's voter fraud. The theory I've heard is that Diebold threw the election to Clinton because the republicans think she's more beatable. They use the polling discrepancies as evidence and add in things like:

The districts where Clinton was unexpectedly ahead of Obama were only the districts that used Diebold optical scanners.

The number of people who voted was less than the number of votes counted, by a few thousand.

Just so you should know...don't shoot the messenger!

leora

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

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

From: Allan L. McCutcheon [mailto:amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU]  
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 10:12 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: [AAPORNET] Race, Gender and New Hampshire

Richard Day makes a very important point--the more "regular" the vote, the more we would expect a swing toward Clinton. And that seems a clearly plausible hypothesis as to what happened on Tuesday.

On Tuesday, 287,637 voters participated in NH's Democratic primary, and the exit polls indicated that 6% were newly registered, so 270,578 voters in the Democratic primary were already registered voters.

Of these 270,379--the exit polls indicate that 52% (140,597) were registered Democrats. That amounts to 62.3% of NH's (225,728) registered Democrats--up from 43.3% of NH's registered Democrats voting in the 2004 primary. It also means that 34.8% of NH's (372,934) registered independents voted in the Democratic primary--up from 33.5% of NH's independents in the 2004 primary.

Given that the Republican's 2008 primary almost certainly attracted more independents than the 2004 Republican primary, it is somewhat surprising that there was an increased proportion of independents who participated in the Democratic primary, even if only by 1.3%

The really surprising increase was the 19% increase in participation among registered Democrats--the "regular" vote in a Democratic primary.

Clearly, more research is already underway to find out why we saw this unanticipated increase among Democrats (and independents) in the Democratic primary.

Hopefully, these investigations will attempt to explore issues in addition to race and gender. The explanation that race bias explains why rank-and-file Democrats--the same who supported other "experience" candidates (e.g., Kerry, Gore) in previous years--now support Clinton is simply speculation without data. And this speculation is no more supportable than the notion that upscale male Democrats--the same as those who supported previous "change" candidates (e.g., Bradley, Dean)--are somehow threatened by a woman candidate.

Best,  
Allan

--

Donald O. Clifton Chair of Survey Science  
Professor of Statistics &  
Survey Research and Methodology  
tel. +402.458.2036  
fax +402.458.2038

-----

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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 15:37:59 -0500  
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: Please ... (Hardball citation & Fox graphic w "Obama Wins"  
exit poll #'s)  
Comments: To: "Leve, Jay" <[jleve@SURVEYUSA.COM](mailto:jleve@SURVEYUSA.COM)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To:  
[A<033131AB4310364FB652738936135D00D13889@exchange.hypotenuse.com>](mailto:A<033131AB4310364FB652738936135D00D13889@exchange.hypotenuse.com>)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I want to make clear that this is a Fox News estimate. It does not necessarily represent the estimate based solely on the exit polls at that time.

We at Edison/Mitofsky transmit information to each of the six NEP members. Each of the NEP members in turn makes editorial decisions about which numbers they wish to report. All inquiries about the information that appears on their air, on their web sites or in their wire service stories should be directed to the individual NEP members.

Joe Lenski  
Edison Media Research

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leve, Jay  
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 3:23 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Please ... (Hardball citation & Fox graphic w "Obama Wins" exit poll #'s)

David Moore's Hardball Citation is at timestamp:

0:48 (48 seconds into)  
and  
3:05 (3 minutes and 5 seconds into) ...

... this you-tube link:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-Jo4pwCG23c>

Separate source, same topic: Fox News Channel (Brit Hume) at 8:01 pm (1 minute after NH polls closed) put up a graphic which showed \*Exit\* Poll Results of:

Obama 39%  
Clinton 34%

[http://www.surveyusa.com/FNC\\_Exit\\_1\\_9.jpg](http://www.surveyusa.com/FNC_Exit_1_9.jpg)

Hume: "We do not think as of this hour that there was the chance there seemed to be earlier of an Obama absolute blowout here."

Jay H Leve  
SurveyUSA  
15 Bloomfield Ave  
Verona NJ 07044  
973-857-8500 x 551  
jleve@surveyusa.com

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of David Moore  
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 3:00 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Please ...

Joe,  
This sounds like a reasonable approach.

Separately, can you respond to AAPORNET whether (as Chris Matthews said last night on Hardball) that even the exit polls showed Obama winning? I've seen some figures suggesting that the unadjusted exit polls showed Obama up by a couple of percentage points. I know that's not far off the final total, but is that correct?

Thanks.  
David

David W. Moore, Ph.D.  
Senior Fellow, The Carsey Institute  
73 Main Street, Huddleston Hall  
The University of New Hampshire  
Durham, NH 03824

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Joe Lenski  
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 2:29 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Please ...

I don't usually want to even discuss these unsubstantiated claims of election fraud. They are usually made by people who want to believe something first and then pick and choose among the tea-leaves for a few random "facts" that could prove their case.

Our preliminary evidence from the New Hampshire Democratic Primary returns on Tuesday night are that Hillary Clinton's strong areas correlated with the areas of the state that went for John Kerry in 2004 and Al Gore in 2000. Barack Obama's strong areas seemed to resemble the areas carried by Howard Dean in 2004 and Bill Bradley in 2000. So unless there has been hidden election fraud in New Hampshire for the last three presidential primaries the "evidence" being used by these fraudsters probably does not hold up to any rigorous statistical analysis.

We don't have the time here to pursue this research because there is a Michigan Primary next week followed by another 20 plus states in the next four weeks.

But if anyone in AAPOR-land has a smart student looking for a quick

research project here is an idea for one.

The New Hampshire Secretary of State's web site has the results town-by-town of all the New Hampshire Primaries since 1992.  
<http://www.sos.nh.gov/presprim2008/index.htm>  
<http://www.sos.nh.gov/election%20stats%20and%20districts.html>

It should not take too long to run some statistical analysis comparing the Clinton-Obama, Kerry-Dean and Gore-Bradley contests to find if there is indeed any evidence that the final vote returns this year are out of line. Also on the point that the number of people who voted is less than the number of votes counted one thing to check is that whether those who registered to vote on election day itself (approximately 30,000 according to our exit polls) are included in those counts.

Let us know what you find.

Joe Lenski  
Executive Vice President  
Edison Media Research

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leora Lawton  
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 1:35 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Race, Gender and New Hampshire

I suppose it might as well be known that there is already talk on the internet about how there's voter fraud. The theory I've heard is that Diebold threw the election to Clinton because the republicans think she's more beatable. They use the polling discrepancies as evidence and add in things like:

The districts where Clinton was unexpectedly ahead of Obama were only the districts that used Diebold optical scanners.

The number of people who voted was less than the number of votes counted, by a few thousand.

Just so you should know...don't shoot the messenger!

leora

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

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

From: Allan L. McCutcheon [mailto:amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU]  
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 10:12 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: [AAPORNET] Race, Gender and New Hampshire

Richard Day makes a very important point--the more "regular" the vote, the more we would expect a swing toward Clinton. And that seems a clearly plausible hypothesis as to what happened on Tuesday.

On Tuesday, 287,637 voters participated in NH's Democratic primary, and the exit polls indicated that 6% were newly registered, so 270,578 voters in the Democratic primary were already registered voters.

Of these 270,379--the exit polls indicate that 52% (140,597) were registered Democrats. That amounts to 62.3% of NH's (225,728) registered Democrats--up from 43.3% of NH's registered Democrats voting in the 2004 primary. It also means that 34.8% of NH's (372,934) registered independents voted in the Democratic primary--up from 33.5% of NH's independents in the 2004 primary.

Given that the Republican's 2008 primary almost certainly attracted more independents than the 2004 Republican primary, it is somewhat surprising that there was an increased proportion of independents who participated in the Democratic primary, even if only by 1.3%

The really surprising increase was the 19% increase in participation among registered Democrats--the "regular" vote in a Democratic primary.

Clearly, more research is already underway to find out why we saw this unanticipated increase among Democrats (and independents) in the Democratic primary.

Hopefully, these investigations will attempt to explore issues in addition to race and gender. The explanation that race bias explains why rank-and-file Democrats--the same who supported other "experience" candidates (e.g., Kerry, Gore) in previous years--now support Clinton is simply speculation without data. And this speculation is no more supportable than the notion that upscale male Democrats--the same as those who supported previous "change" candidates (e.g., Bradley, Dean)--are somehow threatened by a woman candidate.

Best,  
Allan

--

Donald O. Clifton Chair of Survey Science  
Professor of Statistics &  
Survey Research and Methodology  
tel. +402.458.2036  
fax +402.458.2038

-----



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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 16:28:39 -0500  
Reply-To: [lindeman@BARD.EDU](mailto:lindeman@BARD.EDU)

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mark Lindeman <lindeman@BARD.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Please ...  
Comments: To: David Moore <dmoore62@COMCAST.NET>  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
In-Reply-To:  
<!!&!AAAAAAAAAAAAAYAAAAAAAAAKDckmbCVxlHn6UiOGrTmAHCgAAAEAAAAAJvAmk/QnRINiWyQCtVG  
ni  
kBAAAAAA==@comcast.net>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; DelSp="Yes"; format="flowed"  
Content-Disposition: inline  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

WRT Joe Lenski's request: It's not a great model, but controlling for Kerry/Dean margin in 2004, optical scan is not a statistically significant predictor of Clinton/Obama margin in 2008.

I'm probably one of, oh, 5000 people with roughly comparable results. I saw someone already tried a matching analysis reminiscent of Wand and Herron on the NH 2004 general.

Mark Lindeman

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 13:19:24 -0800  
Reply-To: Jason Kerns <[jkerns@DAVISRESEARCH.COM](mailto:jkerns@DAVISRESEARCH.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Jason Kerns <[jkerns@DAVISRESEARCH.COM](mailto:jkerns@DAVISRESEARCH.COM)>  
Subject: Looking for recommendation for conjoint design & analysis  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Hello,

=20

We are currently looking for a recommendation for someone to conduct conjoint design and analysis. Please e-mail off list if you have a recommendation. Thank you.

=20

-----

Jason Kerns

Davis Research

jkerns@davisresearch.com <mailto:jkerns@davisresearch.com>=20

=20

=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 this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====  
Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 17:47:56 -0500

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: Huckabee push-poll

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

I've just been push-pollled by the Huckabee campaign. Flagrant. I won't be responding to emails until tomorrow, just sitting down to dinner. But if there ever was a thing as a push-poll, i.e. a campaign that purports to be a survey but is intended to sway voters (in the upcoming Republican primary in MI) this was it.

The caller ID listed L. Hinton as the caller. This was the second call today from this source. My wife didn't pick it up the first time, but I was preparing dinner just now, so I did.

=20

Nat Ehrlich, Ph.D.

Research Specialist

Michigan State University=20

Institute for Public Policy and Social Research

Office for Social Research

321 Berkey Hall

East Lansing, MI 48824

517-353-2639

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====  
Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 14:58:03 -0800

Reply-To: Ginger Blazier <[gblazier@DIRESEARCH.COM](mailto:gblazier@DIRESEARCH.COM)>

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

From: Ginger Blazier <[gblazier@DIRESEARCH.COM](mailto:gblazier@DIRESEARCH.COM)>

Subject: Re: Race, Gender and New Hampshire

Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

In-Reply-To: <[20080110121140.z6617b6mpwgcgwwso@wm-imp-2.unl.edu](mailto:20080110121140.z6617b6mpwgcgwwso@wm-imp-2.unl.edu)>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="windows-1250"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Thought this might be of interest.

<http://www.mcclatchydc.com/election2008/story/24540.html>

Best regards,

Ginger

Ginger Blazier, PRC

Senior Vice President

Business Development

Directions In Research

7676 Hazard Center Drive, Suite 1300

San Diego, CA 92108

[gblazier@diresearch.com](mailto:gblazier@diresearch.com)

[www.diresearch.com](http://www.diresearch.com) tel:

fax:

toll free: 619 299 5883

619 299 5888

800 676 5883

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

From: AAPORNET [[mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)] On Behalf Of Allan L. McCutcheon

Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 10:12 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Race, Gender and New Hampshire

Richard Day makes a very important point--the more "regular" the vote, the more we would expect a swing toward Clinton. And that seems a clearly plausible hypothesis as to what happened on Tuesday.

On Tuesday, 287,637 voters participated in NH's Democratic primary, and the exit polls indicated that 6% were newly registered, so 270,578 voters in the Democratic primary were already registered voters.

Of these 270,379--the exit polls indicate that 52% (140,597) were registered Democrats. That amounts to 62.3% of NH's (225,728) registered Democrats--up from 43.3% of NH's registered Democrats voting in the 2004 primary. It also means that 34.8% of NH's (372,934) registered independents voted in the Democratic primary--up from 33.5% of NH's independents in the 2004 primary.

Given that the Republican's 2008 primary almost certainly attracted more independents than the 2004 Republican primary, it is somewhat surprising that there was an increased proportion of independents who participated in the Democratic primary, even if only by 1.3%

The really surprising increase was the 19% increase in participation among registered Democrats--the "regular" vote in a Democratic primary.

Clearly, more research is already underway to find out why we saw this unanticipated increase among Democrats (and independents) in the Democratic primary.

Hopefully, these investigations will attempt to explore issues in addition to race and gender. The explanation that race bias explains why rank-and-file Democrats--the same who supported other "experience" candidates (e.g., Kerry, Gore) in previous years--now support Clinton is simply speculation without data. And this speculation is no more supportable than the notion that upscale male Democrats--the same as those who supported previous "change" candidates (e.g., Bradley, Dean)--are somehow threatened by a woman candidate.

Best,  
Allan

--

Donald O. Clifton Chair of Survey Science Professor of Statistics & Survey  
Research and Methodology tel. +402.458.2036  
fax +402.458.2038

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail Please ask authors before  
quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG Free Edition.

Version: 7.5.516 / Virus Database: 269.19.0/1218 - Release Date: 1/10/2008

1:32 PM

No virus found in this outgoing message.

Checked by AVG Free Edition.

Version: 7.5.516 / Virus Database: 269.19.0/1218 - Release Date: 1/10/2008

1:32 PM

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====  
Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 18:13:55 -0500

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: Huckabee push-poll

Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

In-Reply-To: A<[EC15B06368AAA4419321FF6D2159CB1C01BCD365@sscnt03-2.ssc.msu.edu](mailto:EC15B06368AAA4419321FF6D2159CB1C01BCD365@sscnt03-2.ssc.msu.edu)>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Just for reference, the full caller ID was Hinton L 703-961-1077

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

517-353-2639

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Ehrlich, Nathaniel

Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 5:48 PM

To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

Subject: Huckabee push-poll

I've just been push-pollled by the Huckabee campaign. Flagrant. I won't be responding to emails until tomorrow, just sitting down to dinner. But

if there ever was a thing as a push-poll, i.e. a campaign that purports to be a survey but is intended to sway voters (in the upcoming Republican primary in MI) this was it.

The caller ID listed L. Hinton as the caller. This was the second call today from this source. My wife didn't pick it up the first time, but I was preparing dinner just now, so I did.

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

517-353-2639

---

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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 18:48:57 -0500  
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: Huckabee push-poll  
Comments: To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <[Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU](mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[EC15B06368AAA4419321FF6D2159CB1C01BCD36B@ssc03-2.ssc.msu.edu](mailto:EC15B06368AAA4419321FF6D2159CB1C01BCD36B@ssc03-2.ssc.msu.edu)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

FWIW - An "independent" group called "Common Sense Issues" seems to be behind most of the pro-Huckabee push polls, which have been going on for over a month in various states. While Huckabee himself has said that he "wishes they would stop" because they are hurting his campaign, he doesn't seem to have tried very hard to actually make them stop.

For more information and links to many other articles on the topic see:  
<http://www.tpmuckraker.com/archives/005054.php>

Jan Werner

---

Ehrlich, Nathaniel wrote:

> Just for reference, the full caller ID was Hinton L 703-961-1077

>

> 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

> 517-353-2639

>

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Ehrlich, Nathaniel

> Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 5:48 PM

> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

> Subject: Huckabee push-poll

>

>

>

> I've just been push-pollled by the Huckabee campaign. Flagrant. I won't

> be responding to emails until tomorrow, just sitting down to dinner. But

> if there ever was a thing as a push-poll, i.e. a campaign that purports

> to be a survey but is intended to sway voters (in the upcoming

> Republican primary in MI) this was it.

>

> The caller ID listed L. Hinton as the caller. This was the second call

> today from this source. My wife didn't pick it up the first time, but I

> was preparing dinner just now, so I did.

>

>

>

> 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  
>  
> 517-353-2639  
>  
>  
> -----  
> 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 this: set aapornet mail  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> 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 this: set aapornet mail  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> 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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 19:36:20 -0500  
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: Huckabee push-poll  
Comments: To: "Steen, Bob" <[bob.steen@fleishman.com](mailto:bob.steen@fleishman.com)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To:  
<[520278AB4C581048BBC69B44B04D067207CD935D@stle31.corp.fleishman.com](mailto:520278AB4C581048BBC69B44B04D067207CD935D@stle31.corp.fleishman.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="utf-8"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

No screening, no collection of demographic data, political ID, nothing. Just a recording keyed to my responses. Yes I'll be voting in the Michigan Republican Primary (I'm a bipartisan, unaffiliated, independent, freethinker who has voted for Democrats, Republicans, and third- and fourth-party candidates...and

stayed out of one Presidential election because I didn't have enough clothespins.) because the Democrats have announced that no Michigan delegates will be seated at the convention because Michigan pushed its primary up in the schedule.

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  
517-353-2639

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

From: Steen, Bob [mailto:bob.steen@fleishman.com]  
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 6:26 PM  
To: Ehrlich, Nathaniel  
Subject: RE: Huckabee push-poll

At least you didn't get screened out as a researcher!

Bob Steen

Vice President  
Fleishman-Hillard  
Research  
200 N. Broadway  
St. Louis, MO 63102

Office direct: 011 314-982-1752  
Office fax: 011 314-982-9105

Delivering Results at the Point of Impact â,,

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Ehrlich, Nathaniel  
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 4:48 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Huckabee push-poll

I've just been push-pollled by the Huckabee campaign. Flagrant. I won't be responding to emails until tomorrow, just sitting down to dinner. But if there ever was a thing as a push-poll, i.e. a campaign that purports to be a survey but is intended to sway voters (in the upcoming Republican primary in MI) this was it.

The caller ID listed L. Hinton as the caller. This was the second call today

from this source. My wife didn't pick it up the first time, but I was preparing dinner just now, so I did.

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

517-353-2639

---

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 this: set aapornet mail Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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 this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

---

Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 23:04:32 -0500

Reply-To: Colleen Porter <[colleen\\_porter@COX.NET](mailto:colleen_porter@COX.NET)>

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

From: Colleen Porter <[colleen\\_porter@COX.NET](mailto:colleen_porter@COX.NET)>

Subject: "Violence-Related Mortality in Iraq"

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

Mime-Version: 1.0 (Apple Message framework v753)

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII; delp=; format=flowed

Overshadowed by the compelling discussion of the political polls this week was another important survey-related story, release of the findings on "Violence-Related Mortality in Iraq from 2002 to 2006" by the Iraq Family Health Survey Study Group, work conducted by a collaboration between the WHO and Iraqi health ministries.

The report was published online-first this week in the New England Journal of Medicine at  
<http://content.nejm.org/cgi/content/full/NEJMsa0707782>

And there was an accompanying "perspective" piece on gathering mortality data during humanitarian crises at  
<http://content.nejm.org/cgi/content/full/NEJMp0709003>

I have some thoughts on why these rates (point estimate of 151,000; range estimate, 104,000 to 223,000) were different from the previous estimates by Burnham et al. in the Lancet in fall 2006.

But I would also appreciate any insights that y'all have to share.

Also, it was stunning to read the footnote at the end, that one of the study authors had been killed on his way to work in Baghdad

Colleen Porter  
Gainesville, FL

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Date: Fri, 11 Jan 2008 09:42:49 -0500  
Reply-To: "Murray, Patrick" <[pdmurray@MONMOUTH.EDU](mailto:pdmurray@MONMOUTH.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Murray, Patrick" <[pdmurray@MONMOUTH.EDU](mailto:pdmurray@MONMOUTH.EDU)>  
Subject: Q for NH pollsters on soft support  
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

Have any of the NH pollsters captured soft support? In addition to the usual follow-up question on "may change mind" has anyone captured respondents who initially said undecided, but made a choice after the interviewer probed. I suspect (and have some partial evidence for this) that Obama may do better on the probe.

=20

Patrick Murray  
Director of Polling Institute  
Monmouth University  
West Long Branch, NJ 07764-1898  
732-263-5858  
[pdmurray@monmouth.edu](mailto:pdmurray@monmouth.edu)

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Fri, 11 Jan 2008 11:39:22 -0500  
Reply-To: Jennifer Agiesta <AgiestaJ@WASHPOST.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Jennifer Agiesta <AgiestaJ@WASHPOST.COM>  
Subject: NH Vote Counts  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=UTF-8  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Here's an analysis of vote in the 2008, 2004 and 2000 Democratic primaries among those in precincts currently using Diebold machines vs. hand count:

The Method or the Map?

By Jennifer Agiesta and Jon Cohen

Liberal blogs are aflame with speculation that Diebold voting machines rigged a Granite State victory for New York Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton.

Vote tallies from the New Hampshire Secretary of State <<http://www.sos.nh.gov/presprim2008/index.htm>> show that she won by 4.23 percentage points in the counties using Diebold optical scanners, but lost by 5.81 points in those where paper ballots are counted by hand. (These numbers use the most recent vote counts by township.)

Ergo conspiracy.

Preliminary analysis from Edison/Mitofsky, however, indicates that the difference between the two types of precincts goes back at least two elections. As Joe Lenski, executive vice president of Edison Media Research, wrote in an e-mail, "unless there has been hidden election fraud in New Hampshire for the last three presidential primaries the 'evidence' being used by these fraudsters probably does not hold up to any rigorous statistical analysis."

Moreover, attributing all the differences between these townships to their choice of vote-counting procedures misses other potentially important differences among voters (e.g., proportions independent, highly-educated).

Hereâ€™s a Behind the Numbers analysis, showing the differences between the townships have been in the same direction the last three cycles:

	Townships currently using	
	Optical scanners	Paper ballots
2008 Clinton	40.14	33.84
2008 Obama	35.91	39.65
2008 Margin	Clinton +4.23	Obama +5.81
2004 Kerry	39.50	32.53
2004 Dean	24.78	34.19

2004 Margin	Kerry +14.73	Dean +1.67
2000 Gore	50.35	45.82
2000 Bradley	45.04	49.07
2000 Margin	Gore +5.3	Bradley +3.26

Link here:

[http://blog.washingtonpost.com/behind-the-numbers/2008/01/the\\_method\\_or\\_the\\_map\\_1.html](http://blog.washingtonpost.com/behind-the-numbers/2008/01/the_method_or_the_map_1.html)

~~~~~  
Jennifer Agiesta  
Polling Analyst  
The Washington Post  
1150 15th St. NW  
Washington, DC 20071  
202.334.4578

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Fri, 11 Jan 2008 13:20:16 -0500  
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: NH Vote Counts  
Comments: To: Jennifer Agiesta <[AgiestaJ@WASHPOST.COM](mailto:AgiestaJ@WASHPOST.COM)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: A<[OF5BD57343.67AA060A-ON852573CD.005B1FF7-852573CD.005B7EC6@washpost.com](mailto:OF5BD57343.67AA060A-ON852573CD.005B1FF7-852573CD.005B7EC6@washpost.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="utf-8"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Thanks very much for posting this. But I'm afraid that the diehard conspiracy theorists would just say "See...it's been going on since 2000!"

Nat Ehrlich, Ph.D.  
Research Specialist  
Michigan State University  
Institute for Public Policy and Social Research  
Office for Survey Research  
321 Berkey Hall  
East Lansing, MI 48824  
517-353-2639

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

From: AAPORNET [[mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)] On Behalf Of Jennifer Agiesta

Sent: Friday, January 11, 2008 11:39 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: NH Vote Counts

Here's an analysis of vote in the 2008, 2004 and 2000 Democratic primaries among those in precincts currently using Diebold machines vs. hand count:

The Method or the Map?

By Jennifer Agiesta and Jon Cohen

Liberal blogs are aflame with speculation that Diebold voting machines rigged a Granite State victory for New York Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton.

Vote tallies from the New Hampshire Secretary of State

<<http://www.sos.nh.gov/presprim2008/index.htm>> show that she won by 4.23 percentage points in the counties using Diebold optical scanners, but lost by 5.81 points in those where paper ballots are counted by hand. (These numbers use the most recent vote counts by township.)

Ergo conspiracy.

Preliminary analysis from Edison/Mitofsky, however, indicates that the difference between the two types of precincts goes back at least two elections. As Joe Lenski, executive vice president of Edison Media Research, wrote in an e-mail, "unless there has been hidden election fraud in New Hampshire for the last three presidential primaries the 'evidence' being used by these fraudsters probably does not hold up to any rigorous statistical analysis."

Moreover, attributing all the differences between these townships to their choice of vote-counting procedures misses other potentially important differences among voters (e.g., proportions independent, highly-educated).

Here's a Behind the Numbers analysis, showing the differences between the townships have been in the same direction the last three cycles:

|              | Townships currently using |               |
|--------------|---------------------------|---------------|
|              | Optical scanners          | Paper ballots |
| 2008 Clinton | 40.14                     | 33.84         |
| 2008 Obama   | 35.91                     | 39.65         |
| 2008 Margin  | Clinton +4.23             | Obama +5.81   |
| 2004 Kerry   | 39.50                     | 32.53         |
| 2004 Dean    | 24.78                     | 34.19         |
| 2004 Margin  | Kerry +14.73              | Dean +1.67    |
| 2000 Gore    | 50.35                     | 45.82         |
| 2000 Bradley | 45.04                     | 49.07         |
| 2000 Margin  | Gore +5.3                 | Bradley +3.26 |

Link here:

[http://blog.washingtonpost.com/behind-the-numbers/2008/01/the\\_method\\_or\\_the\\_map\\_1.html](http://blog.washingtonpost.com/behind-the-numbers/2008/01/the_method_or_the_map_1.html)

~~~~~  
Jennifer Agiesta  
Polling Analyst  
The Washington Post  
1150 15th St. NW  
Washington, DC 20071  
202.334.4578

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Fri, 11 Jan 2008 18:23:15 +0000  
Reply-To: "Craighill, Peyton M" <[Peyton.M.Craighill@ABC.COM](mailto:Peyton.M.Craighill@ABC.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Craighill, Peyton M" <[Peyton.M.Craighill@ABC.COM](mailto:Peyton.M.Craighill@ABC.COM)>  
Subject: Polling commentary: The New Hampshire Polls: What We Know  
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

From Gary Langer's new blog:

=20

Efforts so far to explain the New Hampshire poll meltdown amount to theories in search of data; we don't yet have the hard evidence and full, thoughtful evaluation we need. But two of the most current explanations are to my mind the weakest: that the polls were right when taken, but missed a late Clinton surge; or that respondents lied.

=20

See the entire blog at The Numbers:  
<http://blogs.abcnews.com/thenumbers/2008/01/the-new-hampshi.html>

=20

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



signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Fri, 11 Jan 2008 13:43:16 -0500  
Reply-To: howard schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: howard schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>  
Subject: Nonresponse & NH  
Comments: To: aapor <aapornet@asu.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Much of the concern about the New Hampshire polls has focused on those said to be "undecided," not to mention the efficacy of tears. But if we are looking for sources of bias (e.g., with regard to race), we need to consider nonresponse, especially Refusals. When I first became involved in doing surveys, I assumed that less than an 80% response rate (with Refusals under 10% of the total sample) was a dismal showing, throwing considerable doubt on the validity of results for the target population. Then we sometimes calculated results assuming the worst as far as the distribution on nonresponse for key variables.

Those days are probably gone forever in the U.S. (though still obtainable in some other countries). Nowadays overt and covert refusals are massive, and polling directors blithely assume that they are random or at least can be readily taken "adjusted for." Apparently that often works out to be the case. But it's not inevitable, and there is no license from Heaven that makes it so. Exactly where race or some other highly sensitive issue is implicit in an election is just where we might be called to account for the casual way in which nonresponse is accepted at present--and of course not even seriously acknowledged by even what we think of as the best polls. Howard

p.s. Mark Blumenthal recently asked for ratings of "best polls" in terms of whether they are "reliable." He should have used the term "valid." The polls can all be highly reliable because they are all sampling some 20 or 30% (even that is too high for some polls) of the target population, but invalid with regard to what they hope to have measured.

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Fri, 11 Jan 2008 13:55:34 -0500  
Reply-To: Paul J Lavrakas PhD <pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Paul J Lavrakas PhD <pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET>  
Subject: Re: NH Vote Counts  
Comments: To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>,  
AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

In-Reply-To: <EC15B06368AAA4419321FF6D2159CB1C01C46EB3@sscnt03-2.ssc.msu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

further indicating how mentally unbalanced they are, huh?

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Ehrlich, Nathaniel  
Sent: Friday, January 11, 2008 1:20 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: NH Vote Counts

Thanks very much for posting this. But I'm afraid that the diehard conspiracy theorists would just say "See...it's been going on since 2000!"

Nat Ehrlich, Ph.D.  
Research Specialist  
Michigan State University  
Institute for Public Policy and Social Research Office for Survey Research  
321 Berkey Hall  
East Lansing, MI 48824  
517-353-2639

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jennifer Agiesta  
Sent: Friday, January 11, 2008 11:39 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: NH Vote Counts

Here's an analysis of vote in the 2008, 2004 and 2000 Democratic primaries among those in precincts currently using Diebold machines vs. hand count:

The Method or the Map?  
By Jennifer Agiesta and Jon Cohen

Liberal blogs are aflame with speculation that Diebold voting machines rigged a Granite State victory for New York Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton.

Vote tallies from the New Hampshire Secretary of State <<http://www.sos.nh.gov/presprim2008/index.htm>> show that she won by 4.23 percentage points in the counties using Diebold optical scanners, but lost by 5.81 points in those where paper ballots are counted by hand. (These numbers use the most recent vote counts by township.)

Ergo conspiracy.

Preliminary analysis from Edison/Mitofsky, however, indicates that the difference between the two types of precincts goes back at least two elections. As Joe Lenski, executive vice president of Edison Media Research, wrote in an e-mail, "unless there has been hidden election fraud in New Hampshire for the last three presidential primaries the 'evidence' being used by these fraudsters probably does not hold up to any rigorous

statistical analysis."

Moreover, attributing all the differences between these townships to their choice of vote-counting procedures misses other potentially important differences among voters (e.g., proportions independent, highly-educated).

Here's a Behind the Numbers analysis, showing the differences between the townships have been in the same direction the last three cycles:

	Townships currently using	
	Optical scanners	Paper ballots
2008 Clinton	40.14	33.84
2008 Obama	35.91	39.65
2008 Margin	Clinton +4.23	Obama +5.81
2004 Kerry	39.50	32.53
2004 Dean	24.78	34.19
2004 Margin	Kerry +14.73	Dean +1.67
2000 Gore	50.35	45.82
2000 Bradley	45.04	49.07
2000 Margin	Gore +5.3	Bradley +3.26

Link here:

[http://blog.washingtonpost.com/behind-the-numbers/2008/01/the\\_method\\_or\\_the\\_map\\_1.html](http://blog.washingtonpost.com/behind-the-numbers/2008/01/the_method_or_the_map_1.html)

~~~~~  
Jennifer Agiesta  
Polling Analyst  
The Washington Post  
1150 15th St. NW  
Washington, DC 20071  
202.334.4578

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Fri, 11 Jan 2008 13:42:05 -0600  
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>  
Subject: Late Surge For Clinton  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=windows-1252; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Regarding:

> The mistakes were not the result of a last-minute trend going Mrs.  
> Clinton's way. Yes, according to exit polls the 17 percent of voters  
> who said they made their decision on Election Day chose Mrs. Clinton a  
> little more than those who decided in the past two or three weeks. But  
> the margin was very small — 39 percent of the late deciders went for  
> Mrs. Clinton and 36 percent went for Mr. Obama. This gap is obviously  
> too narrow to explain the wide lead for Mr. Obama that kept showing up  
> in pre-election polls.

I think it's time to take another look NH late decider exit poll data.  
They appear to deny the Iowa bounce theory for Obama followed by a later  
comeback by Clinton and suggest earlier polls off.

Late decider voting usually tracks pretty well when election day  
outcomes don't match earlier phone polls.

We exit polled the 04 WI primary as did NEP. Late decider votes for  
Edwards explained how the race tightened; i.e., how the election outcome  
differed from phone polls. We see such results time and time again. But  
I think the data are pretty soft when it comes to pinpointing the final  
decision.

The NH exit poll showed:

Obama won by 43% to 28% over Clinton among the "decided sometime last  
week" group. That was the Iowa bounce.

Clinton won by 48% to 31% the "decided before last month" group .

Obama and Clinton are even on other time categories which spawned denial  
of the trend above.

Let's assume that some voters were FOR Clinton then FOR Obama and then  
FOR Clinton. I believe they were.

How did they answer? The first time when they decided for Clinton or the  
second time when they decided for? Both answers are accurate. How would  
you answer?

I don't think answers to all research questions should be taken so literally. Question writer intentions don't always match respondent understanding. I don't think voters have time stamps in their brains to know exactly when they made the final, final decision. I have always thought that these data were somewhat soft.

These data should not be taken so literally. And I don't think the data deny the late surge for Clinton.

I'd like to hear from some exit pollsters on this.

Nick

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Fri, 11 Jan 2008 14:21:30 -0600

Reply-To: [amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU](mailto:amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU)

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

From: "Allan L. McCutcheon" <[amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU](mailto:amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU)>

Subject: Re: Polling commentary: The New Hampshire Polls: What We Know

Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

In-Reply-To: <[4A7624AEDBFA3E41A4DB0A69808E462104E2F4D8@SM-NYNY-VXMB01B.nena.wdpr.disney.com](mailto:4A7624AEDBFA3E41A4DB0A69808E462104E2F4D8@SM-NYNY-VXMB01B.nena.wdpr.disney.com)>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Disposition: inline

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I don't want to rain on anyone's metaphor, but "meltdown," "disaster," debacle," are hyperbole that the pundits have come up with re. the NH primary pre-election polls. AAPOR members should not buy into it.

Let's look at what happened. A quick review of the election results and of Pollster.com or RealClearPolitics.com indicate that (with the usual between-poll variation) the pre-election polls estimated the likely outcome for all but one of the candidates. It was an important mis-estimate, true, but the estimates for the other 9 candidates (depending on which candidates are included) were spot-on. In 1948, there were estimates for 2 candidates, and both estimates were wrong.

Once again--there was only one mis-estimate--the pre-election polls under-estimated Clinton's vote by about 9 percent (again, taking the poll average); the estimates for all of the other candidates are so un-remarkable, because they are so accurate, and accuracy is the norm in pre-election polling.

We need to focus on explaining one thing--why was Clinton's vote so under-estimated by the pre-election poll.

The explanation is linked to the record-shattering turnout for the

Democratic primaries--and "record-shattering" is not hyperbole; nearly 70,000 more people voted in the 2008 Dem primary than in the 2004 Dem primary (and 2004 was the previous record turnout for the Dems). No one, not even NH Sec of State Bill Gardener, predicted this level of turnout.

Interestingly, the turnout for the 2008 Republican primaries was virtually identical to the 2000, which was the previous competitive Republican primary (Gardener did predict this).

Something went wrong, but this was no more a "meltdown of polls" than it was a Diebold conspiracy.

Best,  
Allan

--  
Donald O. Clifton Chair of Survey Science  
Professor of Statistics &  
Survey Research and Methodology  
tel. +402.458.2036  
fax +402.458.2038

Quoting "Craighill, Peyton M" <Peyton.M.Craighill@ABC.COM>:

>> From Gary Langer's new blog:

>  
>  
>  
> Efforts so far to explain the New Hampshire poll meltdown amount to  
> theories in search of data; we don't yet have the hard evidence and  
> full, thoughtful evaluation we need. But two of the most current  
> explanations are to my mind the weakest: that the polls were right when  
> taken, but missed a late Clinton surge; or that respondents lied.

>  
>  
>  
> See the entire blog at The Numbers:  
> <http://blogs.abcnews.com/thenumbers/2008/01/the-new-hampshi.html>

>  
>  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
> signoff aapornet  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Fri, 11 Jan 2008 15:38:21 -0500  
Reply-To: lindeman@BARD.EDU  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mark Lindeman <lindeman@BARD.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Late Surge For Clinton  
Comments: To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
In-Reply-To: <4787C68D.70204@marketsharescorp.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=UTF-8; DelSp="Yes"; format="flowed"  
Content-Disposition: inline  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Quoting Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>:

> These data should not be taken so literally. And I don't think the data  
> deny the late surge for Clinton.  
>  
> I'd like to hear from some exit pollsters on this.

Well, I'm not an exit pollster, but I was arguing the same thing on  
pollster.com.

The 2004 NH primary exit poll does show a bounce -- although, at least  
at a glance, the bounce isn't "big" enough, underscoring that it might  
not be wise to take these results literally.

Mark Lindeman

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Fri, 11 Jan 2008 13:37:32 -0800  
Reply-To: John Nienstedt <john@CERC.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: John Nienstedt <john@CERC.NET>  
Subject: Re: Late Surge For Clinton  
Comments: To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>,  
"AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
In-Reply-To: <4787C68D.70204@marketsharescorp.com>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Nick/Mark: I'm a pre-election pollster (among other things), not an exit  
pollster, but I think your point is an excellent one. From the exit poll . .  
.

Dem voters

|                 | % for | Amount   |    |      |                       |
|-----------------|-------|----------|----|------|-----------------------|
| Reflected       |       |          |    |      |                       |
| When Decided    | %     | approx n | HC | MoSE | in Pre-Election Polls |
| Decided Tuesday | 17    | 332      | 39 | 5.3  | None                  |
| Last 3 days     | 21    | 410      | 34 | 4.6  | Partial               |
| Last week       | 10    | 196      | 28 | 6.3  | All                   |
| Last month      | 17    | 332      | 34 | 5.1  | All                   |
| Prior           | 34    | 665      | 48 | 3.8  | All                   |

All numbers are approximate since I'm sure a lot of weighting was done.

- 1) there was a lot of fluidity in the last few days; nearly half "made up their minds" in the last week
- 2) the exit poll's best estimate shows a Clinton surge
- 3) the exit poll's best estimate tracks extremely well with pre-election poll results which showed Clinton dominating prior to December, tightening occurring in December and then a substantial post-Iowa drop. Over the last three days 1/5 to 1/7 the pre-election polls did pick up a slight surge for Clinton. She roughly went from 30 to 32 to 34 during that time span (here I am apportioning the undecideds as if they didn't vote or broke evenly . . . though I strongly suspect they did vote and broke mostly for Clinton) See realclearpolitics at <http://preview.tinyurl.com/2exju2>
- 4) because of the sample size and your point about interviewers not exactly matching their understanding of the time frame to the exit pollster's, these amount to very educated estimates and, in fact, the surge could have been much greater

To me, this strongly suggests that a substantially large block of uncommitted voters created an environment where Clinton's show of emotion and, possibly, her performance in the last debate plus a superior field organization resulted in the surge which makes the pre-election polls look wrong when in fact they simply couldn't poll on the critical day that 17% of the electorate made up their mind.

That said, to go out on the limb, I suspect that some of the 8% who were undecided in the late pre-election polls were actually "anybody but Obama" voters. Bradley effect? Maybe, but unlike that CA Gov race, this was not a one-on-one situation. They could have been considering Edwards, but ultimately went with Clinton.

John Nienstedt, Sr.  
800-576-CERC  
Get the Edge at [www.cerc.net](http://www.cerc.net)

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)] On Behalf Of Nick Panagakis  
Sent: Friday, January 11, 2008 11:42 AM  
To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Subject: Late Surge For Clinton

Regarding:

- > The mistakes were not the result of a last-minute trend going Mrs.
- > Clinton's way. Yes, according to exit polls the 17 percent of voters
- > who said they made their decision on Election Day chose Mrs. Clinton a



- > little more than those who decided in the past two or three weeks. But
- > the margin was very small - 39 percent of the late deciders went for
- > Mrs. Clinton and 36 percent went for Mr. Obama. This gap is obviously
- > too narrow to explain the wide lead for Mr. Obama that kept showing up
- > in pre-election polls.

I think it's time to take another look NH late decider exit poll data. They appear to deny the Iowa bounce theory for Obama followed by a later comeback by Clinton and suggest earlier polls off.

Late decider voting usually tracks pretty well when election day outcomes don't match earlier phone polls.

We exit polled the 04 WI primary as did NEP. Late decider votes for Edwards explained how the race tightened; i.e., how the election outcome differed from phone polls. We see such results time and time again. But I think the data are pretty soft when it comes to pinpointing the final decision.

The NH exit poll showed:

Obama won by 43% to 28% over Clinton among the "decided sometime last week" group. That was the Iowa bounce.

Clinton won by 48% to 31% the "decided before last month" group .

Obama and Clinton are even on other time categories which spawned denial of the trend above.

Let's assume that some voters were FOR Clinton then FOR Obama and then FOR Clinton. I believe they were.

How did they answer? The first time when they decided for Clinton or the second time when they decided for? Both answers are accurate. How would you answer?

I don't think answers to all research questions should be taken so literally. Question writer intentions don't always match respondent understanding. I don't think voters have time stamps in their brains to know exactly when they made the final, final decision. I have always thought that these data were somewhat soft.

These data should not be taken so literally. And I don't think the data deny the late surge for Clinton.

I'd like to hear from some exit pollsters on this.

Nick

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Date: Fri, 11 Jan 2008 15:36:18 -0800

Reply-To: "Pollack, Lance" <[Lance.Pollack@UCSF.EDU](mailto:Lance.Pollack@UCSF.EDU)>

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

From: "Pollack, Lance" <[Lance.Pollack@UCSF.EDU](mailto:Lance.Pollack@UCSF.EDU)>

Subject: Re: Late Surge For Clinton

Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

In-Reply-To:

[A<CA62D583B8F55A4ABADEEF50C662DF625C6833BD@EXCHANGE.CERC2.cerc.local>](mailto:A<CA62D583B8F55A4ABADEEF50C662DF625C6833BD@EXCHANGE.CERC2.cerc.local>)

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Two other changes occurred in the Clinton campaign that might have affected the decision of undecideds. First, Senator Clinton went back to her "listening tour" approach to her senatorial campaign, i.e., taking time at each stop to take unscripted questions and comments. This allowed for the "moment", but the "moment" may have been only part of the deal, the new strategy being another part. Second, via her husband, the Clinton campaign asked voters to look beyond Obama's "fired up" speech. They might have regained some voters who decided what they really liked was the speech but on other attributes really liked Clinton.

Lance M. Pollack, PhD

University of California, San Francisco

Center for AIDS Prevention Studies (CAPS)

50 Beale Street, Suite 1300

San Francisco, CA 94105

tel: 415-597-9302

fax: 415-597-9213

email: [Lance.Pollack@ucsf.edu](mailto:Lance.Pollack@ucsf.edu)

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

From: AAPORNET [[mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)] On Behalf Of John Nienstedt

Sent: Friday, January 11, 2008 1:38 PM

To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

Subject: Re: Late Surge For Clinton

Nick/Mark: I'm a pre-election pollster (among other things), not an exit pollster, but I think your point is an excellent one. From the exit poll . . .

Dem voters

|              |   | % for    | Amount |      |                 |
|--------------|---|----------|--------|------|-----------------|
| Reflected    |   |          |        |      |                 |
| When Decided | % | approx n | HC     | MoSE | in Pre-Election |
| Polls        |   |          |        |      |                 |

|                 |    |     |    |     |         |
|-----------------|----|-----|----|-----|---------|
| Decided Tuesday | 17 | 332 | 39 | 5.3 | None    |
| Last 3 days     | 21 | 410 | 34 | 4.6 | Partial |
| Last week       | 10 | 196 | 28 | 6.3 | All     |
| Last month      | 17 | 332 | 34 | 5.1 | All     |
| Prior           | 34 | 665 | 48 | 3.8 | All     |

All numbers are approximate since I'm sure a lot of weighting was done.

- 1) there was a lot of fluidity in the last few days; nearly half "made up their minds" in the last week
- 2) the exit poll's best estimate shows a Clinton surge
- 3) the exit poll's best estimate tracks extremely well with pre-election poll results which showed Clinton dominating prior to December, tightening occurring in December and then a substantial post-Iowa drop. Over the last three days 1/5 to 1/7 the pre-election polls did pick up a slight surge for Clinton. She roughly went from 30 to 32 to 34 during that time span (here I am apportioning the undecideds as if they didn't vote or broke evenly . . . though I strongly suspect they did vote and broke mostly for Clinton) See realclearpolitics at <http://preview.tinyurl.com/2exju2>
- 4) because of the sample size and your point about interviewers not exactly matching their understanding of the time frame to the exit pollster's, these amount to very educated estimates and, in fact, the surge could have been much greater

To me, this strongly suggests that a substantially large block of uncommitted voters created an environment where Clinton's show of emotion and, possibly, her performance in the last debate plus a superior field organization resulted in the surge which makes the pre-election polls look wrong when in fact they simply couldn't poll on the critical day that 17% of the electorate made up their mind. That said, to go out on the limb, I suspect that some of the 8% who were undecided in the late pre-election polls were actually "anybody but Obama" voters. Bradley effect? Maybe, but unlike that CA Gov race, this was not a one-on-one situation. They could have been considering Edwards, but ultimately went with Clinton.

John Nienstedt, Sr.  
800-576-CERC  
Get the Edge at [www.cerc.net](http://www.cerc.net)

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)] On Behalf Of Nick Panagakis  
Sent: Friday, January 11, 2008 11:42 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Late Surge For Clinton

Regarding:

- > The mistakes were not the result of a last-minute trend going Mrs.
- > Clinton's way. Yes, according to exit polls the 17 percent of voters
- > who said they made their decision on Election Day chose Mrs. Clinton a
- > little more than those who decided in the past two or three weeks. But
- > the margin was very small - 39 percent of the late deciders went for

> Mrs. Clinton and 36 percent went for Mr. Obama. This gap is obviously  
> too narrow to explain the wide lead for Mr. Obama that kept showing up  
> in pre-election polls.

I think it's time to take another look NH late decider exit poll data.  
They appear to deny the Iowa bounce theory for Obama followed by a later  
comeback by Clinton and suggest earlier polls off.

Late decider voting usually tracks pretty well when election day  
outcomes don't match earlier phone polls.

We exit polled the 04 WI primary as did NEP. Late decider votes for  
Edwards explained how the race tightened; i.e., how the election outcome  
differed from phone polls. We see such results time and time again. But  
I think the data are pretty soft when it comes to pinpointing the final  
decision.

The NH exit poll showed:

Obama won by 43% to 28% over Clinton among the "decided sometime last  
week" group. That was the Iowa bounce.

Clinton won by 48% to 31% the "decided before last month" group .

Obama and Clinton are even on other time categories which spawned denial  
of the trend above.

Let's assume that some voters were FOR Clinton then FOR Obama and then  
FOR Clinton. I believe they were.

How did they answer? The first time when they decided for Clinton or the  
second time when they decided for? Both answers are accurate. How would  
you answer?

I don't think answers to all research questions should be taken so  
literally. Question writer intentions don't always match respondent  
understanding. I don't think voters have time stamps in their brains to  
know exactly when they made the final, final decision. I have always  
thought that these data were somewhat soft.

These data should not be taken so literally. And I don't think the data  
deny the late surge for Clinton.

I'd like to hear from some exit pollsters on this.

Nick

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Fri, 11 Jan 2008 16:32:05 -0800  
Reply-To: Bob Lee <[boblee48@BERKELEY.EDU](mailto:boblee48@BERKELEY.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Bob Lee <[boblee48@BERKELEY.EDU](mailto:boblee48@BERKELEY.EDU)>  
Subject: We may have to invite Ariana back to our conference  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Huffington Post is promoting a petition that asks people to "Say NO to Pollsters". She encourages people to sign it and share it with their friends who live in upcoming primary states.

With friends like her...

--

In 2008, SRC celebrates 50 years of high quality survey research services

Robert H. Lee  
Director of Survey Operations  
Survey Research Center  
University of California, Berkeley  
2538 Channing Way  
# 5100  
Berkeley, CA 94720  
510-642-0871 (my direct #)  
510-643-8292 (fax)  
<http://srcweb.berkeley.edu/>

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Sat, 12 Jan 2008 02:05:32 +0000  
Reply-To: "mail@marketsharescorp.com" <[mkshares@COMCAST.NET](mailto:mkshares@COMCAST.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "mail@marketsharescorp.com" <[mkshares@COMCAST.NET](mailto:mkshares@COMCAST.NET)>  
Subject: Re: We may have to invite Ariana back to our conference

Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

Just like Ariana to exploit her perception of a bad situation.

The same nonsense as in 1998. That's what she is all about. Commercial opportunity.

She should be ignored. Some people never change.

Forget about it.

Nick

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

From: Bob Lee <boblee48@BERKELEY.EDU>

> Huffington Post is promoting a petition that asks people to "Say NO to  
> Pollsters". She encourages people to sign it and share it with their  
> friends who live in upcoming primary states.

>  
> With friends like her...

>  
> --  
>

> In 2008, SRC celebrates 50 years of high quality survey research services

>  
> Robert H. Lee  
> Director of Survey Operations  
> Survey Research Center  
> University of California, Berkeley  
> 2538 Channing Way  
> # 5100  
> Berkeley, CA 94720  
> 510-642-0871 (my direct #)  
> 510-643-8292 (fax)  
> <http://srcweb.berkeley.edu/>

>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
> signoff aapornet  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Fri, 11 Jan 2008 23:02:08 -0500  
Reply-To: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <[tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu](mailto:tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <[tmglp@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU](mailto:tmglp@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Late Surge For Clinton

Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
In-Reply-To: <4787C68D.70204@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 many posts about the NH discrepancy, and it seems to me that some observers are failing to distinguish between the decision about whom one favors and the decision on whether or not to bother to vote. Hillary's success may owe to mobilization of low-likelihood voters who already favored her (or already were against Obama) and were judged by the pollsters' likelihood models to be unlikely to show up at the polls. If events in the media or in the campaign itself (in the last few days) motivated them to vote after all, then you would have larger numbers of voters for Clinton without necessarily having a surge of 'late-deciders' in terms of candidate preference. In the exit polls, folks may have declared themselves to be early deciders because they favored Clinton from the start, even though they earlier weren't sure if they'd bother to cast a ballot. How does that idea fit with the data?

Tom

Thomas M. Guterbock                      Voice: (434)243-5223  
Director                                  CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222  
Center for Survey Research              FAX: (434)982-5524  
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> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date:      Fri, 11 Jan 2008 23:54:37 -0500  
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:    Letter from Humphrey Taylor in NY Times  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=windows-1252; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

The following letter appeared in today's New York Times (1/11/2008):

To the Editor:

Thank you for publishing Andrew Kohut's excellent commentary on why the polls predicted an Obama victory in New Hampshire ("Getting It Wrong,"

Op-Ed, Jan. 10). If he is right that the biggest reason may have been that "less well-educated white people" who "do not respond to surveys tend to have more unfavorable views of blacks than respondents who do the interviews," this has very serious implications for the future of telephone polling.

Refusal rates in phone surveys have been increasing remorselessly for 30 years. For a long time we have been worried that lower response rates would bias our telephone poll results, with the near certainty that they would eventually do so. New Hampshire may be a sign that tougher times lie ahead for pollsters.

Humphrey Taylor  
Chairman, The Harris Poll  
Harris Interactive  
New York, Jan. 10, 2008

-----  
[http://www.nytimes.com/2008/01/11/opinion/111elect.html?\\_r=1&ref=opinion&oref=slogin](http://www.nytimes.com/2008/01/11/opinion/111elect.html?_r=1&ref=opinion&oref=slogin)

or

<http://tinyurl.com/25aa44>

-----  
Jan Werner

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====

Date: Sat, 12 Jan 2008 15:59:11 +0000  
Reply-To: [rbrapo@wm.edu](mailto:rbrapo@wm.edu)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Ronald Rapoport <[rbrapo@WM.EDU](mailto:rbrapo@WM.EDU)>  
Subject: New Hampshire 2008 and Reagan-Carter 1980  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[4788480D.8090206@jwdp.com](mailto:4788480D.8090206@jwdp.com)>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="Windows-1252"  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

In 1980 the polls (including CBS-NYT) had the election "too close to call" and Reagan won big. In response Warren Mitofsky resurveyed the pre-election CBS-NYT sample after the election and found that post-election interview vote reports reflected the actual outcome showing that the sample was good and that it was late deciders that caused the "error."

I think that PEW (or someone else) would do a great service by doing this now.



No one really knows what happened, and doing this would at least eliminate some possibilities.

Ron Rapoport  
Department of Government  
College of William and Mary  
Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry

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

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>

Date: Fri, 11 Jan 2008 23:54:37

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: Letter from Humphrey Taylor in NY Times

The following letter appeared in today's New York Times (1/11/2008):

To the Editor:

Thank you for publishing Andrew Kohut's excellent commentary on why the polls predicted an Obama victory in New Hampshire ("Getting It Wrong," Op-Ed, Jan. 10). If he is right that the biggest reason may have been that "less well-educated white people" who "do not respond to surveys tend to have more unfavorable views of blacks than respondents who do the interviews," this has very serious implications for the future of telephone polling.

Refusal rates in phone surveys have been increasing remorselessly for 30 years. For a long time we have been worried that lower response rates would bias our telephone poll results, with the near certainty that they would eventually do so. New Hampshire may be a sign that tougher times lie ahead for pollsters.

Humphrey Taylor  
Chairman, The Harris Poll  
Harris Interactive  
New York, Jan. 10, 2008

-----

[http://www.nytimes.com/2008/01/11/opinion/11elect.html?\\_r=1&ref=opinion&oref=slogin](http://www.nytimes.com/2008/01/11/opinion/11elect.html?_r=1&ref=opinion&oref=slogin)

or

<http://tinyurl.com/25aa44>

-----

Jan Werner

-----

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Sat, 12 Jan 2008 16:32:37 -0500  
Reply-To: [zukin@rci.rutgers.edu](mailto:zukin@rci.rutgers.edu)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Cliff Zukin <[zukin@RCI.RUTGERS.EDU](mailto:zukin@RCI.RUTGERS.EDU)>  
Subject: NH: respondent call backs  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
In-Reply-To: <[AAPORNET%200801112100010122.0005@LISTS.ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET%200801112100010122.0005@LISTS.ASU.EDU)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=utf-8  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

While it may be too late to do so, an obvious line of inquiry would be for those polling organizations that underestimated the Clinton vote call back their respondents (at least the undecided voters, but perhaps others) and ask whether and how they finally voted in the primary.

Cliff Zukin  
Professor of Public Policy and Political Science  
John. J. Heldrich Center for Workforce Development  
Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy  
Rutgers University  
30 Livingston Avenue  
New Brunswick, NJ 08901  
[zukin@rci.rutgers.edu](mailto:zukin@rci.rutgers.edu) 732 932 4100 x6205

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of AAPORNET automatic digest system  
Sent: Friday, January 11, 2008 11:00 PM  
To: [AAPORNET@LISTS.ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@LISTS.ASU.EDU)  
Subject: AAPORNET Digest - 10 Jan 2008 to 11 Jan 2008 (#2008-9)

There are 14 messages totalling 981 lines in this issue.

Topics of the day:

1. "Violence-Related Mortality in Iraq"
2. Q for NH pollsters on soft support
3. NH Vote Counts (3)
4. Polling commentary: The New Hampshire Polls: What We Know (2)
5. Nonresponse & NH
6. Late Surge For Clinton (4)
7. We may have to invite Ariana back to our conference (2)

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2008 23:04:32 -0500  
From: Colleen Porter <[colleen\\_porter@COX.NET](mailto:colleen_porter@COX.NET)>  
Subject: "Violence-Related Mortality in Iraq"

Overshadowed by the compelling discussion of the political polls this week was another important survey-related story, release of the findings on "Violence-Related Mortality in Iraq from 2002 to 2006" by the Iraq Family Health Survey Study Group, work conducted by a collaboration between the WHO and Iraqi health ministries.

The report was published online-first this week in the New England Journal of Medicine at  
<http://content.nejm.org/cgi/content/full/NEJMsa0707782>

And there was an accompanying "perspective" piece on gathering mortality data during humanitarian crises at  
<http://content.nejm.org/cgi/content/full/NEJMp0709003>

I have some thoughts on why these rates (point estimate of 151,000; range estimate, 104,000 to 223,000) were different from the previous estimates by Burnham et al. in the Lancet in fall 2006.

But I would also appreciate any insights that y'all have to share.

Also, it was stunning to read the footnote at the end, that one of the study authors had been killed on his way to work in Baghdad

Colleen Porter  
Gainesville, FL

---

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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Fri, 11 Jan 2008 09:42:49 -0500  
From: "Murray, Patrick" <[pdmurray@MONMOUTH.EDU](mailto:pdmurray@MONMOUTH.EDU)>  
Subject: Q for NH pollsters on soft support

Have any of the NH pollsters captured soft support? In addition to the usual follow-up question on "may change mind" has anyone captured respondents who initially said undecided, but made a choice after the interviewer probed. I suspect (and have some partial evidence for this)

that Obama may do better on the probe.

=20

Patrick Murray

Director of Polling Institute

Monmouth University

West Long Branch, NJ 07764-1898

732-263-5858

pdmurray@monmouth.edu

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Date: Fri, 11 Jan 2008 11:39:22 -0500

From: Jennifer Agiesta <[AgiestaJ@WASHPOST.COM](mailto:AgiestaJ@WASHPOST.COM)>

Subject: NH Vote Counts

Here's an analysis of vote in the 2008, 2004 and 2000 Democratic primaries among those in precincts currently using Diebold machines vs. hand count:

The Method or the Map?

By Jennifer Agiesta and Jon Cohen

Liberal blogs are aflame with speculation that Diebold voting machines rigged a Granite State victory for New York Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton.

Vote tallies from the New Hampshire Secretary of State

<<http://www.sos.nh.gov/presprim2008/index.htm>> show that she won by 4.23 percentage points in the counties using Diebold optical scanners, but lost by 5.81 points in those where paper ballots are counted by hand. (These numbers use the most recent vote counts by township.)

Ergo conspiracy.

Preliminary analysis from Edison/Mitofsky, however, indicates that the difference between the two types of precincts goes back at least two elections. As Joe Lenski, executive vice president of Edison Media Research, wrote in an e-mail, "unless there has been hidden election fraud in New Hampshire for the last three presidential primaries the 'evidence' being used by these fraudsters probably does not hold up to any rigorous statistical analysis."

Moreover, attributing all the differences between these townships to their choice of vote-counting procedures misses other potentially important differences among voters (e.g., proportions independent, highly-educated).

Here's a Behind the Numbers analysis, showing the differences between the townships have been in the same direction the last three cycles:

Townships currently using  
Optical scanners      Paper ballots

|              |               |               |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| 2008 Clinton | 40.14         | 33.84         |
| 2008 Obama   | 35.91         | 39.65         |
| 2008 Margin  | Clinton +4.23 | Obama +5.81   |
| 2004 Kerry   | 39.50         | 32.53         |
| 2004 Dean    | 24.78         | 34.19         |
| 2004 Margin  | Kerry +14.73  | Dean +1.67    |
| 2000 Gore    | 50.35         | 45.82         |
| 2000 Bradley | 45.04         | 49.07         |
| 2000 Margin  | Gore +5.3     | Bradley +3.26 |

Link here:

[http://blog.washingtonpost.com/behind-the-numbers/2008/01/the\\_method\\_or\\_the\\_map\\_1.html](http://blog.washingtonpost.com/behind-the-numbers/2008/01/the_method_or_the_map_1.html)

~~~~~  
Jennifer Agiesta  
Polling Analyst  
The Washington Post  
1150 15th St. NW  
Washington, DC 20071  
202.334.4578

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Date: Fri, 11 Jan 2008 13:20:16 -0500  
From: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <[Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU](mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: NH Vote Counts

Thanks very much for posting this. But I'm afraid that the diehard conspiracy theorists would just say "See...it's been going on since 2000!"

Nat Ehrlich, Ph.D.  
Research Specialist  
Michigan State University  
Institute for Public Policy and Social Research  
Office, for Survey Research  
321 Berkey Hall  
East Lansing, MI 48824  
517-353-2639

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jennifer Agiesta

Sent: Friday, January 11, 2008 11:39 AM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: NH Vote Counts

Here's an analysis of vote in the 2008, 2004 and 2000 Democratic primaries among those in precincts currently using Diebold machines vs. hand count:

The Method or the Map?

By Jennifer Agiesta and Jon Cohen

Liberal blogs are aflame with speculation that Diebold voting machines rigged a Granite State victory for New York Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton.

Vote tallies from the New Hampshire Secretary of State

<<http://www.sos.nh.gov/presprim2008/index.htm>> show that she won by 4.23 percentage points in the counties using Diebold optical scanners, but lost by 5.81 points in those where paper ballots are counted by hand. (These numbers use the most recent vote counts by township.)

Ergo conspiracy.

Preliminary analysis from Edison/Mitofsky, however, indicates that the difference between the two types of precincts goes back at least two elections. As Joe Lenski, executive vice president of Edison Media Research, wrote in an e-mail, "unless there has been hidden election fraud in New Hampshire for the last three presidential primaries the 'evidence' being used by these fraudsters probably does not hold up to any rigorous statistical analysis."

Moreover, attributing all the differences between these townships to their choice of vote-counting procedures misses other potentially important differences among voters (e.g., proportions independent, highly-educated).

Here's a Behind the Numbers analysis, showing the differences between the townships have been in the same direction the last three cycles:

	Townships currently using	
	Optical scanners	Paper ballots
2008 Clinton	40.14	33.84
2008 Obama	35.91	39.65
2008 Margin	Clinton +4.23	Obama +5.81
2004 Kerry	39.50	32.53
2004 Dean	24.78	34.19
2004 Margin	Kerry +14.73	Dean +1.67
2000 Gore	50.35	45.82
2000 Bradley	45.04	49.07
2000 Margin	Gore +5.3	Bradley +3.26

Link here:

[http://blog.washingtonpost.com/behind-the-numbers/2008/01/the\\_method\\_or\\_the\\_map\\_1.html](http://blog.washingtonpost.com/behind-the-numbers/2008/01/the_method_or_the_map_1.html)

~~~~~  
Jennifer Agiesta  
Polling Analyst  
The Washington Post  
1150 15th St. NW  
Washington, DC 20071  
202.334.4578

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Date: Fri, 11 Jan 2008 18:23:15 +0000  
From: "Craig Hill, Peyton M" <[Peyton.M.Craighill@ABC.COM](mailto:Peyton.M.Craighill@ABC.COM)>  
Subject: Polling commentary: The New Hampshire Polls: What We Know

From Gary Langer's new blog:

=20

Efforts so far to explain the New Hampshire poll meltdown amount to theories in search of data; we don't yet have the hard evidence and full, thoughtful evaluation we need. But two of the most current explanations are to my mind the weakest: that the polls were right when taken, but missed a late Clinton surge; or that respondents lied.

=20

See the entire blog at The Numbers:  
<http://blogs.abcnews.com/thenumbers/2008/01/the-new-hampshi.html>

=20

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Date: Fri, 11 Jan 2008 13:43:16 -0500  
From: howard schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>  
Subject: Nonresponse & NH

Much of the concern about the New Hampshire polls has focused on those said to be "undecided," not to mention the efficacy of tears. But if we are looking for sources of bias (e.g., with regard to race), we need to consider nonresponse, especially Refusals. When I first became involved in doing surveys, I assumed that less than an 80% response rate (with Refusals under 10% of the total sample) was a dismal showing, throwing considerable doubt on the validity of results for the target population. Then we sometimes calculated results assuming the worst as far as the distribution on nonresponse for key variables.

Those days are probably gone forever in the U.S. (though still obtainable in some other countries). Nowadays overt and covert refusals are massive, and polling directors blithely assume that they are random or at least can be readily taken "adjusted for." Apparently that often works out to be the case. But it's not inevitable, and there is no license from Heaven that makes it so. Exactly where race or some other highly sensitive issue is implicit in an election is just where we might be called to account for the casual way in which nonresponse is accepted at present--and of course not even seriously acknowledged by even what we think of as the best polls. Howard

p.s. Mark Blumenthal recently asked for ratings of "best polls" in terms of whether they are "reliable." He should have used the term "valid." The polls can all be highly reliable because they are all sampling some 20 or 30% (even that is too high for some polls) of the target population, but invalid with regard to what they hope to have measured.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Date: Fri, 11 Jan 2008 13:55:34 -0500  
From: Paul J Lavrakas PhD <pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET>  
Subject: Re: NH Vote Counts

further indicating how mentally unbalanced they are, huh?

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Ehrlich, Nathaniel  
Sent: Friday, January 11, 2008 1:20 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU



Subject: Re: NH Vote Counts

Thanks very much for posting this. But I'm afraid that the diehard conspiracy theorists would just say "See...it's been going on since 2000!"

Nat Ehrlich, Ph.D.  
Research Specialist  
Michigan State University  
Institute for Public Policy and Social Research Office for Survey Research  
321 Berkey Hall  
East Lansing, MI 48824  
517-353-2639

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jennifer Agiesta  
Sent: Friday, January 11, 2008 11:39 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: NH Vote Counts

Here's an analysis of vote in the 2008, 2004 and 2000 Democratic primaries among those in precincts currently using Diebold machines vs. hand count:

The Method or the Map?  
By Jennifer Agiesta and Jon Cohen

Liberal blogs are aflame with speculation that Diebold voting machines rigged a Granite State victory for New York Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton.

Vote tallies from the New Hampshire Secretary of State <<http://www.sos.nh.gov/presprim2008/index.htm>> show that she won by 4.23 percentage points in the counties using Diebold optical scanners, but lost by 5.81 points in those where paper ballots are counted by hand. (These numbers use the most recent vote counts by township.)

Ergo conspiracy.

Preliminary analysis from Edison/Mitofsky, however, indicates that the difference between the two types of precincts goes back at least two elections. As Joe Lenski, executive vice president of Edison Media Research, wrote in an e-mail, "unless there has been hidden election fraud in New Hampshire for the last three presidential primaries the 'evidence' being used by these fraudsters probably does not hold up to any rigorous statistical analysis."

Moreover, attributing all the differences between these townships to their choice of vote-counting procedures misses other potentially important differences among voters (e.g., proportions independent, highly-educated).

Here's a Behind the Numbers analysis, showing the differences between the townships have been in the same direction the last three cycles:

Townships currently using  
Optical scanners      Paper ballots

|              |               |               |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| 2008 Clinton | 40.14         | 33.84         |
| 2008 Obama   | 35.91         | 39.65         |
| 2008 Margin  | Clinton +4.23 | Obama +5.81   |
| 2004 Kerry   | 39.50         | 32.53         |
| 2004 Dean    | 24.78         | 34.19         |
| 2004 Margin  | Kerry +14.73  | Dean +1.67    |
| 2000 Gore    | 50.35         | 45.82         |
| 2000 Bradley | 45.04         | 49.07         |
| 2000 Margin  | Gore +5.3     | Bradley +3.26 |

Link here:

[http://blog.washingtonpost.com/behind-the-numbers/2008/01/the\\_method\\_or\\_the\\_map\\_1.html](http://blog.washingtonpost.com/behind-the-numbers/2008/01/the_method_or_the_map_1.html)

~~~~~  
 Jennifer Agiesta  
 Polling Analyst  
 The Washington Post  
 1150 15th St. NW  
 Washington, DC 20071  
 202.334.4578

-----  
 Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
 Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
 signoff aapornet  
 Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
 Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
 Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
 signoff aapornet  
 Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
 Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
 Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
 signoff aapornet  
 Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
 Date: Fri, 11 Jan 2008 13:42:05 -0600  
 From: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
 Subject: Late Surge For Clinton

Regarding:

> The mistakes were not the result of a last-minute trend going Mrs.

> Clinton's way. Yes, according to exit polls the 17 percent of voters  
> who said they made their decision on Election Day chose Mrs. Clinton a  
> little more than those who decided in the past two or three weeks. But  
> the margin was very small - 39 percent of the late deciders went for  
> Mrs. Clinton and 36 percent went for Mr. Obama. This gap is obviously  
> too narrow to explain the wide lead for Mr. Obama that kept showing up  
> in pre-election polls.

I think it's time to take another look NH late decider exit poll data.  
They appear to deny the Iowa bounce theory for Obama followed by a later  
comeback by Clinton and suggest earlier polls off.

Late decider voting usually tracks pretty well when election day  
outcomes don't match earlier phone polls.

We exit polled the 04 WI primary as did NEP. Late decider votes for  
Edwards explained how the race tightened; i.e., how the election outcome  
differed from phone polls. We see such results time and time again. But  
I think the data are pretty soft when it comes to pinpointing the final  
decision.

The NH exit poll showed:

Obama won by 43% to 28% over Clinton among the "decided sometime last  
week" group. That was the Iowa bounce.

Clinton won by 48% to 31% the "decided before last month" group .

Obama and Clinton are even on other time categories which spawned denial  
of the trend above.

Let's assume that some voters were FOR Clinton then FOR Obama and then  
FOR Clinton. I believe they were.

How did they answer? The first time when they decided for Clinton or the  
second time when they decided for? Both answers are accurate. How would  
you answer?

I don't think answers to all research questions should be taken so  
literally. Question writer intentions don't always match respondent  
understanding. I don't think voters have time stamps in their brains to  
know exactly when they made the final, final decision. I have always  
thought that these data were somewhat soft.

These data should not be taken so literally. And I don't think the data  
deny the late surge for Clinton.

I'd like to hear from some exit pollsters on this.

Nick

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Date: Fri, 11 Jan 2008 14:21:30 -0600  
From: "Allan L. McCutcheon" <[amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU](mailto:amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Polling commentary: The New Hampshire Polls: What We Know

I don't want to rain on anyone's metaphor, but "meltdown," "disaster," "debacle," are hyperbole that the pundits have come up with re. the NH primary pre-election polls. AAPOR members should not buy into it.

Let's look at what happened. A quick review of the election results and of Pollster.com or RealClearPolitics.com indicate that (with the usual between-poll variation) the pre-election polls estimated the likely outcome for all but one of the candidates. It was an important mis-estimate, true, but the estimates for the other 9 candidates (depending on which candidates are included) were spot-on. In 1948, there were estimates for 2 candidates, and both estimates were wrong.

Once again--there was only one mis-estimate--the pre-election polls under-estimated Clinton's vote by about 9 percent (again, taking the poll average); the estimates for all of the other candidates are so un-remarkable, because they are so accurate, and accuracy is the norm in pre-election polling.

We need to focus on explaining one thing--why was Clinton's vote so under-estimated by the pre-election poll.

The explanation is linked to the record-shattering turnout for the Democratic primaries--and "record-shattering" is not hyperbole; nearly 70,000 more people voted in the 2008 Dem primary than in the 2004 Dem primary (and 2004 was the previous record turnout for the Dems). No one, not even NH Sec of State Bill Gardener, predicted this level of turnout.

Interestingly, the turnout for the 2008 Republican primaries was virtually identical to the 2000, which was the previous competitive Republican primary (Gardener did predict this).

Something went wrong, but this was no more a "meltdown of polls" than it was a Diebold conspiracy.

Best,  
Allan

--  
Donald O. Clifton Chair of Survey Science  
Professor of Statistics &  
Survey Research and Methodology  
tel. +402.458.2036  
fax +402.458.2038

Quoting "Craighill, Peyton M" <Peyton.M.Craighill@ABC.COM>:

>> From Gary Langer's new blog:

>  
>  
>  
> Efforts so far to explain the New Hampshire poll meltdown amount to  
> theories in search of data; we don't yet have the hard evidence and  
> full, thoughtful evaluation we need. But two of the most current  
> explanations are to my mind the weakest: that the polls were right when  
> taken, but missed a late Clinton surge; or that respondents lied.

> See the entire blog at The Numbers:

> <http://blogs.abcnews.com/thenumbers/2008/01/the-new-hampshi.html>

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

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

> signoff aapornet

> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Date: Fri, 11 Jan 2008 15:38:21 -0500

From: Mark Lindeman <[lindeman@BARD.EDU](mailto:lindeman@BARD.EDU)>

Subject: Re: Late Surge For Clinton

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

> These data should not be taken so literally. And I don't think the data  
> deny the late surge for Clinton.

> I'd like to hear from some exit pollsters on this.

Well, I'm not an exit pollster, but I was arguing the same thing on  
pollster.com.

The 2004 NH primary exit poll does show a bounce -- although, at least  
at a glance, the bounce isn't "big" enough, underscoring that it might  
not be wise to take these results literally.

Mark Lindeman

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Date: Fri, 11 Jan 2008 13:37:32 -0800  
From: John Nienstedt <[john@CERC.NET](mailto:john@CERC.NET)>  
Subject: Re: Late Surge For Clinton

Nick/Mark: I'm a pre-election pollster (among other things), not an exit pollster, but I think your point is an excellent one. From the exit poll . . .

Dem voters

		% for	Amount		
Reflected					
When Decided	%	approx n	HC	MoSE	in Pre-Election Polls
Decided Tuesday	17	332	39	5.3	None
Last 3 days	21	410	34	4.6	Partial
Last week	10	196	28	6.3	All
Last month	17	332	34	5.1	All
Prior	34	665	48	3.8	All

All numbers are approximate since I'm sure a lot of weighting was done.

- 1) there was a lot of fluidity in the last few days; nearly half "made up their minds" in the last week
- 2) the exit poll's best estimate shows a Clinton surge
- 3) the exit poll's best estimate tracks extremely well with pre-election poll results which showed Clinton dominating prior to December, tightening occurring in December and then a substantial post-Iowa drop. Over the last three days 1/5 to 1/7 the pre-election polls did pick up a slight surge for Clinton. She roughly went from 30 to 32 to 34 during that time span (here I am apportioning the undecideds as if they didn't vote or broke evenly . . . though I strongly suspect they did vote and broke mostly for Clinton) See [realclearpolitics](http://preview.tinyurl.com/2exju2) at <http://preview.tinyurl.com/2exju2>
- 4) because of the sample size and your point about interviewers not exactly matching their understanding of the time frame to the exit pollster's, these amount to very educated estimates and, in fact, the surge could have been much greater

To me, this strongly suggests that a substantially large block of uncommitted voters created an environment where Clinton's show of emotion and, possibly, her performance in the last debate plus a superior field organization resulted in the surge which makes the pre-election polls look wrong when in fact they simply couldn't poll on the critical day that 17% of the electorate made up their mind.

That said, to go out on the limb, I suspect that some of the 8% who were undecided in the late pre-election polls were actually "anybody but Obama"

voters. Bradley effect? Maybe, but unlike that CA Gov race, this was not a one-on-one situation. They could have been considering Edwards, but ultimately went with Clinton.

John Nienstedt, Sr.  
800-576-CERC  
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: Friday, January 11, 2008 11:42 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Late Surge For Clinton

Regarding:

> The mistakes were not the result of a last-minute trend going Mrs.  
> Clinton's way. Yes, according to exit polls the 17 percent of voters  
> who said they made their decision on Election Day chose Mrs. Clinton a  
> little more than those who decided in the past two or three weeks. But  
> the margin was very small - 39 percent of the late deciders went for  
> Mrs. Clinton and 36 percent went for Mr. Obama. This gap is obviously  
> too narrow to explain the wide lead for Mr. Obama that kept showing up  
> in pre-election polls.

I think it's time to take another look NH late decider exit poll data.  
They appear to deny the Iowa bounce theory for Obama followed by a later  
comeback by Clinton and suggest earlier polls off.

Late decider voting usually tracks pretty well when election day  
outcomes don't match earlier phone polls.

We exit polled the 04 WI primary as did NEP. Late decider votes for  
Edwards explained how the race tightened; i.e., how the election outcome  
differed from phone polls. We see such results time and time again. But  
I think the data are pretty soft when it comes to pinpointing the final  
decision.

The NH exit poll showed:

Obama won by 43% to 28% over Clinton among the "decided sometime last  
week" group. That was the Iowa bounce.

Clinton won by 48% to 31% the "decided before last month" group .

Obama and Clinton are even on other time categories which spawned denial  
of the trend above.

Let's assume that some voters were FOR Clinton then FOR Obama and then  
FOR Clinton. I believe they were.

How did they answer? The first time when they decided for Clinton or the  
second time when they decided for? Both answers are accurate. How would

you answer?

I don't think answers to all research questions should be taken so literally. Question writer intentions don't always match respondent understanding. I don't think voters have time stamps in their brains to know exactly when they made the final, final decision. I have always thought that these data were somewhat soft.

These data should not be taken so literally. And I don't think the data deny the late surge for Clinton.

I'd like to hear from some exit pollsters on this.

Nick

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Date: Fri, 11 Jan 2008 15:36:18 -0800  
From: "Pollack, Lance" <[Lance.Pollack@UCSF.EDU](mailto:Lance.Pollack@UCSF.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Late Surge For Clinton

Two other changes occurred in the Clinton campaign that might have affected the decision of undecideds. First, Senator Clinton went back to her "listening tour" approach to her senatorial campaign, i.e., taking time at each stop to take unscripted questions and comments. This allowed for the "moment", but the "moment" may have been only part of the deal, the new strategy being another part. Second, via her husband, the Clinton campaign asked voters to look beyond Obama's "fired up" speech. They might have regained some voters who decided what they really liked was the speech but on other attributes really liked Clinton.

Lance M. Pollack, PhD  
University of California, San Francisco  
Center for AIDS Prevention Studies (CAPS)  
50 Beale Street, Suite 1300  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
tel: 415-597-9302  
fax: 415-597-9213  
email: [Lance.Pollack@ucsf.edu](mailto:Lance.Pollack@ucsf.edu)

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>] On Behalf Of John Nienstedt



Sent: Friday, January 11, 2008 1:38 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Late Surge For Clinton

Nick/Mark: I'm a pre-election pollster (among other things), not an exit pollster, but I think your point is an excellent one. From the exit poll . . .

Dem voters		% for		Amount		
Reflected	When Decided	%	approx n	HC	MoSE	in Pre-Election Polls
	Decided Tuesday	17	332	39	5.3	None
	Last 3 days	21	410	34	4.6	Partial
	Last week	10	196	28	6.3	All
	Last month	17	332	34	5.1	All
	Prior	34	665	48	3.8	All

All numbers are approximate since I'm sure a lot of weighting was done.

- 1) there was a lot of fluidity in the last few days; nearly half "made up their minds" in the last week
- 2) the exit poll's best estimate shows a Clinton surge
- 3) the exit poll's best estimate tracks extremely well with pre-election poll results which showed Clinton dominating prior to December, tightening occurring in December and then a substantial post-Iowa drop. Over the last three days 1/5 to 1/7 the pre-election polls did pick up a slight surge for Clinton. She roughly went from 30 to 32 to 34 during that time span (here I am apportioning the undecideds as if they didn't vote or broke evenly . . . though I strongly suspect they did vote and broke mostly for Clinton) See [realclearpolitics.com](http://realclearpolitics.com) at <http://preview.tinyurl.com/2exju2>
- 4) because of the sample size and your point about interviewers not exactly matching their understanding of the time frame to the exit pollster's, these amount to very educated estimates and, in fact, the surge could have been much greater

To me, this strongly suggests that a substantially large block of uncommitted voters created an environment where Clinton's show of emotion and, possibly, her performance in the last debate plus a superior field organization resulted in the surge which makes the pre-election polls look wrong when in fact they simply couldn't poll on the critical day that 17% of the electorate made up their mind. That said, to go out on the limb, I suspect that some of the 8% who were undecided in the late pre-election polls were actually "anybody but Obama" voters. Bradley effect? Maybe, but unlike that CA Gov race, this was not a one-on-one situation. They could have been considering Edwards, but ultimately went with Clinton.

John Nienstedt, Sr.  
800-576-CERC  
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: Friday, January 11, 2008 11:42 AM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: Late Surge For Clinton

Regarding:

> The mistakes were not the result of a last-minute trend going Mrs.  
> Clinton's way. Yes, according to exit polls the 17 percent of voters  
> who said they made their decision on Election Day chose Mrs. Clinton a  
> little more than those who decided in the past two or three weeks. But  
> the margin was very small - 39 percent of the late deciders went for  
> Mrs. Clinton and 36 percent went for Mr. Obama. This gap is obviously  
> too narrow to explain the wide lead for Mr. Obama that kept showing up  
> in pre-election polls.

I think it's time to take another look NH late decider exit poll data.  
They appear to deny the Iowa bounce theory for Obama followed by a later  
comeback by Clinton and suggest earlier polls off.

Late decider voting usually tracks pretty well when election day  
outcomes don't match earlier phone polls.

We exit polled the 04 WI primary as did NEP. Late decider votes for  
Edwards explained how the race tightened; i.e., how the election outcome  
differed from phone polls. We see such results time and time again. But  
I think the data are pretty soft when it comes to pinpointing the final  
decision.

The NH exit poll showed:

Obama won by 43% to 28% over Clinton among the "decided sometime last  
week" group. That was the Iowa bounce.

Clinton won by 48% to 31% the "decided before last month" group .

Obama and Clinton are even on other time categories which spawned denial  
of the trend above.

Let's assume that some voters were FOR Clinton then FOR Obama and then  
FOR Clinton. I believe they were.

How did they answer? The first time when they decided for Clinton or the  
second time when they decided for? Both answers are accurate. How would  
you answer?

I don't think answers to all research questions should be taken so  
literally. Question writer intentions don't always match respondent  
understanding. I don't think voters have time stamps in their brains to  
know exactly when they made the final, final decision. I have always  
thought that these data were somewhat soft.

These data should not be taken so literally. And I don't think the data deny the late surge for Clinton.

I'd like to hear from some exit pollsters on this.

Nick

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Fri, 11 Jan 2008 16:32:05 -0800  
From: Bob Lee <[boble48@BERKELEY.EDU](mailto:boble48@BERKELEY.EDU)>  
Subject: We may have to invite Ariana back to our conference

Huffington Post is promoting a petition that asks people to "Say NO to Pollsters". She encourages people to sign it and share it with their friends who live in upcoming primary states.

With friends like her...

--

In 2008, SRC celebrates 50 years of high quality survey research services

Robert H. Lee  
Director of Survey Operations  
Survey Research Center  
University of California, Berkeley  
2538 Channing Way  
# 5100  
Berkeley, CA 94720  
510-642-0871 (my direct #)  
510-643-8292 (fax)  
<http://srcweb.berkeley.edu/>

---

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Date: Sat, 12 Jan 2008 02:05:32 +0000  
From: "mail@marketsharescorp.com" <[mkshares@COMCAST.NET](mailto:mkshares@COMCAST.NET)>  
Subject: Re: We may have to invite Ariana back to our conference

Just like Ariana to exploit her perception of a bad situation.

The same nonsense as in 1998. That's what she is all about. Commercial opportunity.

She should be ignored. Some people never change.

Forget about it.

Nick

----- Original message -----  
From: Bob Lee <[boblee48@BERKELEY.EDU](mailto:boblee48@BERKELEY.EDU)>  
> Huffington Post is promoting a petition that asks people to "Say NO to  
> Pollsters". She encourages people to sign it and share it with their  
> friends who live in upcoming primary states.  
>  
> With friends like her...  
>  
> --  
>  
> In 2008, SRC celebrates 50 years of high quality survey research services  
>  
> Robert H. Lee  
> Director of Survey Operations  
> Survey Research Center  
> University of California, Berkeley  
> 2538 Channing Way  
> # 5100  
> Berkeley, CA 94720  
> 510-642-0871 (my direct #)  
> 510-643-8292 (fax)  
> <http://srcweb.berkeley.edu/>  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
> signoff aapornet  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
End of AAPORNET Digest - 10 Jan 2008 to 11 Jan 2008 (#2008-9)

\*\*\*\*\*

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====  
Date: Sun, 13 Jan 2008 15:51:46 -0600

Reply-To: [amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU](mailto:amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU)

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

From: "Allan L. McCutcheon" <[amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU](mailto:amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU)>

Subject: Someone else is writing about the failure of the likely voter  
models in New Hampshire

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

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="=\_6zfdrtce6eq"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

This message is in MIME format.

--=\_6zfdrtce6eq

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset=ISO-8859-1;

DelSp="Yes";

format="flowed"

Content-Disposition: inline

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi,

I thank Joe Lenski for forwarding this link to me:

[http://www.pollster.com/blogs/likely\\_voter\\_screens\\_and\\_the\\_c.php](http://www.pollster.com/blogs/likely_voter_screens_and_the_c.php)

Best,

Allan

--

Donald O. Clifton Chair of Survey Science

Professor of Statistics &

Survey Research and Methodology

tel. +402.458.2036

fax +402.458.2038

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

--= 6zfdrtce6eq  
This message is in MIME format.

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

[http://www.pollster.com/blogs/likely\\_voter\\_screens\\_and\\_the\\_c.php](http://www.pollster.com/blogs/likely_voter_screens_and_the_c.php)

=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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

--= 6zfdrtce6eq--

=====  
Date: Mon, 14 Jan 2008 10:59:39 -0500  
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 Crying Game, and the Political Herd  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

The Crying Game, and the Political Herd  
New York Times

<http://www.nytimes.com/2008/01/13/weekinreview/13carey.html?ref=weekinreview>  
or  
<http://tinyurl.com/2rrmlx>

ONE of the CNN regulars working the New Hampshire primary last Tuesday, Jeffrey Toobin, turned up his palms during the broadcast and vented his and many viewers' impatience with his co-hosts' analysis of Hillary Clinton's surprising lead.

SNIP

Any or all of those factors could have contributed to the surprise result. But social scientists say that the pop-psych 101 hypothesis - linking emotional breakdowns to ballots - cannot be dismissed so easily.

Short, emotionally charged narratives - story fragments, of a certain kind - can travel through a population faster than any virus and alter behavior on a dime, they say. Under certain conditions, this behavior is especially infectious, research suggests, and anyone eager to play Monday morning quarterback on the New Hampshire vote should take them into account.

"Any story that is short and powerful and throws into relief exactly the sort of issues people are thinking about at the moment they're making a decision can have enormous impact," said Francesca Polletta, a sociologist at the University of California at Irvine who analyzed the effect of personal stories on the civil rights movement in her book "It Was Like a Fever: Storytelling in Protest and Politics."

SNIP

Copyright 2008 The New York Times Company

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

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Mon, 14 Jan 2008 12:57:47 -0500  
Reply-To: Pat Lewis <[plewis@AAPOR.ORG](mailto:plewis@AAPOR.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Pat Lewis <[plewis@AAPOR.ORG](mailto:plewis@AAPOR.ORG)>  
Subject: AAPOR Announces Formation of Ad Hoc Committee to Evaluate New  
Hampshire Pre-election Primary Poll Methodology  
Comments: To: aapor net <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=WINDOWS-1252  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable  
Content-Disposition: inline

AAPOR News Release

Washington DC =96 January 14, 2008 -- In the wake of the New Hampshire pre-election polls, the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) today announced the formation of an ad hoc committee to evaluate pre-election primary poll methodology and the sponsorship of a

public forum on the issue.

"Pre-election polls have a long-running record of being remarkably accurate," said AAPOR President Nancy Mathiowetz. "Sixty years ago the public opinion profession faced a crisis related to the poll predictions of the Truman-Dewey race. The way survey researchers reacted then =96 with a quick, public effort to identify the causes =96 played a key role in restoring public confidence and improving research methodology."

The work of the ad hoc committee will be twofold: (1) To review and assist in the dissemination of the evaluations currently being conducted by the individual polling organizations who were engaged in polling prior to the New Hampshire primary; and (2) to request and archive the data related to the New Hampshire primary for future scholarly research.

Although the impetus for the ad hoc committee was the failure of the New Hampshire pre-election polls to accurately reflect the outcome of the Democratic race for one candidate, the committee could examine other elections throughout the primary season.

AAPOR will sponsor a public forum on the topic of the New Hampshire Primary hosted by the Kaiser Family Foundation at its Barbara Jordan Conference Center.

The American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) is the leading professional organization of public opinion and survey research professionals in the U.S., with members from academia, media, government, the non-profit sector and private industry.

###

--=20

Pat Lewis  
Communications Director  
American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR)  
1405 North George Mason Drive  
Arlington, Virginia  
703.527-5245  
cell 703.201.5070  
www.aapor.org

AAPOR -- the leading association of public opinion and survey research professionals.

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====

Date: Tue, 15 Jan 2008 09:24:33 -0500

Reply-To: Nancy Whelchel <[nlwhelch@GW.FIS.NCSU.EDU](mailto:nlwhelch@GW.FIS.NCSU.EDU)>

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



From: Nancy Whelchel <nlwhelch@GW.FIS.NCSU.EDU>  
Subject: Skype software?  
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Has anyone had any experience using Skype software to conduct online interviews?

I'm posting this for a friend of a friend - - a student working on a dissertation in England. This is what she has to say:  
"I am continuing on my merry PhD path, the subject of which has morphed into looking at the moderating effect of online community participation on loyalty to mobile location based services. I have adopted a mixed methodology - the first qualitative part being interviews with active online community participants. I would like to perform these interviews synchronously (like a chat back and forth as opposed to an email type interview).

I wanted to use "Skype" as the software platform to carry out these interviews, but have not found any academic studies which have done so to date...Do you know of anyone in your circles who has used Skype for online interviewing and has had any experience they could share?"

Thanks.  
Nancy

\*\*\*\*\*

Nancy Whelchel, Ph.D.  
Assistant Director for Survey Research  
University Planning and Analysis  
Box 7002  
NCSU  
Raleigh, NC 27695-7002  
919-515-4184  
Nancy\_Whelchel@ncsu.edu

\*\*\*\*\*

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Tue, 15 Jan 2008 09:47:53 -0500  
Reply-To: "Miriam L. Gerver" <mgerver@GMAIL.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Miriam L. Gerver" <mgerver@GMAIL.COM>  
Subject: Re: Skype software?  
Comments: To: Nancy Whelchel <nlwhelch@gw.fis.ncsu.edu>  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <478C7BD1.5CBC.001C.0@gw.fis.ncsu.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Content-Disposition: inline

Hi Nancy,

It sounds like she just wants to use the "chat" instant message feature of Skype; is that correct? Skype has a chat instant message feature and a VOIP feature.

I use the VOIP feature fairly regularly for personal calls and the connection ranges from decent to horrible (i.e., dropping every third word, bad sound quality in general, etc.). I can't imagine conducting interviews using Skype's VOIP.

I would suggest looking to see whether anyone has used instant messaging or VOIP to conduct interviews, rather than looking specifically at Skype, since there are a number of companies that offer these services, although I think Skype is the only one that offers these for free.

Miriam

On Jan 15, 2008 9:24 AM, Nancy Whelchel <nlwhelch@gw.fis.ncsu.edu> wrote:

> Has anyone had any experience using Skype software to conduct online  
> interviews?  
>  
> I'm posting this for a friend of a friend - - a student working on a  
> dissertation in England. This is what she has to say:  
> "I am continuing on my merry PhD path, the subject of which has morphed  
> into looking at the moderating effect of online community participation  
> on loyalty to mobile location based services. I have adopted a mixed  
> methodology - the first qualitative part being interviews with active  
> online community participants. I would like to perform these interviews  
> synchronously (like a chat back and forth as opposed to an email type  
> interview).  
>  
> I wanted to use "Skype" as the software platform to carry out these  
> interviews, but have not found any academic studies which have done so  
> to date...Do you know of anyone in your circles who has used Skype for  
> online interviewing and has had any experience they could share?"  
>  
> Thanks.  
> Nancy  
>  
> \*\*\*\*\*  
> Nancy Whelchel, Ph.D.  
> Assistant Director for Survey Research  
> University Planning and Analysis  
> Box 7002  
> NCSU  
> Raleigh, NC 27695-7002  
> 919-515-4184  
> Nancy\_Whelchel@ncsu.edu

>  
> \*\*\*\*\*  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
> [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Tue, 15 Jan 2008 12:37:15 -0500  
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: Portland pollster scrutinized for controversial Presidential  
poll  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

<Includes links to some of the questions asked and the pollster's  
statement. The NH Push Poll Law is in many ways problematic IMNSHO.>

Portland pollster scrutinized for controversial Presidential poll  
By Pat Dooris, [kgw.com](http://kgw.com)

[http://www.kgw.com/news-local/stories/kgw\\_011408\\_news\\_oregon\\_election\\_po  
ll.2239263c.html](http://www.kgw.com/news-local/stories/kgw_011408_news_oregon_election_poll.2239263c.html)  
or  
<http://tinyurl.com/2ut3le>

James Kennedy, an assistant attorney general in New Hampshire, will  
present an unusual request to a Multnomah County, Oregon, judge on  
Wednesday January 16, 2008.

Kennedy will ask the judge to order Portland pollster Bob Moore, and his  
employee Kristina Britton, to travel to New Hampshire and answer  
questions from a grand jury.

The grand jury is investigating whether Moore and his company, Moore  
Information, illegally conducted a "push poll" on New Hampshire voters  
before the 2007 presidential primary.

A push poll is a survey purporting to be unbiased---but is actually an  
effort to plant negative information about a candidate in the minds of  
voters.

SNIP

--

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

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Tue, 15 Jan 2008 14:27:47 -0600  
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)>  
Subject: Re: Portland pollster scrutinized for controversial Presidential  
poll  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To:  
<[3248A9B21DD5574785FE5E2C8E5216849CB9B1@exchange.local.artscience.com](mailto:3248A9B21DD5574785FE5E2C8E5216849CB9B1@exchange.local.artscience.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=windows-1252; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

1. This was not in violation of the NH statute; i.e., not a general election but a primary.

2. This does not comply with AAPOR's description of a push poll....  
"A so-called "push poll" is an insidious form of negative campaigning, disguised as a political poll. "Push polls" are not surveys at all, but rather unethical political telemarketing -- telephone calls disguised as research that aim to persuade large numbers of voters and affect election outcomes, rather than measure opinions."

Needless to say, 400 is not a "large number" and, therefore, not enough to "affect an election outcome".

3. Neither does it comply with New Hampshire's description of a push poll...  
"conducted in a manner likely to be construed by the voter to be a survey or poll".

The New Hampshire AG must be having too much spare time.

Nick Panagakis

More from the story Leo sent...

Under New Hampshire law, a push poll exists if all three of the following criteria exist, according to the New Hampshire Attorney

General's Office.

1. The call is on behalf of, in support of, or in opposition to, any candidate for public office;
2. The recipient is asked questions relative to opposing candidates which state, imply or convey information about the candidate's character, status, record, or political stance; and
3. The call is conducted in a manner likely to be construed by the voter to be a survey or poll to gather statistical data for entities that are independent of any political party, candidate, or interest group."

The state has no law against push polls in the primary, but it is forbidden before the general election unless the person or group paying for the push poll is identified up front.

After 400 voters were called November 11, 2007, both Mitt Romney and John McCain's campaigns complained to the New Hampshire Attorney General.

Moore has refused to disclose who hired him, but did issue a statement that read "Moore Information has never, currently does not, nor will it ever engage in push polling."

[http://www.kgw.com/politics/stories/kgw\\_011408\\_news\\_controversial\\_poll.21dd0265.html](http://www.kgw.com/politics/stories/kgw_011408_news_controversial_poll.21dd0265.html)

Leo Simonetta wrote:

><Includes links to some of the questions asked and the pollster's  
>statement. The NH Push Poll Law is in many ways problematic IMNSHO.>  
>  
>  
>Portland pollster scrutinized for controversial Presidential poll  
>By Pat Dooris, kgw.com  
>  
>[http://www.kgw.com/news-local/stories/kgw\\_011408\\_news\\_oregon\\_election\\_po  
>ll.2239263c.html](http://www.kgw.com/news-local/stories/kgw_011408_news_oregon_election_poll.2239263c.html)  
>or  
><http://tinyurl.com/2ut3le>  
>  
>  
>James Kennedy, an assistant attorney general in New Hampshire, will  
>present an unusual request to a Multnomah County, Oregon, judge on  
>Wednesday January 16, 2008.  
>  
>Kennedy will ask the judge to order Portland pollster Bob Moore, and his  
>employee Kristina Britton, to travel to New Hampshire and answer  
>questions from a grand jury.  
>  
>The grand jury is investigating whether Moore and his company, Moore  
>Information, illegally conducted a "push poll" on New Hampshire voters  
>before the 2007 presidential primary.  
>

>A push poll is a survey purporting to be unbiased---but is actually an  
>effort to plant negative information about a candidate in the minds of  
>voters.  
>  
>SNIP  
>  
>  
>

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Tue, 15 Jan 2008 23:28:05 -0500  
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: USCV on NH  
Comments: To: [aapornet](mailto:aapornet) [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
Mime-Version: 1.0 (Apple Message framework v753)  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII; delp=; format=flowed

[FYI. Forwarding does not constitute endorsement.]

[http://electionarchive.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=149&Itemid=84](http://electionarchive.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=149&Itemid=84)  
<http://electionarchive.org/ucvData/NH/ReleaseReNHPrimary2008.pdf>

RELEASE: NEW HAMPSHIRE DEMOCRATIC PRIMARY ? WERE VOTES COUNTED ACCURATELY?

Park City, UT January 14, 2008  
CONTACT: Kathy Dopp [kathy@electionarchive.org](mailto:kathy@electionarchive.org) 435-658-4657

NEW HAMPSHIRE'S DEMOCRATIC PRIMARY ELECTION RESULTS ARE SUSPICIOUS

Pre-election polls projected that Barack Obama would win the New Hampshire Democratic primary election. An average of seven opinion polls predicted that 38.8 percent were going to vote for Obama, while 30 percent would vote for Clinton. The opinion polls came close to predicting the final results for New Hampshire's hand-counted votes - 39.2% for Obama and 34.9% for Clinton - but New Hampshire's Diebold/Premier machine-counted votes reversed the outcome.

The reversal of the machine and hand counts is consistent with programming errors counting votes cast for Obama, for Clinton and votes cast for Clinton, for Obama.

To see this consistency of New Hampshire's election results with

programming error, analysts examined Clinton and Obama vote shares out of votes cast only for Obama and Clinton. Overall, Clinton's hand count share of such votes is 47.07% to Obama's 52.93% share and a virtually exact reverse pattern occurs with machine counts where Clinton's share is 52.95% to Obama's 47.05%.

A statistical analysis of New Hampshire's Democratic primary by the National Election Data Archive rules out precinct-size and seems to rule out demographic factors as possible causes for the reversal of Obama and Clinton's machine and hand-counted results; and shows that the pattern is consistent with vote miscount favoring Clinton.

The National Election Data Archive's New Hampshire analysis and raw data is posted on the Internet at ElectionArchive.org

<http://electionarchive.org/ucvData/NH/DemPrimary2008-PairedPrecinctStudy.pdf>  
and  
<http://electionarchive.org/ucvData/NH/>

About 80% of New Hampshire ballots were counted by Diebold/Premier optical scanning machines without any post-election manual audits to verify the machine count accuracy.

Press reports hypothesized theories for why Clinton beat Obama in New Hampshire including:

1. the "Bradley effect" (closet racism) that white voters lie to pollsters and "say" they'll vote for a Black, but given a secret ballot don't,
2. the "damsel in distress" theory that Clinton's tears brought women voters out for her,
3. the "good weather" theory, and
4. the "economy was key" theory.

It would be interesting to know why these effects would only occur when ballots are counted by Diebold/Premier voting machines but not when ballots are counted in public view by hand.

The "electronic miscount" theory could be a more plausible explanation for the discrepancies between the opinion polls and the machine-counted results.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Wed, 16 Jan 2008 09:26:17 -0500  
Reply-To: Claire Durand <Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Claire Durand <Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA>  
Subject: Re: NH, Kohut, etc.  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
In-Reply-To: <OF47E70433.15F7A228-ON882573CC.005B0A19-882573CC.005B0A27@  
sjsu.edu>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I am a bit late on this thread but, I would like to make two comments.

a) On post election polls among pre-election respondents:

I carried such polls twice for Quebec elections, in 1998 and in 2007. In both cases, we managed to get response rates of more than 80% with very very few refusals. We asked only four questions i.e. did you vote, when did you make up your mind, whom did you vote for and, if voting behavior is different from vote intention, what is the main reason for your vote (or for not participating in the vote). This question is open-ended.

In 1998, we concluded that late change did not explain the discrepancy between the polls and the vote (see POQ article in 2001 and JOS in 2002) while in 2007, we concluded that late change was part of the explanation. This kind of polls is really not expensive and has many advantages, one being to stop speculation and help concentrate on the possible reasons and improve our methodology.

In 2007, in addition, we conducted a survey of non respondents to pre-election polls. This is however a lot more expensive.

b) on low-educated people being more racist. It is at least clear in France that extreme-right candidate Le Pen gets a disproportionate proportion of his support from low-educated people. BUT, I would not compare Clinton to Le Pen!!

Best,

Le 11:34 2008-01-10,Phil Trounstine écrit:

>Andrew Kohut makes an interesting and informative argument. And I am not  
>one to argue that we live in a post-racial world. If there's a race effect  
>happening, I want to know about it. My caution is not about trying to make  
>a utopian argument. Only that we should have some facts before we suggest  
>that there's a race effect happening in a Democratic primary. Re. Mr.  
>Kohut's article:  
>



>1. His experience in New York was in a general election, not a primary.  
>Have we ever seen hidden racial voting in a Democratic primary?  
>  
>2. Obama's vote was not over-estimated; Clinton's vote was under-estimated.  
>  
>3. He says "Poorer, less well-educated white people refuse surveys more  
>often than affluent, better-educated whites. Polls generally adjust their  
>samples for this tendency." This argues that surveys may not have included  
>adequate numbers of some voters (but not very many, I suspect) more likely  
>to vote for Clinton. But this is not evidence, per se, of some hidden  
>racial effect. To prove that, wouldn't we have to know the difference in  
>racial attitudes among respondents and non-respondents in this cohort?  
>Otherwise, the argument would suggest, without evidence, that poor,  
>less-educated whites who intended to vote for Clinton systematically  
>refused to participate in surveys but did turn out to vote. Not only would  
>that seem not to provide enough votes, but it's a lot further-fetched than  
>other, more logical explanations, like a significant post-survey a shift  
>among undecideds, a break to Clinton among women, more independents than  
>predicted taking GOP ballots (to help McCain), and what we might call the  
>Right-to-Rebel Effect of New Hampshire voters in the face of a media  
>avalanche for Obama.

>  
-----  
>Philip J. Trounstine, Director  
>Survey and Policy Research Institute  
>at San Jose State University  
>408-924-6993

>-----  
>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 this: set aapornet mail  
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

Claire Durand  
professeur titulaire,  
directrice des études supérieures,  
<http://www.mapageweb.umontreal.ca/durandc>  
Département de sociologie,  
Université de Montréal  
C.P. 6128, succ. Centre-ville,  
Montréal, H3C 3J7

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Wed, 16 Jan 2008 09:57:01 -0500  
Reply-To: Tresa Udem <[tudem@LAKERESEARCH.COM](mailto:tudem@LAKERESEARCH.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>

From: Tresa Udem <tudem@LAKERESEARCH.COM>  
Subject: Job Posting  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Senior Analyst for Methodology<?xml:namespace prefix =3D o ns =3D =  
"urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:office" />

Lake Research Partners

Washington, DC

=20

Lake Research Partners seeks a highly organized, self-starter to help =  
manage all aspects of data collection to lead our field department. =  
Position requires a candidate with formal survey methodology training =  
through graduate study or equivalent survey research experience. The =  
Senior Analyst for Methodology will manage a staff of two people, design =  
and oversee sampling, analyze calling data and procedures, and make =  
recommendations for improving research methods from sample design =  
through statistical modeling. This position will also oversee =  
qualitative research, including focus group and other methods. Please =  
send resume and cover letter via email to the Chief Operating Officer at =  
jobs@lakeresearch.com or fax (202) 776-9074.=20

=20

Job Duties:=20

The successful candidate is able to fulfill the following =  
responsibilities:=20

=A7 Ensure that Lake Research Partners remains a leader in our =  
field for Survey Methodology=20

=A7 Develop and refine calling procedures and devise the =  
methodological underpinning of survey sampling frames=20

=A7 Manipulate and prepare and samples files for calling house =  
vendors=20

=A7 Analyze nightly calling to ensure vendors are executing our =  
methodological practices accurately, developing and using existing =  
forensic tracking devices=20

=A7 Analyze ongoing dispositions/response rates to detect trends =  
in calling and offer solutions=20

=A7 Maintain a database of public and private methodological =

approaches and how these impact data=20

=A7 Be an active student of the current state of survey =  
methodology trends and drive innovation through the Field department =  
outward to the entire firm=20

=A7 Manage and train the field coordinator and Production/Field =  
Assistant=20

=A7 Assist in the training and learning of junior staff firm =  
wide=20

=20

Desired Qualifications:

The successful candidate will have the following professional and =  
personal characteristics:=20

=A6 Demonstrated experience on the leading edge of survey =  
methodological practices, including up to date understanding of:

? Non-response bias=20

? Cell-phone usage=20

? Online survey techniques=20

=A7 Fluent in SPSS with proven statistical skills=20

=A7 Is extremely detail oriented and solution oriented=20

=A7 Possesses the ability to juggle multiple projects in a fast =  
paced environment=20

=A7 Has the ability to adopt academic research findings for use =  
in a private polling firm with tight deadlines and limited budgets=20

=A7 Has some managerial experience=20

=A7 Political campaign experience a plus=20

=A7 Knowledge of census data, voter files and election returns =  
analysis a plus

=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 this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

---

Date: Wed, 16 Jan 2008 16:21:29 -0500  
Reply-To: "Thomas P. Duffy" <Thomas.P.Duffy.Jr@MACROINTERNATIONAL.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Thomas P. Duffy" <Thomas.P.Duffy.Jr@MACROINTERNATIONAL.COM>  
Subject: FW: MacroPoll Wireless Posting  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

=20  
We're still trying to fill up the survey for MacroPoll Wireless, scheduled to field Jan 23-29. Please contact me at randal.zuwallack@macrointernational.com or at 802-863-9600 if you are interested. =20

Thanks and I hope to hear from you.

Randy

---

=20

In October, Macro completed the first MacroPoll Wireless, a national omnibus survey conducted with cell phone users. Two-hundred and fifty respondents answered the survey, with over 100 reporting that they don't have a landline. Forty percent of the dual-users reported that they receive "all or almost all" calls on their cell phone. Further, 61 percent reported that they don't answer or they screen calls on their landline.=20

Eight cell survey pioneers placed an eclectic set of questions on the survey with topics including political preferences, awareness and perceptions of current events, consumer expenditures, health and healthcare, and mobile phone and internet usage. Rounding out the very full 20-minute survey was a core set of questions that covered cell phone sharing, telephone usage and behaviors for landline (if applicable) and cell phone, and demographics.

We appreciate the very positive response to the first MacroPoll Wireless and want to keep the momentum going. We are running MacroPoll Wireless again in January 2008. We are hoping to build enough support to run 2 waves of 250 each (or 500 in total for those who want to get on both surveys). The survey will field from Jan 23-Jan 29 with data and tabs delivered on Feb 1.=20

Please contact me at randal.zuwallack@macrointernational.com or at 802-863- 9600 for more information about funding some questions or about the survey itself (content, weighting methods, etc.)=20

Thanks and I hope to hear from you.

Randy

=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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Thu, 17 Jan 2008 11:13:31 -0600  
Reply-To: John Stevenson <[stevens@SSC.WISC.EDU](mailto:stevens@SSC.WISC.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: John Stevenson <[stevens@SSC.WISC.EDU](mailto:stevens@SSC.WISC.EDU)>  
Organization: UW Survey Center  
Subject: Summary of responses to questions about RDD telephone survey  
response rates  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed

Greetings AAPORNETers,

Thanks to everyone who responded to my inquiry about current response rates in RDD telephone surveys. The responses I received were extremely helpful and I appreciate the time everyone took to reply. Below I am including my original message and a summary of the replies.

John Stevenson  
Associate Director  
University of Wisconsin Survey Center  
1800 University Ave  
Madison, WI 53726  
ph (608)262-9032  
fx (608)262-8432  
[www.uwsc.wisc.edu](http://www.uwsc.wisc.edu)

\*\*\*\*  
I wld check the national surveys sponsored by the federal government. They have pretty good documentation. The NHES is a national telephone study that is done every 2-3 years (<http://aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/06/Catalog-AI-AN-NA/NHES.htm>; also go the NCES website). The NHIS <http://www.nber.org/~kling/surveys/NHIS.htm> is another national survey.

What I know from the federal surveys is that RR are going down and a lot of them are moving towards mixed mode in part to combat RR and cell phone coverage.  
\*\*\*\*\*

Check out the chapter by Holbrook, Krosnick and Pfent (chapter 23) in the new Wiley book: "Advances in Telephone Survey Methodology"  
<http://www.wiley.com/WileyCDA/WileyTitle/productCd-0471745316.html>  
This is exactly what you are looking for. Other chapters in the same book contain information about response rates.

Another interesting paper is the one by Bob Tortora published in the Slovenian Journal Metodološki zvezki, Vol. 1, No. 1, 2004, 21-32  
\*\*\*\*\*

I'll add to that a study CMOR conducted from 2000-2002 (<http://www.cmor.org/rc/studies.cfm>) which analyzed response rates from about 400 RDD surveys.  
\*\*\*\*\*

the National Immunization Survey and it might be of use to you as we have RDD response rates since 1994. However, it's important to keep in mind that, though national in scope, our estimation areas are actually "immunization action plan" areas. In some cases those are whole states, but in other cases they are small urban areas (Chicago, Boston, etc.) So comparisons to other studies concerned with purely national estimates may be misleading. Information about the study and response rates from 1995 to 2006 are available in the latest data users guide at [cdc.gov/nis/datafiles.htm](http://cdc.gov/nis/datafiles.htm). Final 2007 numbers will be available in a few months but won't be posted online until the fall.

You may also wish to look at the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance Survey, if have not already.  
\*\*\*\*\*

I think the CDC's Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System would be a good source of information for you, at least in regard to government-sponsored health surveys conducted using RDD. They publish both their methodology and their response rates at their Web site.

BRFSS methodology: <http://ftp.cdc.gov/pub/Data/Brfss/userguide.pdf>

BRFSS response rates:  
<http://ftp.cdc.gov/pub/Data/Brfss/2006SummaryDataQualityReport.pdf>

Those links are for the 2006 BRFSS data sets. The BRFSS Web site has methodology and response rate reports going back for several years, so you'd have data to look at the trend over the past five years.  
\*\*\*\*\*

The Centers for Disease Control publishes a lot of information about response rates by state for the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, RDD surveys done in all states. The rates are published for about the last 12 years.

See: [http://www.cdc.gov/brfss/technical\\_infodata/quality.htm](http://www.cdc.gov/brfss/technical_infodata/quality.htm)  
\*\*\*\*\*

The CDC's annual Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) survey, conducted by individual states, provides not just response rates but also full telephone dispositions and calculation formulas used for each year. It may be a helpful source of data for your analysis.  
\*\*\*\*\*

Original Posting:

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of John Stevenson  
Sent: Tuesday, January 08, 2008 2:07 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: [Fwd: message to aapornet]

Greetings AAPORNETers,

We are seeking information anyone might have on current response rates for national RDD telephone surveys in order to make comparisons. We have been scouring the literature, and reviewing documentation at websites, but documentation is sparse. We have reviewed the results from the excellent work of Curtin, Singer, and Presser for the Surveys of Consumers (SCA), but would really like more.

Are there other recent national RDD telephone surveys out there that publish their response rates and provide enough documentation on their study design to understand their methodology.  
By recent, say maybe in the last 5 years or so?

If you current run or know of any national RDDs, we would really appreciate hearing about your study.

Thank you very much. Please respond to:

John Stevenson  
Associate Director  
University of Wisconsin Survey Center  
1800 University Ave  
Madison, WI 53726  
ph (608)262-9032  
fx (608)262-8432  
www.uwsc.wisc.edu

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Thu, 17 Jan 2008 10:50:58 -0800  
Reply-To: John Huffman <[johnhuffman935@YAHOO.COM](mailto:johnhuffman935@YAHOO.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: John Huffman <[johnhuffman935@YAHOO.COM](mailto:johnhuffman935@YAHOO.COM)>  
Subject: Automated Dialers, Predictive Dialers and Cell Phones  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[478F8CBB.3040606@ssc.wisc.edu](mailto:478F8CBB.3040606@ssc.wisc.edu)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Does anyone know if the language in the TCPA that restricts conducting research on cell phones by using 'automated' dialers has been clarified?

Specifically, does this only apply to 'predictive dialers' or does it apply to any type of dialer that is not manual. Manual meaning that the interviewer has to punch in the area code and number.

I'm trying to determine if cell phones can be included in a sample for a survey that uses a 'power dialer', that is, a dialer where the interviewer only has to punch one button (or the 'enter' key) and then one, and only one, number is dialed.

Thanks,  
JH  
John Huffman  
Newark, DE  
302.432.4501 W  
302.218.3981 C

-----  
Looking for last minute shopping deals? Find them fast with Yahoo! Search.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Thu, 17 Jan 2008 14:17:05 -0500  
Reply-To: Paul J Lavrakas PhD <[pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET](mailto:pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Paul J Lavrakas PhD <[pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET](mailto:pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET)>  
Subject: Re: Automated Dialers, Predictive Dialers and Cell Phones  
Comments: To: John Huffman <[johnhuffman935@YAHOO.COM](mailto:johnhuffman935@YAHOO.COM)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[321790.173.qm@web54202.mail.re2.yahoo.com](mailto:321790.173.qm@web54202.mail.re2.yahoo.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

The current interpretation from CMOR, as far as I know, is that anything but hand-dialing of cell phone numbers (unless the cell phone owner has given prior consent to be called by the organization), must get hand dialed. Thus your power-dialer is consider an automatic dialer under this interpretation.

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of John Huffman  
Sent: Thursday, January 17, 2008 1:51 PM  
To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Subject: Automated Dialers, Predictive Dialers and Cell Phones

Does anyone know if the language in the TCPA that restricts conducting



research on cell phones by using 'automated' dialers has been clarified?

Specifically, does this only apply to 'predictive dialers' or does it apply to any type of dialer that is not manual. Manual meaning that the interviewer has to punch in the area code and number.

I'm trying to determine if cell phones can be included in a sample for a survey that uses a 'power dialer', that is, a dialer where the interviewer only has to punch one button (or the 'enter' key) and then one, and only one, number is dialed.

Thanks,  
JH  
John Huffman  
Newark, DE  
302.432.4501 W  
302.218.3981 C

---

Looking for last minute shopping deals? Find them fast with Yahoo! Search.

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Thu, 17 Jan 2008 14:27:02 -0500  
Reply-To: John Healy <[jhealy@NYSUTMAIL.ORG](mailto:jhealy@NYSUTMAIL.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: John Healy <[jhealy@NYSUTMAIL.ORG](mailto:jhealy@NYSUTMAIL.ORG)>  
Subject: Re: Automated Dialers, Predictive Dialers and Cell Phones  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU), Paul J Lavrakas PhD <[pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET](mailto:pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET)>  
In-Reply-To: <[010301c8593d\\$8c0b7f60\\$8b00a8c0@NYCNMRLAVRAKPB](mailto:010301c8593d$8c0b7f60$8b00a8c0@NYCNMRLAVRAKPB)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Content-Disposition: inline

Question Invited from Below - Other than our members, if we are calling from voter registration files for example, therefore not knowingly dialing cell phone numbers, but with phone numbers that could or could not be cell do we still need to dial manually IN CASE?

John Healy  
Manager, Polling Center  
NYSUT

800 Troy-Schenectady Road  
Latham, NY 12110-2455  
(518) 213-6000  
x.6680  
jhealy@nysutmail.org

>>> "Paul J Lavrakas PhD" <pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET> 01/17/08 2:17 PM  
>>>

The current interpretation from CMOR, as far as I know, is that anything but hand-dialing of cell phone numbers (unless the cell phone owner has given prior consent to be called by the organization), must get hand dialed. Thus your power-dialer is consider an automatic dialer under this interpretation.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of John Huffman  
Sent: Thursday, January 17, 2008 1:51 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Automated Dialers, Predictive Dialers and Cell Phones

Does anyone know if the language in the TCPA that restricts conducting research on cell phones by using 'automated' dialers has been clarified?

Specifically, does this only apply to 'predictive dialers' or does it apply to any type of dialer that is not manual. Manual meaning that the interviewer has to punch in the area code and number.

I'm trying to determine if cell phones can be included in a sample for a survey that uses a 'power dialer', that is, a dialer where the interviewer only has to punch one button (or the 'enter' key) and then one, and only one, number is dialed.

Thanks,  
JH  
John Huffman  
Newark, DE  
302.432.4501 W  
302.218.3981 C

-----  
Looking for last minute shopping deals? Find them fast with Yahoo! Search.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Thu, 17 Jan 2008 14:29:53 -0500  
Reply-To: Mike Donatello <[mike@DONATELLO.US](mailto:mike@DONATELLO.US)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mike Donatello <[mike@DONATELLO.US](mailto:mike@DONATELLO.US)>  
Subject: Re: Automated Dialers, Predictive Dialers and Cell Phones  
Comments: To: John Huffman <[johnhuffman935@YAHOO.COM](mailto:johnhuffman935@YAHOO.COM)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[321790.173.qm@web54202.mail.re2.yahoo.com](mailto:321790.173.qm@web54202.mail.re2.yahoo.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="windows-1250"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I'd ask CMOR on this one. The fact that an interviewer has to "punch a button" to dial only one number says to me that this is an manual dial (albeit one in which all 10 digits are dialed with the one button press).

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of John Huffman  
Sent: Thursday, 17 January, 2008 13:51  
To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Subject: [AAPORNET] Automated Dialers, Predictive Dialers and Cell Phones

Does anyone know if the language in the TCPA that restricts conducting research on cell phones by using 'automated' dialers has been clarified?

Specifically, does this only apply to 'predictive dialers' or does it apply to any type of dialer that is not manual. Manual meaning that the interviewer has to punch in the area code and number.

I'm trying to determine if cell phones can be included in a sample for a survey that uses a 'power dialer', that is, a dialer where the interviewer only has to punch one button (or the 'enter' key) and then one, and only one, number is dialed.

Thanks,  
JH  
John Huffman  
Newark, DE  
302.432.4501 W  
302.218.3981 C

-----  
Looking for last minute shopping deals? Find them fast with Yahoo! Search.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

No virus found in this incoming message.  
Checked by AVG Free Edition.  
Version: 7.5.516 / Virus Database: 269.19.5/1228 - Release Date: 1/16/2008  
9:01

No virus found in this outgoing message.  
Checked by AVG Free Edition.  
Version: 7.5.516 / Virus Database: 269.19.5/1228 - Release Date: 1/16/2008  
9:01

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Thu, 17 Jan 2008 13:40:19 -0600  
Reply-To: [lynn.stalone@IHR-RESEARCH.COM](mailto:lynn.stalone@IHR-RESEARCH.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Lynn Stalone <[lynn.stalone@IHR-RESEARCH.COM](mailto:lynn.stalone@IHR-RESEARCH.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Automated Dialers, Predictive Dialers and Cell Phones  
Comments: To: John Healy <[jhealy@NYSUTMAIL.ORG](mailto:jhealy@NYSUTMAIL.ORG)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

I would consult CMOR on that. Our understanding is that not knowing is not necessarily going to exonerate you. There may be a provision somewhere for voter lists that CMOR knows of.

Best regards,  
Lynn

Lynn Stalone, PRC  
Partner  
I/H/R Research Group  
[Lynn.Stalone@ihr-research.com](mailto:Lynn.Stalone@ihr-research.com)  
(714) 368-1885 direct

(714) 368-1884 I/H/R Main  
(714) 315-9453 mobile

-----  
On Thu, 17 Jan 2008 14:27:02 -0500, John Healy <jhealy@NYSUTMAIL.ORG> wrote:

> Question Invited from Below - Other than our members, if we are calling  
> from voter registration files for example, therefore not knowingly  
> dialing cell phone numbers, but with phone numbers that could or could  
> not be cell do we still need to dial manually IN CASE?

>  
> John Healy  
> Manager, Polling Center  
> NYSUT  
> 800 Troy-Schenectady Road  
> Latham, NY 12110-2455  
> (518) 213-6000  
> x.6680  
> jhealy@nysutmail.org

>>>> "Paul J Lavrakas PhD" <pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET> 01/17/08 2:17 PM

>>>>  
> The current interpretation from CMOR, as far as I know, is that  
> anything but  
> hand-dialing of cell phone numbers (unless the cell phone owner has  
> given  
> prior consent to be called by the organization), must get hand dialed.  
> Thus  
> your power-dialer is consider an automatic dialer under this  
> interpretation.

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of John Huffman  
> Sent: Thursday, January 17, 2008 1:51 PM  
> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
> Subject: Automated Dialers, Predictive Dialers and Cell Phones

>>>>  
> Does anyone know if the language in the TCPA that restricts conducting  
> research on cell phones by using 'automated' dialers has been  
> clarified?

>>>>  
> Specifically, does this only apply to 'predictive dialers' or does it  
> apply  
> to any type of dialer that is not manual. Manual meaning that the  
> interviewer has to punch in the area code and number.

>>>>  
> I'm trying to determine if cell phones can be included in a sample  
> for a  
> survey that uses a 'power dialer', that is, a dialer where the  
> interviewer

> only has to punch one button (or the 'enter' key) and then one, and  
> only  
> one, number is dialed.  
>  
> Thanks,  
> JH  
> John Huffman  
> Newark, DE  
> 302.432.4501 W  
> 302.218.3981 C  
>  
>

> -----  
> Looking for last minute shopping deals? Find them fast with Yahoo!  
> Search.  
>  
>

> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
> signoff aapornet  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>  
>

> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
> signoff aapornet  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>  
>

> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
> signoff aapornet  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>  
>

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
=====

Date: Thu, 17 Jan 2008 14:41:32 -0500  
Reply-To: Paul J Lavrakas PhD <[pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET](mailto:pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Paul J Lavrakas PhD <[pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET](mailto:pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET)>  
Subject: Re: Automated Dialers, Predictive Dialers and Cell Phones  
Comments: To: John Healy <[jhealy@nysutmail.org](mailto:jhealy@nysutmail.org)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[478F65B6020000360000C298@nysutmail.org](mailto:478F65B6020000360000C298@nysutmail.org)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

In theory and in strict compliance with CMOR's interpretation of the TCPA,  
Yes.

However, as I have written elsewhere, the likelihood that anyone will ever be sued for doing so is almost non-existent because the onus of the legal action is on the respondent and almost no respondents understand their rights or care.

It's clearly impractical to follow the law strictly is one is dialing phone numbers in the US, so I always advised my company to have the interviewer politely terminate the call as soon as s/he learns a cell phone has been reached without asking anything more of the individual, assuming the call wasn't hand-dialed. I believe that course is in the spirit of the TCPA.

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

From: John Healy [mailto:jhealy@nysutmail.org]  
Sent: Thursday, January 17, 2008 2:27 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU; Paul J Lavrakas PhD  
Subject: Re: Automated Dialers, Predictive Dialers and Cell Phones

Question Invited from Below - Other than our members, if we are calling from voter registration files for example, therefore not knowingly dialing cell phone numbers, but with phone numbers that could or could not be cell do we still need to dial manually IN CASE?

John Healy  
Manager, Polling Center  
NYSUT  
800 Troy-Schenectady Road  
Latham, NY 12110-2455  
(518) 213-6000  
x.6680  
jhealy@nysutmail.org

>>> "Paul J Lavrakas PhD" <pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET> 01/17/08 2:17 PM  
>>>

The current interpretation from CMOR, as far as I know, is that anything but hand-dialing of cell phone numbers (unless the cell phone owner has given prior consent to be called by the organization), must get hand dialed.

Thus  
your power-dialer is consider an automatic dialer under this interpretation.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of John Huffman  
Sent: Thursday, January 17, 2008 1:51 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Automated Dialers, Predictive Dialers and Cell Phones

Does anyone know if the language in the TCPA that restricts conducting research on cell phones by using 'automated' dialers has been clarified?

Specifically, does this only apply to 'predictive dialers' or does it apply to any type of dialer that is not manual. Manual meaning that the interviewer has to punch in the area code and number.

I'm trying to determine if cell phones can be included in a sample for a survey that uses a 'power dialer', that is, a dialer where the interviewer only has to punch one button (or the 'enter' key) and then one, and only one, number is dialed.

Thanks,  
JH  
John Huffman  
Newark, DE  
302.432.4501 W  
302.218.3981 C

---

Looking for last minute shopping deals? Find them fast with Yahoo! Search.

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Thu, 17 Jan 2008 14:52:16 -0500  
Reply-To: John Healy <[jhealy@NYSUTMAIL.ORG](mailto:jhealy@NYSUTMAIL.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: John Healy <[jhealy@NYSUTMAIL.ORG](mailto:jhealy@NYSUTMAIL.ORG)>  
Subject: Re: Automated Dialers, Predictive Dialers and Cell Phones  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU), Paul J Lavrakas PhD <[pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET](mailto:pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET)>  
In-Reply-To: <[012301c85940\\$f665e0f0\\$8b00a8c0@NYCNMRLAVRAKPB](mailto:012301c85940$f665e0f0$8b00a8c0@NYCNMRLAVRAKPB)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Content-Disposition: inline

Just received a battery of responses and thank you all. This is a very informative forum in which to participate. And this cell phone issue today (1/17) and a number of months ago have informed me greatly. Thank you all. John

John Healy



Manager, Polling Center  
NYSUT  
800 Troy-Schenectady Road  
Latham, NY 12110-2455  
(518) 213-6000  
x.6680  
jhealy@nysutmail.org

>>> "Paul J Lavrakas PhD" <pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET> 01/17/08 2:41 PM

>>>

In theory and in strict compliance with CMOR's interpretation of the  
TCPA,  
Yes.

However, as I have written elsewhere, the likelihood that anyone will  
ever  
be sued for doing so is almost non-existent because the onus of the  
legal  
action is on the respondent and almost no respondents understand their  
rights or care.

It's clearly impractical to follow the law strictly is one is dialing  
phone  
numbers in the US, so I always advised my company to have the  
interviewer  
politely terminate the call as soon as s/he learns a cell phone has  
been  
reached without asking anything more of the individual, assuming the  
call  
wasn't hand-dialed. I believe that course is in the spirit of the  
TCPA.

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

From: John Healy [mailto:jhealy@nysutmail.org]  
Sent: Thursday, January 17, 2008 2:27 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU; Paul J Lavrakas PhD  
Subject: Re: Automated Dialers, Predictive Dialers and Cell Phones

Question Invited from Below - Other than our members, if we are calling  
from  
voter registration files for example, therefore not knowingly dialing  
cell  
phone numbers, but with phone numbers that could or could not be cell  
do we  
still need to dial manually IN CASE?

John Healy  
Manager, Polling Center  
NYSUT  
800 Troy-Schenectady Road  
Latham, NY 12110-2455  
(518) 213-6000  
x.6680

jhealy@nysutmail.org

>>> "Paul J Lavrakas PhD" <pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET> 01/17/08 2:17 PM

>>>

The current interpretation from CMOR, as far as I know, is that anything but hand-dialing of cell phone numbers (unless the cell phone owner has given prior consent to be called by the organization), must get hand dialed.

Thus your power-dialer is consider an automatic dialer under this interpretation.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of John Huffman

Sent: Thursday, January 17, 2008 1:51 PM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: Automated Dialers, Predictive Dialers and Cell Phones

Does anyone know if the language in the TCPA that restricts conducting research on cell phones by using 'automated' dialers has been clarified?

Specifically, does this only apply to 'predictive dialers' or does it apply to any type of dialer that is not manual. Manual meaning that the interviewer has to punch in the area code and number.

I'm trying to determine if cell phones can be included in a sample for a survey that uses a 'power dialer', that is, a dialer where the interviewer only has to punch one button (or the 'enter' key) and then one, and only one, number is dialed.

Thanks,  
JH  
John Huffman  
Newark, DE  
302.432.4501 W  
302.218.3981 C

-----  
Looking for last minute shopping deals? Find them fast with Yahoo! Search.

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Thu, 17 Jan 2008 13:51:06 -0600

Reply-To: [lynn.stalone@IHR-RESEARCH.COM](mailto:lynn.stalone@IHR-RESEARCH.COM)

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

From: Lynn Stalone <[lynn.stalone@IHR-RESEARCH.COM](mailto:lynn.stalone@IHR-RESEARCH.COM)>

Subject: Re: Automated Dialers, Predictive Dialers and Cell Phones

Comments: To: Paul J Lavrakas PhD <[pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET](mailto:pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

To take that a bit further, when dialing potential cell numbers, you might want to consider offering remuneration for their "minutes" once you find out it is a cell phone. \$5 usually is more than sufficient to encourage participation and improve sample representativeness. It's a small courtesy, but we have found it to be very effective.

Lynn Stalone, PRC

Partner

I/H/R Research Group

[Lynn.Stalone@ihr-research.com](mailto:Lynn.Stalone@ihr-research.com)

(714) 368-1885 direct

(714) 368-1884 I/H/R Main

(714) 315-9453 mobile

-----  
On Thu, 17 Jan 2008 14:41:32 -0500, Paul J Lavrakas PhD

<[pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET](mailto:pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET)> wrote:

> In theory and in strict compliance with CMOR's interpretation of the TCPA,

> Yes.

>

> However, as I have written elsewhere, the likelihood that anyone will ever

> be sued for doing so is almost non-existent because the onus of the legal

> action is on the respondent and almost no respondents understand their

> rights or care.  
>  
> It's clearly impractical to follow the law strictly is one is dialing phone  
> numbers in the US, so I always advised my company to have the interviewer  
> politely terminate the call as soon as s/he learns a cell phone has been  
> reached without asking anything more of the individual, assuming the call  
> wasn't hand-dialed. I believe that course is in the spirit of the TCPA.

>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: John Healy [mailto:jhealy@nysutmail.org]  
> Sent: Thursday, January 17, 2008 2:27 PM  
> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU; Paul J Lavrakas PhD  
> Subject: Re: Automated Dialers, Predictive Dialers and Cell Phones

>  
> Question Invited from Below - Other than our members, if we are calling from  
> voter registration files for example, therefore not knowingly dialing cell  
> phone numbers, but with phone numbers that could or could not be cell do we  
> still need to dial manually IN CASE?

>  
> John Healy  
> Manager, Polling Center  
> NYSUT  
> 800 Troy-Schenectady Road  
> Latham, NY 12110-2455  
> (518) 213-6000  
> x.6680  
> jhealy@nysutmail.org

>  
>  
> >>> "Paul J Lavrakas PhD" <pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET> 01/17/08 2:17 PM  
> >>>

> The current interpretation from CMOR, as far as I know, is that anything but  
> hand-dialing of cell phone numbers (unless the cell phone owner has given  
> prior consent to be called by the organization), must get hand dialed.  
> Thus  
> your power-dialer is consider an automatic dialer under this interpretation.

>  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of John Huffman  
> Sent: Thursday, January 17, 2008 1:51 PM  
> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
> Subject: Automated Dialers, Predictive Dialers and Cell Phones

>  
> Does anyone know if the language in the TCPA that restricts conducting  
> research on cell phones by using 'automated' dialers has been clarified?  
>  
> Specifically, does this only apply to 'predictive dialers' or does it apply  
> to any type of dialer that is not manual. Manual meaning that the  
> interviewer has to punch in the area code and number.

>  
> I'm trying to determine if cell phones can be included in a sample for a  
> survey that uses a 'power dialer', that is, a dialer where the interviewer  
> only has to punch one button (or the 'enter' key) and then one, and only

> one, number is dialed.  
>  
> Thanks,  
> JH  
> John Huffman  
> Newark, DE  
> 302.432.4501 W  
> 302.218.3981 C  
>  
>  
> -----  
> Looking for last minute shopping deals? Find them fast with Yahoo!  
> Search.  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
> signoff aapornet  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
> signoff aapornet  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
> signoff aapornet  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
> signoff aapornet  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Thu, 17 Jan 2008 14:52:54 -0500  
Reply-To: [llang@cmor.org](mailto:llang@cmor.org)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "LaToya R. Lang, Esq." <[lrembert@CMOR.ORG](mailto:lrembert@CMOR.ORG)>  
Subject: Re: Automated Dialers, Predictive Dialers and Cell Phones  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU), [pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET](mailto:pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET)  
In-Reply-To: <[010301c8593d\\$8c0b7f60\\$8b00a8c0@NYCNMRLAVRAKPB](mailto:010301c8593d$8c0b7f60$8b00a8c0@NYCNMRLAVRAKPB)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Paul is correct with his assessment and interpretation. Autodialers, including predictive dialers, may not be used to contact numbers assigned to

cell phones unless prior express consent is given.

This rule applies to all uses of autodialers, including survey research.

As clarified by the FCC's 2003 Report, this includes all forms of auto-dialers and predictive dialers, and applies to intra-state calls, interstate calls and calls from outside the United States.

The TCPA regulations state that, "(a) No person or entity may: (1) Initiate any telephone call (other than a call made for emergency purposes or made with the prior express consent of the called party) using an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice ... (iii) To any telephone number assigned to a paging service, cellular telephone service, specialized mobile radio service, or other radio common carrier service, or any service for which the called party is charged for the call."

Autodialed calls (and possibly automated text messages) to cell phones without express prior consent are prohibited by federal law - the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA). This DOES apply to survey and opinion research. Pre-existing business relationships do not have any impact. However, in many cases if the respondent provides their cell phone number as their contact number, such provision is usually deemed to equal prior consent to call (for survey and opinion research purposes, not necessarily for telemarketing).

Please do not hesitate to contact LaToya Lang, CMOR State Legislative Director at [llang@cmor.org](mailto:llang@cmor.org), or Howard Fienberg, CMOR Director of Government Affairs for more information regarding this matter.

Best,

LaToya Lang

LaToya R. Lang, Esq.  
State Legislative Director  
CMOR...Shielding the Profession

1111 16th St., NW

Suite 120

Washington, DC 20036

Contact Phone: 202.775.5171

Fax: 202.775.5172

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

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

The information contained in this electronic communication is provided as guidance and for informational purposes only. It is not intended as nor is a substitute for legal advice. It is advisable to consult with private legal counsel regarding the interpretation and application of any laws to your business.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)] On Behalf Of Paul J Lavrakas PhD

Sent: Thursday, January 17, 2008 2:17 PM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: Re: Automated Dialers, Predictive Dialers and Cell Phones

The current interpretation from CMOR, as far as I know, is that anything but hand-dialing of cell phone numbers (unless the cell phone owner has given prior consent to be called by the organization), must get hand dialed. Thus your power-dialer is consider an automatic dialer under this interpretation.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)] On Behalf Of John Huffman

Sent: Thursday, January 17, 2008 1:51 PM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: Automated Dialers, Predictive Dialers and Cell Phones

Does anyone know if the language in the TCPA that restricts conducting research on cell phones by using 'automated' dialers has been clarified?

Specifically, does this only apply to 'predictive dialers' or does it apply to any type of dialer that is not manual. Manual meaning that the interviewer has to punch in the area code and number.

I'm trying to determine if cell phones can be included in a sample for a survey that uses a 'power dialer', that is, a dialer where the interviewer only has to punch one button (or the 'enter' key) and then one, and only one, number is dialed.

Thanks,

JH

John Huffman

Newark, DE

302.432.4501 W

302.218.3981 C

-----  
Looking for last minute shopping deals? Find them fast with Yahoo! Search.

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



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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Thu, 17 Jan 2008 15:07:01 -0500

Reply-To: [llang@cmor.org](mailto:llang@cmor.org)

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

From: "LaToya R. Lang, Esq." <[lrembert@CMOR.ORG](mailto:lrembert@CMOR.ORG)>

Subject: Re: Automated Dialers, Predictive Dialers and Cell Phones

Comments: To: Paul J Lavrakas PhD <[pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET](mailto:pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

In-Reply-To: <[012301c85940\\$f665e0f0\\$8b00a8c0@NYCNMRLAVRAKPB](mailto:012301c85940$f665e0f0$8b00a8c0@NYCNMRLAVRAKPB)>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

If cell phone numbers may exist in the voter registration files; then in accordance to complying with the TCPA, unless prior consent occurs, the calls must be manually placed.

Again, remember the scope of the TCPA:

The TCPA regulations state that, "(a) No person or entity may: (1) Initiate any telephone call (other than a call made for emergency purposes or made with the prior express consent of the called party) using an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice ... (iii) To any telephone number assigned to a paging service, cellular telephone service, specialized mobile radio service, or other radio common carrier service, or any service for which the called party is charged for the call."

There is not a defined standard of knowing versus not knowing whether a number provided listed as a cell phone number. Accidental calls are not exempt: In its 2003 Report, the FCC rejected proposals to create a good faith exception for inadvertent autodialed calls to wireless numbers and proposals to create implied consent "because we find that there are adequate solutions in the marketplace to . identify wireless numbers." Though there is a limited safe harbor for cell phones that have been ported.

Yet, I also recognize, that, in many cases, if the respondent provides their cell phone number as their contact number, such provision is usually deemed to equal prior consent to call (for survey and opinion research purposes, not necessarily for telemarketing). The question is whether providing their cell phone number on their voter registration gives consent for contact for other purposes beyond their voting registration. If contacting the respondent for survey research purposes appears even slightly beyond the scope of completing a survey solely related to customer satisfaction for voting registration, then manual dialing is the best course to forward and be in full compliance with the law.

Best,

LaToya Lang

LaToya R. Lang, Esq.

State Legislative Director

CMOR...Shielding the Profession

1111 16th St., NW

Suite 120

Washington, DC 20036

Contact Phone: 202.775.5171

Fax: 202.775.5172

<http://www.cmor.org>

<http://www.youropinioncounts.org>

The information contained in this electronic communication is provided as guidance and for informational purposes only. It is not intended as nor is a substitute for legal advice. It is advisable to consult with private legal counsel regarding the interpretation and application of any laws to your business.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Paul J Lavrakas PhD

Sent: Thursday, January 17, 2008 2:42 PM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: Re: Automated Dialers, Predictive Dialers and Cell Phones

In theory and in strict compliance with CMOR's interpretation of the TCPA,

Yes.

However, as I have written elsewhere, the likelihood that anyone will ever be sued for doing so is almost non-existent because the onus of the legal action is on the respondent and almost no respondents understand their rights or care.

It's clearly impractical to follow the law strictly is one is dialing phone numbers in the US, so I always advised my company to have the interviewer politely terminate the call as soon as s/he learns a cell phone has been reached without asking anything more of the individual, assuming the call wasn't hand-dialed. I believe that course is in the spirit of the TCPA.

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

From: John Healy [mailto:jhealy@nysutmail.org]

Sent: Thursday, January 17, 2008 2:27 PM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU; Paul J Lavrakas PhD

Subject: Re: Automated Dialers, Predictive Dialers and Cell Phones

Question Invited from Below - Other than our members, if we are calling from voter registration files for example, therefore not knowingly dialing cell phone numbers, but with phone numbers that could or could not be cell do we still need to dial manually IN CASE?

John Healy

Manager, Polling Center

NYSUT

800 Troy-Schenectady Road

Latham, NY 12110-2455

(518) 213-6000

x.6680

jhealy@nysutmail.org

>>> "Paul J Lavrakas PhD" <pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET> 01/17/08 2:17 PM

>>>

The current interpretation from CMOR, as far as I know, is that anything but hand-dialing of cell phone numbers (unless the cell phone owner has given prior consent to be called by the organization), must get hand dialed.

Thus

your power-dialer is consider an automatic dialer under this interpretation.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of John Huffman

Sent: Thursday, January 17, 2008 1:51 PM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: Automated Dialers, Predictive Dialers and Cell Phones

Does anyone know if the language in the TCPA that restricts conducting research on cell phones by using 'automated' dialers has been clarified?

Specifically, does this only apply to 'predictive dialers' or does it apply to any type of dialer that is not manual. Manual meaning that the interviewer has to punch in the area code and number.

I'm trying to determine if cell phones can be included in a sample for a survey that uses a 'power dialer', that is, a dialer where the interviewer only has to punch one button (or the 'enter' key) and then one, and only one, number is dialed.

Thanks,

JH

John Huffman

Newark, DE

302.432.4501 W

302.218.3981 C

-----

Looking for last minute shopping deals? Find them fast with Yahoo!

Search.

---

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Thu, 17 Jan 2008 16:55:35 -0500

Reply-To: Tresa Udem <[tudem@LAKERESEARCH.COM](mailto:tudem@LAKERESEARCH.COM)>

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

From: Tresa Udem <[tudem@LAKERESEARCH.COM](mailto:tudem@LAKERESEARCH.COM)>

Subject: Job Posting #2

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

Junior|Associate Analyst  
Lake Research Partners  
Washington, DC

Lake Research Partners is looking for a junior|associate level analyst to be part of a team that conducts qualitative and quantitative research on a variety of issues including health care, poverty, substance use, and other social issues. Candidate should have a college degree plus one year or more of work in the following fields: public opinion|political polling, PR, Hill staff, progressive think tanks, non-profit. Individuals right out of graduate school are also welcome to apply. Must be passionate about working on social issues, have a statistics background, interest in the research process, and strong interpersonal skills. Job is a mix of substantive (analysis, conducting interviews, attending client meetings, etc.) and support (editing, number checking, setting up client calls, etc.) tasks. Please send both a cover letter and resume to the Chief Operating Officer at [jobs@lakeresearch.com](mailto:jobs@lakeresearch.com) or via fax at (202) 776-9074.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Fri, 18 Jan 2008 10:03:16 -0500  
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: States try to pull plug on 'robo-calls'  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

States try to pull plug on 'robo-calls'  
Millions of automated political pitches tie up Americans' phones  
By Dennis Cauchon  
USA TODAY

States are trying to disconnect computer-generated political calls that are flooding the nation's households at election time.

More than 5 million automated "robo-calls" have been made to potential voters in early primary states. The number of robo-calls could run into the hundreds of millions this election year as the political parties battle for control of the White House, Congress and state governments.

"What's making people mad is the volume of calls," says Jerry Dorchuck of Political Marketing International, which provides automated calling services to candidates. "People can get 25 automated calls on the day before an election."

Nineteen states restrict political robo-calls. At least five more will consider limits this year.

SNIP

"You can do 100,000 phone calls in an hour for \$2,000," says Shaun Dakin, founder of Citizens for Civil Discourse, a non-partisan group critical of robo-calls. "It's efficient and irresistible."

Before the Iowa caucuses Jan. 3, 80% of voters received robo-calls, the Pew Research Center found.

Few states have enforced their robo-call laws, partly out of fear that they violate free speech protections.

SNIP

Find this article at:

[http://www.usatoday.com/printedition/news/20080118/1a\\_bottomstrip18.art.htm?loc=interstitialskip](http://www.usatoday.com/printedition/news/20080118/1a_bottomstrip18.art.htm?loc=interstitialskip)

or

<http://tinyurl.com/39pxkq>

--

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

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====

Date: Fri, 18 Jan 2008 11:01:13 -0500  
Reply-To: Patrick Glaser <[pglaser@CMOR.ORG](mailto:pglaser@CMOR.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Patrick Glaser <[pglaser@CMOR.ORG](mailto:pglaser@CMOR.ORG)>  
Subject: CMOR Respondent Cooperation Workshop, March 3-5th Las Vegas  
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

Colleagues,=20

=20  
CMOR will be hosting our 7th annual Respondent Cooperation Workshop this March 3rd-5th in Las Vegas, NV.

=20  
The program for the 2 =BD day conference is available online at <http://www.cmor.org/rc/events.cfm>, and includes topics such as using RDD



w/ address-based sampling, offshore data collection, certifying bi-lingual interviewers, and much more. There is also a special (4.5 hour) telephone call center management summit as well as special session on mixed modes led by Don Dillman.

=20

Register by next Friday (01/25) to receive an early bird discount.

=20

=20

Patrick Glaser

Director of Respondent Cooperation

CMOR...Shielding the Profession

Ph:212.480.2464

Fx:860.682.1010

=20

Mailing Address:

110 National Drive, 2nd Floor

Glastonbury, CT 06033-1212

=20

[www.cmor.org](http://www.cmor.org)

[www.youropinioncounts.org](http://www.youropinioncounts.org)

=20

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====  
Date: Fri, 18 Jan 2008 08:30:39 -0800

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)>

Subject: Re: States try to pull plug on 'robo-calls'

Comments: To: Leo Simonetta <[Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>, "AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>

In-Reply-To:

<[3248A9B21DD5574785FE5E2C8E5216849CBBD5@exchange.local.artscience.com](mailto:3248A9B21DD5574785FE5E2C8E5216849CBBD5@exchange.local.artscience.com)>

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

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

What the article didn't mention is Pew's data demonstrating that campaign robo-calls are disliked. Their research (in Iowa and New Hampshire) shows that far more than half who get those calls are annoyed by them and usually hang up. In contrast, about 80% of those who get "live" calls from a person usually listen.

However, there is a free speech issue. AAPORites ought to be wary of the plug-pulling efforts. Despite our sense that the millions of automated calls contribute to lower cooperation rates on phone surveys, the difference between passing laws to restrict robo-calls and passing laws to restrict survey calls is, well, only one word.

John Nienstedt, Sr.

800-576-CERC

Get the Edge at [www.cerc.net](http://www.cerc.net)

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

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

Sent: Friday, January 18, 2008 7:03 AM

To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

Subject: States try to pull plug on 'robo-calls'

States try to pull plug on 'robo-calls'

Millions of automated political pitches tie up Americans' phones

By Dennis Cauchon

USA TODAY

States are trying to disconnect computer-generated political calls that are flooding the nation's households at election time.

More than 5 million automated "robo-calls" have been made to potential voters in early primary states. The number of robo-calls could run into the hundreds of millions this election year as the political parties battle for control of the White House, Congress and state governments.

"What's making people mad is the volume of calls," says Jerry Dorchuck of Political Marketing International, which provides automated calling services to candidates. "People can get 25 automated calls on the day before an election."

Nineteen states restrict political robo-calls. At least five more will consider limits this year.

SNIP

"You can do 100,000 phone calls in an hour for \$2,000," says Shaun Dakin, founder of Citizens for Civil Discourse, a non-partisan group critical of robo-calls. "It's efficient and irresistible."

Before the Iowa caucuses Jan. 3, 80% of voters received robo-calls, the Pew Research Center found.

Few states have enforced their robo-call laws, partly out of fear that they violate free speech protections.

SNIP

Find this article at:

[http://www.usatoday.com/printedition/news/20080118/1a\\_bottomstrip18.art.htm?loc=interstitialskip](http://www.usatoday.com/printedition/news/20080118/1a_bottomstrip18.art.htm?loc=interstitialskip)

or

<http://tinyurl.com/39pxkq>

--

Leo G. Simonetta

Director of Research

Art & Science Group, LLC  
6115 Falls Road, Suite 101  
Baltimore MD 21209

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Fri, 18 Jan 2008 16:49:33 -0000  
Reply-To: [Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK](mailto:Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Iain Noble <[Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK](mailto:Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK)>  
Subject: Re: States try to pull plug on 'robo-calls'  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To:  
A<[CA62D583B8F55A4ABADEEF50C662DF626374A616@EXCHANGE.CERC2.cerc.local](mailto:CA62D583B8F55A4ABADEEF50C662DF626374A616@EXCHANGE.CERC2.cerc.local)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Has anybody looked at the effect on voters' party preference? Are robo-calls in fact counter-productive?

Iain Noble  
Department for Children, Schools and Families  
Young People Analysis Division - YCS and Next Steps Study,  
W606, Moorfoot, Sheffield, S1 4PQ.  
0114 259 1180  
For information about the Next Steps Study go to  
[www.nextstepsstudy.org.uk](http://www.nextstepsstudy.org.uk) or  
<http://www.esds.ac.uk/longitudinal/access/lstype/>

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

>>From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of John Nienstedt

>>Sent: 18 January 2008 16:31

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

>>Subject: Re: States try to pull plug on 'robo-calls'

>

>>What the article didn't mention is Pew's data demonstrating that campaign robo-calls are  
>>disliked. Their research (in Iowa and New Hampshire) shows that far more than half who get  
>>those calls are annoyed by them and usually hang up. In contrast, about 80% of those who  
>>get "live" calls from a person usually listen.

>

>>However, there is a free speech issue. AAPORites ought to be wary of the plug-pulling

>efforts. Despite our sense that the millions of automated calls contribute to lower  
>cooperation rates on phone surveys, the difference between passing laws to restrict robo-calls  
>and passing laws to restrict survey calls is, well, only one word.  
>  
>John Nienstedt, Sr.  
>800-576-CERC  
>Get the Edge at [www.cerc.net](http://www.cerc.net)  
>  
>  
>-----Original Message-----  
>From: AAPORNET [mailto:[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta  
>Sent: Friday, January 18, 2008 7:03 AM  
>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
>Subject: States try to pull plug on 'robo-calls'  
>  
>States try to pull plug on 'robo-calls'  
>Millions of automated political pitches tie up Americans' phones  
>By Dennis Cauchon  
>USA TODAY  
>  
>States are trying to disconnect computer-generated political calls that  
>are flooding the nation's households at election time.  
>  
>More than 5 million automated "robo-calls" have been made to potential  
>voters in early primary states. The number of robo-calls could run into  
>the hundreds of millions this election year as the political parties  
>battle for control of the White House, Congress and state governments.  
>  
>"What's making people mad is the volume of calls," says Jerry Dorchuck  
>of Political Marketing International, which provides automated calling  
>services to candidates. "People can get 25 automated calls on the day  
>before an election."  
>  
>Nineteen states restrict political robo-calls. At least five more will  
>consider limits this year.  
>  
>SNIP  
>  
>"You can do 100,000 phone calls in an hour for \$2,000," says Shaun  
>Dakin, founder of Citizens for Civil Discourse, a non-partisan group  
>critical of robo-calls. "It's efficient and irresistible."  
>  
>Before the Iowa caucuses Jan. 3, 80% of voters received robo-calls, the  
>Pew Research Center found.  
>  
>Few states have enforced their robo-call laws, partly out of fear that  
>they violate free speech protections.  
>  
>SNIP  
>  
>  
>Find this article at:

>[http://www.usatoday.com/printedition/news/20080118/1a\\_bottomstrip18.art](http://www.usatoday.com/printedition/news/20080118/1a_bottomstrip18.art)

>[htm?loc=interstitialskip](#)

>or

><http://tinyurl.com/39pxkq>

>

>--

>Leo G. Simonetta

>Director of Research

>Art & Science Group, LLC

>6115 Falls Road, Suite 101

>Baltimore MD 21209

>

>-----

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

>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

[aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

>

>-----

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

>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

[aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

>

>This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the Government  
Secure

>Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless in partnership  
with MessageLabs.

>(CCTM Certificate Number 2007/11/0032.) In case of problems, please  
call your

>organisation's IT Helpdesk.

>Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored  
and/or recorded for

>legal purposes.

The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure  
Intranet virus scanning service supplied by Cable&Wireless in partnership with  
MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2007/11/0032.) On leaving the GSi this  
email was certified virus free.

Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or  
recorded for legal purposes.

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

>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

---

Date: Fri, 18 Jan 2008 09:25:43 -0800

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)>

Subject: Re: States try to pull plug on 'robo-calls'

Comments: To: "Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK" <[Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK](mailto:Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK)> ,

"AAPORNET@ASU.EDU" <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

In-Reply-To: <8CD5D9A623A40E4BAB9DD7531EBDEDBB0465A17C@MFEXC01.AD.HQ.DEPT>

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

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

To my knowledge -- and I've asked -- no one has done a large scale study on the effect of robo-calls. It would be tough to isolate their effect in amongst all the other things going on in a major campaign.

However, a few years ago we did a head-to-head test between live and robo-campaign calls towards the end of a small community college board race. The calls were get-out-the-vote messages. The test variable was whether or not the registered voters we were calling actually voted. Validation of the voting records showed the percentage of turnout among those receiving the robo-calls to be exactly the same as the turnout for those who had not received any of our calls. The percentage of turnout among those receiving the live calls was 6% higher compared to those who had not received any of our calls.

Based on this and other experience, I've concluded that the utility of robo-calls is very limited. Perhaps they work with the perfect message, from the perfect messenger, at the perfect time in a situation where the call is not competing with other campaign communications. But that's obviously rare and almost never going to happen in major elections.

But they are not going to go away. A candidate can "contact" roughly 10 voters via a robo-call for the cost of one live call. Of course, the Pew results and the results of our experiment outlined above would certainly suggest that 10 times zero is still a waste of money. But a) the candidate doesn't know that and b) the robo-call-buying political consultant can tell the candidate the campaign is doing something.

Perhaps you are suggesting that if robo-calls can be shown to actually suppress voter participation, then authorities could act to ban them? Interesting thought.

John Nienstedt, Sr.  
800-576-CERC  
Get the Edge at [www.cerc.net](http://www.cerc.net)

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Iain Noble

Sent: Friday, January 18, 2008 8:50 AM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: Re: States try to pull plug on 'robo-calls'

Has anybody looked at the effect on voters' party preference? Are robo-calls in fact counter-productive?

Iain Noble  
Department for Children, Schools and Families  
Young People Analysis Division - YCS and Next Steps Study,

W606, Moorfoot, Sheffield, S1 4PQ.

0114 259 1180

For information about the Next Steps Study go to

[www.nextstepsstudy.org.uk](http://www.nextstepsstudy.org.uk) or

<http://www.esds.ac.uk/longitudinal/access/lstype/>

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

>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of John Nienstedt

>Sent: 18 January 2008 16:31

>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

>Subject: Re: States try to pull plug on 'robo-calls'

>

>What the article didn't mention is Pew's data demonstrating that  
>campaign robo-calls are

>disliked. Their research (in Iowa and New Hampshire) shows that far  
>more than half who get

>those calls are annoyed by them and usually hang up. In contrast,  
>about 80% of those who

>get "live" calls from a person usually listen.

>

>However, there is a free speech issue. AAPORites ought to be wary of  
>the plug-pulling

>efforts. Despite our sense that the millions of automated calls  
>contribute to lower

>cooperation rates on phone surveys, the difference between passing laws  
>to restrict robo-calls

>and passing laws to restrict survey calls is, well, only one word.

>

>John Nienstedt, Sr.

>800-576-CERC

>Get the Edge at [www.cerc.net](http://www.cerc.net)

>

>

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

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

>Sent: Friday, January 18, 2008 7:03 AM

>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

>Subject: States try to pull plug on 'robo-calls'

>

>States try to pull plug on 'robo-calls'

>Millions of automated political pitches tie up Americans' phones

>By Dennis Cauchon

>USA TODAY

>

>States are trying to disconnect computer-generated political calls that  
>are flooding the nation's households at election time.

>

>More than 5 million automated "robo-calls" have been made to potential

>voters in early primary states. The number of robo-calls could run into

>the hundreds of millions this election year as the political parties

>battle for control of the White House, Congress and state governments.

>

>"What's making people mad is the volume of calls," says Jerry Dorchuck

>of Political Marketing International, which provides automated calling

>services to candidates. "People can get 25 automated calls on the day  
>before an election."  
>  
>Nineteen states restrict political robo-calls. At least five more will  
>consider limits this year.  
>  
>SNIP  
>  
>"You can do 100,000 phone calls in an hour for \$2,000," says Shaun  
>Dakin, founder of Citizens for Civil Discourse, a non-partisan group  
>critical of robo-calls. "It's efficient and irresistible."  
>  
>Before the Iowa caucuses Jan. 3, 80% of voters received robo-calls, the  
>Pew Research Center found.  
>  
>Few states have enforced their robo-call laws, partly out of fear that  
>they violate free speech protections.  
>  
>SNIP  
>  
>  
>Find this article at:  
>[http://www.usatoday.com/printedition/news/20080118/1a\\_bottomstrip18.art](http://www.usatoday.com/printedition/news/20080118/1a_bottomstrip18.art)  
>.  
>[htm?loc=interstitialskip](http://htm?loc=interstitialskip)  
>or  
><http://tinyurl.com/39pxkq>  
>  
>--  
>Leo G. Simonetta  
>Director of Research  
>Art & Science Group, LLC  
>6115 Falls Road, Suite 101  
>Baltimore MD 21209  
>  
>-----  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
>[aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>  
>-----  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
>[aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>  
>This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the Government  
Secure  
>Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless in partnership  
with MessageLabs.  
>(CCTM Certificate Number 2007/11/0032.) In case of problems, please  
call your  
>organisation's IT Helpdesk.



>Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for  
>legal purposes.

The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intranet virus scanning service supplied by Cable&Wireless in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2007/11/0032.) On leaving the GSi this email was certified virus free.

Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Fri, 18 Jan 2008 14:33:05 -0600  
Reply-To: "Shang E. Ha" <[sha1@UCHICAGO.EDU](mailto:sha1@UCHICAGO.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Shang E. Ha" <[sha1@UCHICAGO.EDU](mailto:sha1@UCHICAGO.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: States try to pull plug on 'robo-calls'  
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 series of field experiments have revealed that robo calls have no discernible effect on turnout. See \*\*Donald P. Green and Alan S. Gerber. 2004. Get Out The Vote!: How To Increase Voter Turnout. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press\*\* (particularly, pp. 70-71, 77, 94 (Table 8-1), and Appendix C). A revised edition will be forthcoming sometime this year.

Shang E. Ha  
Postdoctoral Fellow  
Institution for Social and Policy Studies  
Yale University  
[shang.ha@yale.edu](mailto:shang.ha@yale.edu)

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

>Date: Fri, 18 Jan 2008 09:25:43 -0800  
>From: John Nienstedt <[john@CERC.NET](mailto:john@CERC.NET)>  
>Subject: Re: States try to pull plug on 'robo-calls'  
>To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

>  
>To my knowledge -- and I've asked -- no one has done a large scale study on the effect of robo-calls. It would be tough to isolate their effect in amongst all the other things going on in a major campaign.

>  
>However, a few years ago we did a head-to-head test between live and robo-campaign calls towards the end of a small community college board race. The calls were get-out-the-vote messages. The test variable was whether or not the registered voters we were calling actually voted. Validation of the voting records showed the percentage of turnout among those receiving the robo-calls to be exactly the same as the turnout for those who had not received any of our calls. The percentage of turnout among those receiving the live calls was 6% higher compared to those who had not received any of our calls.

>  
>Based on this and other experience, I've concluded that the utility of robo-calls is very limited. Perhaps they work with the perfect message, from the perfect messenger, at the perfect time in a situation where the call is not competing with other campaign communications. But that's obviously rare and almost never going to happen in major elections.

>  
>But they are not going to go away. A candidate can "contact" roughly 10 voters via a robo-call for the cost of one live call. Of course, the Pew results and the results of our experiment outlined above would certainly suggest that 10 times zero is still a waste of money. But a) the candidate doesn't know that and b) the robo-call-buying political consultant can tell the candidate the campaign is doing something.

>  
>Perhaps you are suggesting that if robo-calls can be shown to actually suppress voter participation, then authorities could act to ban them? Interesting thought.

>  
>John Nienstedt, Sr.  
>800-576-CERC  
>Get the Edge at [www.cerc.net](http://www.cerc.net)

>  
>  
>-----Original Message-----  
>From: AAPORNET [mailto:[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)] On Behalf Of Iain Noble  
>Sent: Friday, January 18, 2008 8:50 AM  
>To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
>Subject: Re: States try to pull plug on 'robo-calls'

>  
>Has anybody looked at the effect on voters' party preference? Are robo-calls in fact counter-productive?

>  
>Iain Noble  
>Department for Children, Schools and Families  
>Young People Analysis Division - YCS and Next Steps Study,  
>W606, Moorfoot, Sheffield, S1 4PQ.  
>0114 259 1180

>For information about the Next Steps Study go to  
>[www.nextstepsstudy.org.uk](http://www.nextstepsstudy.org.uk) or  
><http://www.esds.ac.uk/longitudinal/access/lstype/>

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

>>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of John Nienstedt

>>Sent: 18 January 2008 16:31

>>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

>>Subject: Re: States try to pull plug on 'robo-calls'

>>  
>>What the article didn't mention is Pew's data demonstrating that  
>campaign robo-calls are  
>>disliked. Their research (in Iowa and New Hampshire) shows that far  
>more than half who get  
>>those calls are annoyed by them and usually hang up. In contrast,  
>about 80% of those who  
>>get "live" calls from a person usually listen.

>>  
>>However, there is a free speech issue. AAPORites ought to be wary of  
>the plug-pulling  
>>efforts. Despite our sense that the millions of automated calls  
>contribute to lower  
>>cooperation rates on phone surveys, the difference between passing laws  
>to restrict robo-calls  
>>and passing laws to restrict survey calls is, well, only one word.

>>  
>>John Nienstedt, Sr.  
>>800-576-CERC  
>>Get the Edge at [www.cerc.net](http://www.cerc.net)

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

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

>>Sent: Friday, January 18, 2008 7:03 AM

>>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

>>Subject: States try to pull plug on 'robo-calls'

>>  
>>States try to pull plug on 'robo-calls'  
>>Millions of automated political pitches tie up Americans' phones  
>>By Dennis Cauchon  
>>USA TODAY  
>>  
>>States are trying to disconnect computer-generated political calls that

>>are flooding the nation's households at election time.  
>>  
>>More than 5 million automated "robo-calls" have been made to potential voters in early primary states. The number of robo-calls could run into the hundreds of millions this election year as the political parties battle for control of the White House, Congress and state governments.  
>>  
>>"What's making people mad is the volume of calls," says Jerry Dorchuck of Political Marketing International, which provides automated calling services to candidates. "People can get 25 automated calls on the day before an election."  
>>  
>>Nineteen states restrict political robo-calls. At least five more will consider limits this year.  
>>  
>>SNIP  
>>  
>>"You can do 100,000 phone calls in an hour for \$2,000," says Shaun Dakin, founder of Citizens for Civil Discourse, a non-partisan group critical of robo-calls. "It's efficient and irresistible."  
>>  
>>Before the Iowa caucuses Jan. 3, 80% of voters received robo-calls, the Pew Research Center found.  
>>  
>>Few states have enforced their robo-call laws, partly out of fear that they violate free speech protections.  
>>  
>>SNIP  
>>  
>>  
>>Find this article at:  
>>[http://www.usatoday.com/printedition/news/20080118/1a\\_bottomstrip18.art](http://www.usatoday.com/printedition/news/20080118/1a_bottomstrip18.art)  
>.br/>>>[http://www.usatoday.com/printedition/news/20080118/1a\\_bottomstrip18.art](http://www.usatoday.com/printedition/news/20080118/1a_bottomstrip18.art)?loc=interstitialskip  
>>or  
>><http://tinyurl.com/39pxkq>  
>>  
>>--  
>>Leo G. Simonetta  
>>Director of Research  
>>Art & Science Group, LLC

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

>>  
>>-----  
>>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>>Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
>aapornet-request@asu.edu

>>  
>>-----  
>>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>>Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
>aapornet-request@asu.edu

>>This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by  
the Government

>Secure  
>>Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless in  
partnership  
>with MessageLabs.

>>(CCTM Certificate Number 2007/11/0032.) In case of  
problems, please  
>call your  
>>organisation's IT Helpdesk.  
>>Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged,  
monitored  
>and/or recorded for  
>>legal purposes.

>  
>The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the  
Government Secure Intranet virus scanning service supplied  
by Cable&Wireless in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM  
Certificate Number 2007/11/0032.) On leaving the GSi this  
email was certified virus free.  
>Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged,  
monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

>  
>-----  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
aapornet-request@asu.edu

>  
>-----  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
aapornet-request@asu.edu

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

---

Date: Fri, 18 Jan 2008 15:28:57 -0600  
Reply-To: amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Allan L. McCutcheon" <amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU>  
Subject: Michigan's Generational Split Among African-Americans  
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; DelSp="Yes"; format="flowed"  
Content-Disposition: inline  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Some may find this of interest:

<http://www.exit-poll.net/pbtn.html>

Best,  
Allan

--  
Donald O. Clifton Chair of Survey Science  
Professor of Statistics &  
Survey Research and Methodology  
tel. +402.458.2036  
fax +402.458.2038

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Fri, 18 Jan 2008 17:01:32 -0500  
Reply-To: Barry Hollander <barry@UGA.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Barry Hollander <barry@UGA.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Michigan's Generational Split Among African-Americans  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; format=flowed; charset="iso-8859-1";  
reply-type=response  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

CNN spent a great deal of time on this issue today but never answered, at least when I was watching, whether the generational split was also seen among white voters. Is the degree of a generational split among African-American voters significantly larger than any generational split seen among white voters, assuming there even is one?

-----  
Barry Hollander  
Grady College of Journalism  
and Mass Communication

University of Georgia  
barry@uga.edu  
<http://www.barryhollander.com>

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Fri, 18 Jan 2008 14:30:15 -0800  
Reply-To: "Pollack, Lance" <[Lance.Pollack@UCSF.EDU](mailto:Lance.Pollack@UCSF.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Pollack, Lance" <[Lance.Pollack@UCSF.EDU](mailto:Lance.Pollack@UCSF.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Michigan's Generational Split Among African-Americans  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: A<000801c85a1d\$afbe12c0\$dc1dc080@barry>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Before that they must establish the bonafides of the numbers they are looking at. Does the "uncommitted" vote really translate into "not Clinton", or can it mean something else given the primary does not connect to delegates? Who voted in this non-primary primary? Was the turnout small, large, about normal? Do they demographically look like previous turnouts for the democratic primary in Michigan? Let's not do another Iowa and try to generalize from numbers that may not be generalizable.

Lance M. Pollack, PhD  
University of California, San Francisco  
Center for AIDS Prevention Studies (CAPS)  
50 Beale Street, Suite 1300  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
tel: 415-597-9302  
fax: 415-597-9213  
email: [Lance.Pollack@ucsf.edu](mailto:Lance.Pollack@ucsf.edu)

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>] On Behalf Of Barry Hollander  
Sent: Friday, January 18, 2008 2:02 PM  
To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Subject: Re: Michigan's Generational Split Among African-Americans

CNN spent a great deal of time on this issue today but never answered, at least when I was watching, whether the generational split was also seen among white voters. Is the degree of a generational split among African-American voters significantly larger than any generational split seen among white voters, assuming there even is one?

-----  
Barry Hollander

Grady College of Journalism  
and Mass Communication  
University of Georgia  
barry@uga.edu  
<http://www.barryhollander.com>

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
[aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Fri, 18 Jan 2008 17:47:04 -0600  
Reply-To: [amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU](mailto:amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Allan L. McCutcheon" <[amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU](mailto:amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Michigan's Generational Split Among African-Americans  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; DelSp="Yes"; format="flowed"  
Content-Disposition: inline  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I can't speak to the results of CNN's poll (these are posted on their web page), and I did not see any analysis of African-American voters in Michigan's Dem primary on the [CNN.com/politics/](http://CNN.com/politics/) webpage.

Your questions are interesting, however, and your cautions are important (see my own cautions in the blog).

The turnout for the 2008 MI Dem primary was not so low (592,798), given the weather conditions. This was not so far off from the other turnout figures that are available. We have to go all the way back to 1992 to find another MI Dem primary for president (turnout 585,972). There was also a non-competitive MI Dem senatoral primary in 2006 (513,438).

The proportion of African-Americans in the MI Dem turnouts in the 2006 and 2008 primaries are also fairly comparable (25% vs. 23%).

As to whether the "uncommitted" votes among African-American voters were really "not Clinton" votes that would have gone for Obama--it could be that they are Edwards (or Kucinich) supporters, though I am skeptical of that interpretation.

As I clearly state in the blog, it is important to be cautious in our interpretations--still, this might suggest an interesting pattern. We will learn more in a week, when the Dems have their SC primary.



Best,  
Allan

--

Donald O. Clifton Chair of Survey Science  
Professor of Statistics &  
Survey Research and Methodology  
tel. +402.458.2036  
fax +402.458.2038

Quoting "Pollack, Lance" <Lance.Pollack@UCSF.EDU>:

> Before that they must establish the bonafides of the numbers they are  
> looking at. Does the "uncommitted" vote really translate into "not  
> Clinton", or can it mean something else given the primary does not  
> connect to delegates? Who voted in this non-primary primary? Was the  
> turnout small, large, about normal? Do they demographically look like  
> previous turnouts for the democratic primary in Michigan? Let's not do  
> another Iowa and try to generalize from numbers that may not be  
> generalizable.

>

> Lance M. Pollack, PhD  
> University of California, San Francisco  
> Center for AIDS Prevention Studies (CAPS)  
> 50 Beale Street, Suite 1300  
> San Francisco, CA 94105  
> tel: 415-597-9302  
> fax: 415-597-9213  
> email: Lance.Pollack@ucsf.edu

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Barry Hollander  
> Sent: Friday, January 18, 2008 2:02 PM  
> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
> Subject: Re: Michigan's Generational Split Among African-Americans

>

> CNN spent a great deal of time on this issue today  
> but never answered, at least when I was watching,  
> whether the generational split was also seen among  
> white voters. Is the degree of a generational  
> split among African-American voters significantly  
> larger than any generational split seen among white  
> voters, assuming there even is one?

>

>

> -----

> Barry Hollander  
> Grady College of Journalism  
> and Mass Communication  
> University of Georgia  
> barry@uga.edu  
> <http://www.barryhollander.com>

>

> -----

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

> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
> aapornet-request@asu.edu  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu  
>

----- End forwarded message -----

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu  
=====

Date: Sat, 19 Jan 2008 01:23:03 +0000  
Reply-To: "mail@marketsharescorp.com" <mkshares@COMCAST.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "mail@marketsharescorp.com" <mkshares@COMCAST.NET>  
Subject: Re: Michigan's Generational Split Among African-Americans  
Comments: To: amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Comments: cc: "Allan L. McCutcheon" <amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU>

Here are three exit poll links to view both current and future exit poll results.

I hope this allowed by AAPORnet.

Use the pull-down "additional exit polls" menu to look up future states when available (or "state" on CNN).

All are sponsors of NEP exit polls. Each displays \*different\* information from the same data source. Bookmark these.

CBS, as usual, provides question wording.

<http://election.cbsnews.com/campaign2008/exitPoll.shtml?state=MI&race=P&jurisdiction=0&party=D>

MSNBC

<http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/21225987>

CNN

<http://www.cnn.com/ELECTION/2008/primaries/results/epolls/index.html#MIDEM>

Hope these links are useful.

What I see is that white voters voted for Clinton by 63% to 31% over uncommitted.

Black voters voted for uncommitted over Clinton by 68% to 30%.

At the MSNBC site, voters in cities over 500,000 (city?) voted for uncommitted

over Clinton, 60% to 36%.

Voters who went through the effort to vote "uncommitted" can mean: ""not Clinton" or "anyone but Clinton", or "I will take my chances - at the convention they may vote for Obama on the first ballot". Your choice.

Nick Panagakis

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

From: "Allan L. McCutcheon" <amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU>

> I can't speak to the results of CNN's poll (these are posted on their  
> web page), and I did not see any analysis of African-American voters  
> in Michigan's Dem primary on the CNN.com/politics/ webpage.

>  
> Your questions are interesting, however, and your cautions are  
> important (see my own cautions in the blog).

>  
> The turnout for the 2008 MI Dem primary was not so low (592,798),  
> given the weather conditions. This was not so far off from the other  
> turnout figures that are available. We have to go all the way back to  
> 1992 to find another MI Dem primary for president (turnout 585,972).  
> There was also a non-competitive MI Dem senatoral primary in 2006  
> (513,438).

>  
> The proportion of African-Americans in the MI Dem turnouts in the 2006  
> and 2008 primaries are also fairly comparable (25% vs. 23%).

>  
> As to whether the "uncommitted" votes among African-American voters  
> were really "not Clinton" votes that would have gone for Obama--it  
> could be that they are Edwards (or Kucinich) supporters, though I am  
> skeptical of that interpretation.

>  
> As I clearly state in the blog, it is important to be cautious in our  
> interpretations--still, this might suggest an interesting pattern. We  
> will learn more in a week, when the Dems have their SC primary.

>  
> Best,  
> Allan  
> --  
> Donald O. Clifton Chair of Survey Science  
> Professor of Statistics &  
> Survey Research and Methodology  
> tel. +402.458.2036  
> fax +402.458.2038

>  
>  
> Quoting "Pollack, Lance" <Lance.Pollack@UCSF.EDU>:

>  
>> Before that they must establish the bonafides of the numbers they are  
>> looking at. Does the "uncommitted" vote really translate into "not  
>> Clinton", or can it mean something else given the primary does not  
>> connect to delegates? Who voted in this non-primary primary? Was the  
>> turnout small, large, about normal? Do they demographically look like  
>> previous turnouts for the democratic primary in Michigan? Let's not do

>> another Iowa and try to generalize from numbers that may not be  
>> generalizable.

>>  
>> Lance M. Pollack, PhD  
>> University of California, San Francisco  
>> Center for AIDS Prevention Studies (CAPS)  
>> 50 Beale Street, Suite 1300  
>> San Francisco, CA 94105  
>> tel: 415-597-9302  
>> fax: 415-597-9213  
>> email: Lance.Pollack@ucsf.edu

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

>> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Barry Hollander  
>> Sent: Friday, January 18, 2008 2:02 PM  
>> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
>> Subject: Re: Michigan's Generational Split Among African-Americans

>>  
>> CNN spent a great deal of time on this issue today  
>> but never answered, at least when I was watching,  
>> whether the generational split was also seen among  
>> white voters. Is the degree of a generational  
>> split among African-American voters significantly  
>> larger than any generational split seen among white  
>> voters, assuming there even is one?

>>  
>>  
>> -----

>> Barry Hollander  
>> Grady College of Journalism  
>> and Mass Communication  
>> University of Georgia  
>> barry@uga.edu  
>> http://www.barryhollander.com

>>  
>> -----  
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
>> aapornet-request@asu.edu

>>  
>> -----  
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-  
request@asu.edu

>>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> ----- End forwarded message -----  
>

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

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

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu  
=====

Date: Sun, 20 Jan 2008 17:08:16 -0600  
Reply-To: harkness@zuma-mannheim.de  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Harkness ZUMA Mail <harkness@ZUMA-MANNHEIM.DE>  
Organization: zuma  
Subject: ISA RC 33 conference September 2008, Naples  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-15; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

\*Call for Papers\*

\*Quality Control and Quality Assurance in Designing and Implementing  
Comparative Surveys \*

(under the letter "Q" at "conference topics" on the RC 333 website:  
<http://www.rc332008.unina.it>)

at the Interim meeting of the ISA (International Sociological Association)  
Research Committee 33 (RC33) on "Logic and Methodology in Sociology",  
September 1-5, 2008, in Naples, Italy

The session focuses on developments towards quality control and quality assurance in multinational and/or multilingual studies. These include large multinational or multiregional surveys (Europe, Latin America, or Africa, for example) and international studies of a variety of kinds (such as attitudinal, health, or educational testing) but also studies within one country (e.g., multilanguage studies at national level, such as conducted in different parts of the world).

Quality challenges are faced at each step of the survey lifecycle: at study conception, at instrument design and development stages, when deciding sample design(s) and implementation(s), when producing different language versions, at data collection planning and implementation, and for data editing and documentation.

Presentations focusing on methodological challenges on any aspect of the survey lifecycle and solutions proposed for these, and papers on tools and protocols to enhance quality are most welcome. Presentations must be explicitly comparative in focus.

Chair: Janet Harkness University of Nebraska-Lincoln, USA and gesis-ZUMA, Germany

Deadline for abstracts: February 17, 2008. The session organizers or the

organisation committee will inform you about the acceptance by the end of March at the latest.

Further information and updates: <http://www.rc332008.unina.it/>

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Mon, 21 Jan 2008 10:14:08 -0000

Reply-To: Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Iain Noble <Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK>

Subject: Re: States try to pull plug on 'robo-calls'

Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

In-Reply-To: <20080118143305.AVI95757@m4500-03.uchicago.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I think my query is not so much turnout as partisanship. It's a reasonably plausible hypothesis that someone plagued by robo-calls might actually turn against the perpetrator as a result. And if everyone is doing it then the most irritating or the one who just happens to call at the most inconvenient time.

Considering robo-calls both political and commercial I consider the faith in their efficacy as rather touchingly naïve in this cynical and disenchanting age.

Iain Noble

Department for Children, Schools and Families

Young People Analysis Division - YCS and Next Steps Study,

W606, Moorfoot, Sheffield, S1 4PQ.

0114 259 1180

For information about the Next Steps Study go to [www.nextstepsstudy.org.uk](http://www.nextstepsstudy.org.uk) or

<http://www.esds.ac.uk/longitudinal/access/lstype/>

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

>>From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Shang E. Ha

>>Sent: 18 January 2008 20:33

>>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

>>Subject: Re: States try to pull plug on 'robo-calls'

>

>>A series of field experiments have revealed that robo calls

>>have no discernible effect on turnout. See \*\*Donald P. Green

>>and Alan S. Gerber. 2004. Get Out The Vote!: How To Increase

>>Voter Turnout. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press\*\*

>>(particularly, pp. 70-71, 77, 94 (Table 8-1), and Appendix

>>C). A revised edition will be forthcoming sometime this year.

>

>>Shang E. Ha

>>Postdoctoral Fellow

>>Institution for Social and Policy Studies

>Yale University  
>shang.ha@yale.edu

>  
>----- Original message -----  
>>Date: Fri, 18 Jan 2008 09:25:43 -0800  
>>From: John Nienstedt <john@CERC.NET>  
>>Subject: Re: States try to pull plug on 'robo-calls'  
>>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

>>  
>>To my knowledge -- and I've asked -- no one has done a  
>large scale study on the effect of robo-calls. It would be  
>tough to isolate their effect in amongst all the other  
>things going on in a major campaign.  
>>  
>>However, a few years ago we did a head-to-head test between  
>live and robo-campaign calls towards the end of a small  
>community college board race. The calls were get-out-the-  
>vote messages. The test variable was whether or not the  
>registered voters we were calling actually voted.  
>Validation of the voting records showed the percentage of  
>turnout among those receiving the robo-calls to be exactly  
>the same as the turnout for those who had not received any  
>of our calls. The percentage of turnout among those  
>receiving the live calls was 6% higher compared to those who  
>had not received any of our calls.

>>  
>>Based on this and other experience, I've concluded that the  
>utility of robo-calls is very limited. Perhaps they work  
>with the perfect message, from the perfect messenger, at the  
>perfect time in a situation where the call is not competing  
>with other campaign communications. But that's obviously  
>rare and almost never going to happen in major elections.

>>  
>>But they are not going to go away. A candidate  
>can "contact" roughly 10 voters via a robo-call for the cost  
>of one live call. Of course, the Pew results and the  
>results of our experiment outlined above would certainly  
>suggest that 10 times zero is still a waste of money. But a)  
>the candidate doesn't know that and b) the robo-call-buying  
>political consultant can tell the candidate the campaign is  
>doing something.

>>  
>>Perhaps you are suggesting that if robo-calls can be shown  
>to actually suppress voter participation, then authorities  
>could act to ban them? Interesting thought.

>>  
>>John Nienstedt, Sr.  
>>800-576-CERC  
>>Get the Edge at [www.cerc.net](http://www.cerc.net)

>>  
>>-----Original Message-----  
>>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Iain  
>Noble

>>Sent: Friday, January 18, 2008 8:50 AM  
>>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
>>Subject: Re: States try to pull plug on 'robo-calls'

>>  
>>Has anybody looked at the effect on voters' party  
>preference? Are  
>>robo-calls in fact counter-productive?

>>  
>>Iain Noble  
>>Department for Children, Schools and Families  
>>Young People Analysis Division - YCS and Next Steps Study,  
>>W606, Moorfoot, Sheffield, S1 4PQ.  
>>0114 259 1180  
>>For information about the Next Steps Study go to  
>>[www.nextstepsstudy.org.uk](http://www.nextstepsstudy.org.uk) or  
>><http://www.esds.ac.uk/longitudinal/access/lsype/>

>>  
>>>-----Original Message-----  
>>>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of John  
>Nienstedt  
>>>Sent: 18 January 2008 16:31  
>>>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
>>>Subject: Re: States try to pull plug on 'robo-calls'

>>>  
>>>What the article didn't mention is Pew's data  
>demonstrating that  
>>campaign robo-calls are  
>>>disliked. Their research (in Iowa and New Hampshire) shows  
>that far  
>>more than half who get  
>>>those calls are annoyed by them and usually hang up. In  
>contrast,  
>>about 80% of those who  
>>>get "live" calls from a person usually listen.

>>>  
>>>However, there is a free speech issue. AAPORites ought to  
>be wary of  
>>the plug-pulling  
>>>efforts. Despite our sense that the millions of automated  
>calls  
>>contribute to lower  
>>>cooperation rates on phone surveys, the difference between  
>passing laws  
>>to restrict robo-calls  
>>>and passing laws to restrict survey calls is, well, only  
>one word.

>>>  
>>>John Nienstedt, Sr.  
>>>800-576-CERC  
>>>Get the Edge at [www.cerc.net](http://www.cerc.net)

>>>  
>>>>-----Original Message-----  
>>>>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo



>Simonetta

>>>Sent: Friday, January 18, 2008 7:03 AM

>>>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

>>>Subject: States try to pull plug on 'robo-calls'

>>>

>>>States try to pull plug on 'robo-calls'

>>>Millions of automated political pitches tie up Americans'

>phones

>>>By Dennis Cauchon

>>>USA TODAY

>>>

>>>States are trying to disconnect computer-generated

>political calls that

>>>are flooding the nation's households at election time.

>>>

>>>More than 5 million automated "robo-calls" have been made

>to potential

>>>voters in early primary states. The number of robo-calls

>could run into

>>>the hundreds of millions this election year as the

>political parties

>>>battle for control of the White House, Congress and state

>governments.

>>>

>>>"What's making people mad is the volume of calls," says

>Jerry Dorchuck

>>>of Political Marketing International, which provides

>automated calling

>>>services to candidates. "People can get 25 automated calls

>on the day

>>>before an election."

>>>

>>>Nineteen states restrict political robo-calls. At least

>five more will

>>>consider limits this year.

>>>

>>>SNIP

>>>

>>>"You can do 100,000 phone calls in an hour for \$2,000,"

>says Shaun

>>>Dakin, founder of Citizens for Civil Discourse, a non-

>partisan group

>>>critical of robo-calls. "It's efficient and irresistible."

>>>

>>>Before the Iowa caucuses Jan. 3, 80% of voters received

>robo-calls, the

>>>Pew Research Center found.

>>>

>>>Few states have enforced their robo-call laws, partly out

>of fear that

>>>they violate free speech protections.

>>>

>>>SNIP

>>>

>>>>  
>>>Find this article at:  
>>>[http://www.usatoday.com/printedition/news/20080118/1a\\_botto](http://www.usatoday.com/printedition/news/20080118/1a_botto)  
>mstrip18.art

>>.br/>>>>[http://www.usatoday.com/printedition/news/20080118/1a\\_botto](http://www.usatoday.com/printedition/news/20080118/1a_botto)  
>>>htm?loc=interstitialskip  
>>>or  
>>><http://tinyurl.com/39pxkq>  
>>>

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

>>>-----  
>>>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>>>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>>>Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
>>aapornet-request@asu.edu  
>>>

>>>-----  
>>>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>>>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>>>Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
>>aapornet-request@asu.edu  
>>>

>>>>This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by  
>the Government  
>>Secure  
>>>Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless in  
>partnership  
>>with MessageLabs.  
>>>(CCTM Certificate Number 2007/11/0032.) In case of  
>problems, please  
>>call your  
>>>organisation's IT Helpdesk.  
>>>Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged,  
>monitored  
>>and/or recorded for  
>>>legal purposes.  
>>

>>>>The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the  
>Government Secure Intranet virus scanning service supplied  
>by Cable&Wireless in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM  
>Certificate Number 2007/11/0032.) On leaving the GSi this  
>email was certified virus free.  
>>Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged,  
>monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.  
>>

>>-----  
>>>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>>>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

>aapornet-request@asu.edu

>>

>>-----

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

>>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

>aapornet-request@asu.edu

>

>-----

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

>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

>

>This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the Government Secure

>Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless in partnership with MessageLabs.

>(CCTM Certificate Number 2007/11/0032.) In case of problems, please call your organisation's IT Helpdesk.

>Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for

>legal purposes.

The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intranet virus scanning service supplied by Cable&Wireless in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2007/11/0032.) On leaving the GSi this email was certified virus free.

Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

-----  
Date: Mon, 21 Jan 2008 12:00:57 -0800

Reply-To: Steve Johnson <[stevej@nsdssurvey.org](mailto:stevej@nsdssurvey.org)>

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

From: Steve Johnson <[stevej@NSDSSURVEY.ORG](mailto:stevej@NSDSSURVEY.ORG)>

Organization: Northwest Survey & Data Services

Subject: measuring assessed valuation

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

A question has come up about how well respondents understand bond = measure surveys where the cost of the bond is given in dollars for each = \$1,000 of assessed value. Sometimes people add something about average = costs to a homeowner, although these can vary widely and are not = accurate for very many respondents. In addition, on the actual ballot = the measures are expressed in dollars (or cents) for each \$1,000 of = assessed value. I would appreciate any experiences people have with =

this and especially any research that has looked at how people = understand these values.

Thanks in advance

Steve Johnson, PhD

President, Northwest Survey & Data Services

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====  
Date: Mon, 21 Jan 2008 14:17:26 -0600

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)>

Subject: Re: measuring assessed valuation

Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

In-Reply-To: <009c01c85c6859444660\$0cfea8c0@stevelaptop>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

How about briefly stating the ballot description as worded.

Depending on news coverage, then give examples of the dollar tax increase for two representative area home values. You have to decide that. You know the area.

For example:

For a \$400,000 home, property taxes would increase from \$???? to \$????.

For a \$600,000 home, property taxes would increase from \$???? to \$????.

Or however the increase is being covered in the news.

Nick

Steve Johnson wrote:

>A question has come up about how well respondents understand bond measure surveys where the cost of the bond is given in dollars for each \$1,000 of assessed value. Sometimes people add something about average costs to a homeowner, although these can vary widely and are not accurate for very many respondents. In addition, on the actual ballot the measures are expressed in dollars (or cents) for each \$1,000 of assessed value. I would appreciate any experiences people have with this and especially any research that has looked at how people understand these values.

>Thanks in advance

>Steve Johnson, PhD

>President, Northwest Survey & Data Services

>

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

>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

>  
>  
>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

---

Date: Mon, 21 Jan 2008 17:07:17 -0500

Reply-To: Eric Plutzer <exp12@PSU.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Eric Plutzer <exp12@PSU.EDU>

Subject: Citizen exit polling

Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

In-Reply-To: <AAPORNET%200801102100010832.A2D1@LISTS.ASU.EDU>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Colleagues,

I have some recollection of posts to AAPORNET describing a citizen's group conducting their own exit polls during the 2006 and perhaps 2004 elections -- perhaps in New Mexico?

I am hoping that somebody on the list has a better memory of this than I do -- I would welcome any replies that could send me to accounts of the group's activities (media reports, the organization's web site or even the organization's name, exit poll analysis).

Thanks!

Eric

~~~~~  
Eric Plutzer

Department of Political Science

Penn State University

Voice: 814/865-6576

<http://www.personal.psu.edu/exp12/>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

---

Date: Mon, 21 Jan 2008 18:22:42 -0500

Reply-To: Paul J Lavrakas PhD <pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Paul J Lavrakas PhD <pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET>

Subject: Re: Citizen exit polling

Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

The WCVI (Willie C. Velasquez Institute) conducts a Latino/Hispanic exit poll for major elections. The professor that heads this effort is Dr. Henry Flores (dean of graduate studies) at St. Mary's U. in San Antonio.

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

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Eric Plutzer  
Sent: Monday, January 21, 2008 5:07 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Citizen exit polling

Colleagues,

I have some recollection of posts to AAPORNET describing a citizen's group conducting their own exit polls during the 2006 and perhaps 2004 elections -- perhaps in New Mexico?

I am hoping that somebody on the list has a better memory of this than I do -- I would welcome any replies that could send me to accounts of the group's activities (media reports, the organization's web site or even the organization's name, exit poll analysis).

Thanks!  
Eric

---

Eric Plutzer  
Department of Political Science  
Penn State University  
Voice: 814/865-6576  
<http://www.personal.psu.edu/exp12/>

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Mon, 21 Jan 2008 16:19:18 -0800  
Reply-To: Charles DiSogra <[cdisogra@KNOWLEDGENETWORKS.COM](mailto:cdisogra@KNOWLEDGENETWORKS.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Charles DiSogra <[cdisogra@KNOWLEDGENETWORKS.COM](mailto:cdisogra@KNOWLEDGENETWORKS.COM)>

Subject: Looking for refusal conversion findings 2007 AAPOR session  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

All,

=20

I dropped into a session at Anaheim/2007 AAPOR last year where a slide was shown about refusal conversion efforts made from 1 to 12 months after the original refusal. The graph showed a % success curve rising across the first 3 months, being highest at month 3 then declining thereafter. Unfortunately, the meeting abstracts and paper titles don't seem to help in my search for this information (I tried!) and I'm concerned that this data slide was dropped into a presentation that may have had a different focus but was being shown as relevant information. Anyway, if anyone has a recollection of this paper or if the authors are out there, I'd like to contact you. (I'm positive I didn't imagine this but next time I'll take better notes.)=20

=20

Thanks all for your assistance and collective memory.

=20

Charles DiSogra

Knowledge Networks

=20

=20

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Tue, 22 Jan 2008 04:53:27 EST  
Reply-To: [Scheuren@AOL.COM](mailto:Scheuren@AOL.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Fritz Scheuren <[Scheuren@AOL.COM](mailto:Scheuren@AOL.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Citizen exit polling  
Comments: To: [exp12@PSU.EDU](mailto:exp12@PSU.EDU), [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Dear Eric:

You remember rightly. There have been some efforts that are aimed at learning how voters felt the process went. To learn more about the NM work for 2004, see [\\_www.votingsystems.us\\_](http://www.votingsystems.us) (<http://www.votingsystems.us>) A second iteration was carried out in Ohio in 2006. Quin Monson of BYU gave a paper on this at the 2007 AAPOR meetings.

Best, Fritz

PS Contact me directly re the still developing plans for 2008.

In a message dated 1/21/2008 5:13:56 PM Eastern Standard Time, [exp12@PSU.EDU](mailto:exp12@PSU.EDU) writes:

Colleagues,

I have some recollection of posts to AAPORNET describing a citizen's group conducting their own exit polls during the 2006 and perhaps 2004 elections -- perhaps in New Mexico?

I am hoping that somebody on the list has a better memory of this than I do -- I would welcome any replies that could send me to accounts of the group's activities (media reports, the organization's web site or even the organization's name, exit poll analysis).

Thanks!  
Eric

---

Eric Plutzer  
Department of Political Science  
Penn State University  
Voice: 814/865-6576  
<http://www.personal.psu.edu/exp12/>

\*\*\*\*\*Start the year off right. Easy ways to stay in shape.  
<http://body.aol.com/fitness/winter-exercise?NCID=aolcmp00300000002489>

---

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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Tue, 22 Jan 2008 10:05:43 -0500



Reply-To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Michigan's Generational Split Among African-Americans  
Comments: To: amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

A few notes here:

Kucinich was on the Democratic Ballot. Obama and Edwards removed their names. If your figures for the number of Democratic ballots is correct, her total means that she got 4.9% of the registered voters in the state (7.1 million) to support her.

We have been conducting a panel survey among MSU students. After two waves [the first just after Thanksgiving, the second after NH and before MI] Sen. Clinton's support is 100% from students who consider themselves Democrats or Independents. In terms of Social and Fiscal policies, the students who support her are more liberal than those who support any other candidate, and her supporters among the student panel are -24% male compared to the panel. Obama (top choice overall in first two waves) and McCain (third overall, top Republican) are the candidates who get the greatest crossover from the "other side" on party ID and Social and Fiscal Ideology.

More complete results and analysis can be found under the heading, " Obama Widens Lead Among MSU Students  
McCain Overtakes Giuliani in IPPSR Survey" at our website,  
<http://www.ippsr.msu.edu/>

Nat Ehrlich, Ph.D.  
Research Specialist  
Michigan State University  
Institute for Public Policy and Survey Research  
Office for Survey Research  
321 Berkey Hall  
East Lansing, MI 48824  
517-353-2639

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Allan L. McCutcheon  
Sent: Friday, January 18, 2008 6:47 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Michigan's Generational Split Among African-Americans

I can't speak to the results of CNN's poll (these are posted on their web page), and I did not see any analysis of African-American voters in Michigan's Dem primary on the CNN.com/politics/ webpage.

Your questions are interesting, however, and your cautions are important (see my own cautions in the blog).

The turnout for the 2008 MI Dem primary was not so low (592,798), given the weather conditions. This was not so far off from the other turnout figures that are available. We have to go all the way back to 1992 to find another MI Dem primary for president (turnout 585,972). There was also a non-competitive MI Dem senatoral primary in 2006 (513,438).

The proportion of African-Americans in the MI Dem turnouts in the 2006 and 2008 primaries are also fairly comparable (25% vs. 23%).

As to whether the "uncommitted" votes among African-American voters were really "not Clinton" votes that would have gone for Obama--it could be that they are Edwards (or Kucinich) supporters, though I am skeptical of that interpretation.

As I clearly state in the blog, it is important to be cautious in our interpretations--still, this might suggest an interesting pattern. We will learn more in a week, when the Dems have their SC primary.

Best,  
Allan

--

Donald O. Clifton Chair of Survey Science  
Professor of Statistics &  
Survey Research and Methodology  
tel. +402.458.2036  
fax +402.458.2038

Quoting "Pollack, Lance" <Lance.Pollack@UCSF.EDU>:

> Before that they must establish the bonafides of the numbers they are  
> looking at. Does the "uncommitted" vote really translate into "not  
> Clinton", or can it mean something else given the primary does not  
> connect to delegates? Who voted in this non-primary primary? Was the  
> turnout small, large, about normal? Do they demographically look like  
> previous turnouts for the democratic primary in Michigan? Let's not do  
> another Iowa and try to generalize from numbers that may not be  
> generalizable.

>

> Lance M. Pollack, PhD  
> University of California, San Francisco  
> Center for AIDS Prevention Studies (CAPS)  
> 50 Beale Street, Suite 1300  
> San Francisco, CA 94105  
> tel: 415-597-9302  
> fax: 415-597-9213  
> email: Lance.Pollack@ucsf.edu

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Barry Hollander

> Sent: Friday, January 18, 2008 2:02 PM

> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

> Subject: Re: Michigan's Generational Split Among African-Americans

>

> CNN spent a great deal of time on this issue today  
> but never answered, at least when I was watching,  
> whether the generational split was also seen among  
> white voters. Is the degree of a generational  
> split among African-American voters significantly  
> larger than any generational split seen among white  
> voters, assuming there even is one?

>  
>

> -----

> Barry Hollander  
> Grady College of Journalism  
> and Mass Communication  
> University of Georgia  
> barry@uga.edu  
> http://www.barryhollander.com

>

> -----

> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
> [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

>

> -----

> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

>

----- End forwarded message -----

-----

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Tue, 22 Jan 2008 09:40:18 -0600  
Reply-To: [amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU](mailto:amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Allan L. McCutcheon" <[amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU](mailto:amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Michigan's Generational Split Among African-Americans  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[EC15B06368AAA4419321FF6D2159CB1C01CBF3DF@ssc03-2.ssc.msu.edu](mailto:EC15B06368AAA4419321FF6D2159CB1C01CBF3DF@ssc03-2.ssc.msu.edu)>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Disposition: inline

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

There also appears to have been a generational split among South Carolina's self-identified born-again Christians in the recent Republican primary. See

<http://www.exit-poll.net/pbtn.html>

It is not surprising that Clinton received the support of only 4.9% of all registered MI voters. No candidate--Democrat nor Republican (nor "uncommitted")--received more than a small fraction of the registered vote (in the single digits), since the MI Sec. of State reports that a combined total of 20.7% of all registered voters participated in the two primary elections.

Incidentally, did the panel study of MSU students really show that 100% of the self-identified Democrats and Independents supported Clinton in the earlier waves?

Best,

Allan

--

Donald O. Clifton Chair of Survey Science

Professor of Statistics &

Survey Research and Methodology

tel. +402.458.2036

fax +402.458.2038

Quoting "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>:

> A few notes here:

> Kucinich was on the Democratic Ballot. Obama and Edwards removed their names.

> If your figures for the number of Democratic ballots is correct, her

> total means that she got 4.9% of the registered voters in the state

> (7.1 million) to support her.

> We have been conducting a panel survey among MSU students. After two

> waves [the first just after Thanksgiving, the second after NH and

> before MI] Sen. Clinton's support is 100% from students who consider

> themselves Democrats or Independents. In terms of Social and Fiscal

> policies, the students who support her are more liberal than those

> who support any other candidate, and her supporters among the

> student panel are -24% male compared to the panel. Obama (top choice

> overall in first two waves) and McCain (third overall, top

> Republican) are the candidates who get the greatest crossover from

> the "other side" on party ID and Social and Fiscal Ideology.

> More complete results and analysis can be found under the heading, "

> Obama Widens Lead Among MSU Students

> McCain Overtakes Giuliani in IPPSR Survey" at our website,

> <http://www.ippsr.msu.edu/>

>  
>  
>  
> Nat Ehrlich, Ph.D.  
> Research Specialist  
> Michigan State University  
> Institute for Public Policy and Survey Research  
> Office for Survey Research  
> 321 Berkey Hall  
> East Lansing, MI 48824  
> 517-353-2639  
>  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Allan L. McCutcheon  
> Sent: Friday, January 18, 2008 6:47 PM  
> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
> Subject: Re: Michigan's Generational Split Among African-Americans  
>  
> I can't speak to the results of CNN's poll (these are posted on their  
> web page), and I did not see any analysis of African-American voters  
> in Michigan's Dem primary on the CNN.com/politics/ webpage.  
>  
> Your questions are interesting, however, and your cautions are  
> important (see my own cautions in the blog).  
>  
> The turnout for the 2008 MI Dem primary was not so low (592,798),  
> given the weather conditions. This was not so far off from the other  
> turnout figures that are available. We have to go all the way back to  
> 1992 to find another MI Dem primary for president (turnout 585,972).  
> There was also a non-competitive MI Dem senatoral primary in 2006  
> (513,438).  
>  
> The proportion of African-Americans in the MI Dem turnouts in the 2006  
> and 2008 primaries are also fairly comparable (25% vs. 23%).  
>  
> As to whether the "uncommitted" votes among African-American voters  
> were really "not Clinton" votes that would have gone for Obama--it  
> could be that they are Edwards (or Kucinich) supporters, though I am  
> skeptical of that interpretation.  
>  
> As I clearly state in the blog, it is important to be cautious in our  
> interpretations--still, this might suggest an interesting pattern. We  
> will learn more in a week, when the Dems have their SC primary.  
>  
> Best,  
> Allan  
> --  
> Donald O. Clifton Chair of Survey Science  
> Professor of Statistics &  
> Survey Research and Methodology  
> tel. +402.458.2036  
> fax +402.458.2038  
>

>  
> Quoting "Pollack, Lance" <Lance.Pollack@UCSF.EDU>:  
>  
>> Before that they must establish the bonafides of the numbers they are  
>> looking at. Does the "uncommitted" vote really translate into "not  
>> Clinton", or can it mean something else given the primary does not  
>> connect to delegates? Who voted in this non-primary primary? Was the  
>> turnout small, large, about normal? Do they demographically look like  
>> previous turnouts for the democratic primary in Michigan? Let's not do  
>> another Iowa and try to generalize from numbers that may not be  
>> generalizable.  
>>  
>> Lance M. Pollack, PhD  
>> University of California, San Francisco  
>> Center for AIDS Prevention Studies (CAPS)  
>> 50 Beale Street, Suite 1300  
>> San Francisco, CA 94105  
>> tel: 415-597-9302  
>> fax: 415-597-9213  
>> email: Lance.Pollack@ucsf.edu  
>> -----Original Message-----  
>> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Barry Hollander  
>> Sent: Friday, January 18, 2008 2:02 PM  
>> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
>> Subject: Re: Michigan's Generational Split Among African-Americans  
>>  
>> CNN spent a great deal of time on this issue today  
>> but never answered, at least when I was watching,  
>> whether the generational split was also seen among  
>> white voters. Is the degree of a generational  
>> split among African-American voters significantly  
>> larger than any generational split seen among white  
>> voters, assuming there even is one?  
>>  
>>  
>> -----  
>> Barry Hollander  
>> Grady College of Journalism  
>> and Mass Communication  
>> University of Georgia  
>> barry@uga.edu  
>> http://www.barryhollander.com  
>>  
>> -----  
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
>> [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>>  
>> -----  
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

>>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> ----- End forwarded message -----

> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](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 this: set aapornet mail  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> 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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Tue, 22 Jan 2008 09:58:59 -0600  
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)>  
Subject: Re: Michigan's Generational Split Among African-Americans  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[20080122094018.hh7gcryc08s8og0k@wm-imp-2.unl.edu](mailto:20080122094018.hh7gcryc08s8og0k@wm-imp-2.unl.edu)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=windows-1252; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Here is my summary of the Evangelical vote in all state exit polls. No generational data available, but nonetheless, this may be of interest.

Huckabee won Iowa by cornering the Evangelical vote with 46%. Romney was a distant second with 19%. Some 60% of Iowa caucus-goers said yes to the question: "Would you describe yourself as a born-again or evangelical Christian?"

In three states after Iowa, other candidates began winning shares of the Evangelical vote comparable to Huckabee's.

NH share of Evangelicals: Huckabee 28%, McCain 28%, Romney 27%.  
MI share of Evangelicals: Huckabee 29%, McCain 23%, Romney 34%.  
NV, pretty much uncontested for Republicans: Huckabee 22%, Romney 39%.

In those primaries and caucus Huckabee came in no better than third.

Evangelical percentages of Republican primary/caucus voters in the three states were lower than in Iowa: Michigan 39%, Nevada 24%, and New Hampshire 23%.

South Carolina had the same percentage of Evangelicals as Iowa, 60%.

Huckabee won almost the same percentage of Evangelicals as the 46% he won in Iowa. He won 43% in South Carolina. But he lost the primary with 30% to McCain's 33%.

In South Carolina McCain won 27% of Evangelicals versus Huckabee's 43%.

Summary:

1. Huckabee has never won a majority of Evangelicals. In three states after Iowa, Huckabee didn't even win a plurality of Evangelicals. They appear not to be single-issue voters. (???)

2. Despite claims to the contrary, his campaign seems to be all about winning by winning the Evangelical vote. Only 14% of non-Evangelicals in Iowa and South Carolina voted for him. Huckabee's non-Evangelical vote in the other states was only 3% to 6%.

3. In South Carolina, unlike Iowa, one candidate won an appreciable share of the large Evangelical segment. McCain's 27% of Evangelicals was enough for him to win.

Would appreciate any comments.

Nick

Allan L. McCutcheon wrote:

> There also appears to have been a generational split among South  
> Carolina's self-identified born-again Christians in the recent  
> Republican primary. See

>  
> <http://www.exit-poll.net/pbtn.html>

>  
> It is not surprising that Clinton received the support of only 4.9% of  
> all registered MI voters. No candidate--Democrat nor Republican (nor  
> "uncommitted")--received more than a small fraction of the registered  
> vote (in the single digits), since the MI Sec. of State reports that a  
> combined total of 20.7% of all registered voters participated in the  
> two primary elections.

>  
> Incidentally, did the panel study of MSU students really show that 100%  
> of the self-identified Democrats and Independents supported Clinton in



> the earlier waves?  
>  
> Best,  
> Allan

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Tue, 22 Jan 2008 11:20:48 -0500  
Reply-To: Doug Usher <[Doug.Usher@WIDMEYER.COM](mailto:Doug.Usher@WIDMEYER.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Doug Usher <[Doug.Usher@WIDMEYER.COM](mailto:Doug.Usher@WIDMEYER.COM)>  
Subject: Re: measuring assessed valuation  
Comments: To: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: A<[4794FDD6.7010007@marketsharescorp.com](mailto:4794FDD6.7010007@marketsharescorp.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

It is important that you measure "understanding" separately from measuring support. The soundest approach for measuring support for the measure is to test the \*actual\* ballot language.

You could then do an additional test, including specific examples, to test the impact of that knowledge on support/opposition. However, if you include information in the ballot test that is not in the actual language, you will not have an accurate read on support.

> -----Original Message-----  
> From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Nick Panagakis  
> Sent: Monday, January 21, 2008 3:17 PM  
> To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
> Subject: Re: measuring assessed valuation  
>  
> How about briefly stating the ballot description as worded.  
>  
> Depending on news coverage, then give examples of the dollar tax  
> increase for two representative area home values. You have to decide  
> that. You know the area.  
>  
> For example:  
> For a \$400,000 home, property taxes would increase from \$???? to  
> \$????.  
> For a \$600,000 home, property taxes would increase from \$???? to  
> \$????.  
>  
> Or however the increase is being covered in the news.  
>  
> Nick

>  
>  
> Steve Johnson wrote:  
>  
>>A question has come up about how well respondents understand bond  
measure  
> surveys where the cost of the bond is given in dollars for each \$1,000  
of  
> assessed value. Sometimes people add something about average costs to  
a  
> homeowner, although these can vary widely and are not accurate for  
very  
> many respondents. In addition, on the actual ballot the measures are  
> expressed in dollars (or cents) for each \$1,000 of assessed value. I  
> would appreciate any experiences people have with this and especially  
any  
> research that has looked at how people understand these values.  
>>Thanks in advance  
>>Steve Johnson, PhD  
>>President, Northwest Survey & Data Services  
>>

>>-----  
>>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>>Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-  
> request@asu.edu  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>

> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-  
> request@asu.edu

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Tue, 22 Jan 2008 12:25:44 -0500  
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: Michigan's Generational Split Among African-Americans  
Comments: To: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[479612C3.8050907@marketsharescorp.com](mailto:479612C3.8050907@marketsharescorp.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=windows-1252; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Members of the Southern Baptist Convention and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (the largest, and probably most liberal, mainstream Lutheran group in the US) both call themselves "Evangelical Christians."

Contrary to what simpleminded journalists (and pollsters) may think, "Evangelical" is NOT a synonym for religious fundamentalist.

Jan Werner

---

Nick Panagakis wrote:

- > Here is my summary of the Evangelical vote in all state exit polls. No
- > generational data available, but nonetheless, this may be of interest.
- >
- > Huckabee won Iowa by cornering the Evangelical vote with 46%. Romney was
- > a distant second with 19%. Some 60% of Iowa caucus-goers said yes to the
- > question: "Would you describe yourself as a born-again or evangelical
- > Christian?"
- >
- > In three states after Iowa, other candidates began winning shares of the
- > Evangelical vote comparable to Huckabee's.
- >
- > NH share of Evangelicals: Huckabee 28%, McCain 28%, Romney 27%.
- > MI share of Evangelicals: Huckabee 29%, McCain 23%, Romney 34%.
- > NV, pretty much uncontested for Republicans: Huckabee 22%, Romney 39%.
- >
- > In those primaries and caucus Huckabee came in no better than third.
- >
- > Evangelical percentages of Republican primary/caucus voters in the three
- > states were lower than in Iowa: Michigan 39%, Nevada 24%, and New
- > Hampshire 23%.
- >
- > South Carolina had the same percentage of Evangelicals as Iowa, 60%.
- >
- > Huckabee won almost the same percentage of Evangelicals as the 46% he
- > won in Iowa. He won 43% in South Carolina. But he lost the primary with
- > 30% to McCain's 33%.
- >
- > In South Carolina McCain won 27% of Evangelicals versus Huckabee's 43%.
- >
- > Summary:
- >
- > 1. Huckabee has never won a majority of Evangelicals. In three states
- > after Iowa, Huckabee didn't even win a plurality of Evangelicals. They
- > appear not to be single-issue voters. (???)
- >
- > 2. Despite claims to the contrary, his campaign seems to be all about
- > winning by winning the Evangelical vote. Only 14% of non-Evangelicals in
- > Iowa and South Carolina voted for him. Huckabee's non-Evangelical vote
- > in the other states was only 3% to 6%.
- >

> 3. In South Carolina, unlike Iowa, one candidate won an appreciable  
> share of the large Evangelical segment. McCain's 27% of Evangelicals was  
> enough for him to win.

>  
> Would appreciate any comments.

>  
> Nick

>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> Allan L. McCutcheon wrote:

>  
>> There also appears to have been a generational split among South  
>> Carolina's self-identified born-again Christians in the recent  
>> Republican primary. See

>>  
>> <http://www.exit-poll.net/pbtn.html>

>>  
>> It is not surprising that Clinton received the support of only 4.9% of  
>> all registered MI voters. No candidate--Democrat nor Republican (nor  
>> "uncommitted")--received more than a small fraction of the registered  
>> vote (in the single digits), since the MI Sec. of State reports that a  
>> combined total of 20.7% of all registered voters participated in the  
>> two primary elections.

>>  
>> Incidentally, did the panel study of MSU students really show that 100%  
>> of the self-identified Democrats and Independents supported Clinton in  
>> the earlier waves?

>>  
>> Best,  
>> Allan

>  
> -----

> 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 this: set aapornet mail  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> 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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Tue, 22 Jan 2008 12:41:36 -0500  
Reply-To: "Caplan, James R CIV DMDC" <[James.Caplan@OSD.PENTAGON.MIL](mailto:James.Caplan@OSD.PENTAGON.MIL)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>

From: "Caplan, James R CIV DMDC" <James.Caplan@OSD.PENTAGON.MIL>  
Subject: Elections offices  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Dear AAPOR colleagues,  
We have been asked to survey local election officials. We know of Election Data Services, but wonder if there are other resources from which we could obtain a database (sampling frame) of the various election jurisdictions and their addresses?

Thanks,  
Jim

Ref:  
James R. Caplan, Ph.D.  
Chief, Survey Technology Branch  
DMDC  
Department of Defense  
1600 Wilson Blvd.  
Arlington, VA 22209

Ph: 703-696-5848  
DNS: 426-5848

Ref:  
James R. Caplan, Ph.D.  
Chief, Survey Technology Branch  
DMDC  
Department of Defense  
1600 Wilson Blvd.  
Arlington, VA 22209

Ph: 703-696-5848  
DNS: 426-5848

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====

Date: Tue, 22 Jan 2008 12:58:26 -0500  
Reply-To: Hugh Clark <[cji@COLUMBUS.RR.COM](mailto:cji@COLUMBUS.RR.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Hugh Clark <[cji@COLUMBUS.RR.COM](mailto:cji@COLUMBUS.RR.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Elections offices  
Comments: To: "Caplan, James R CIV DMDC" <[James.Caplan@OSD.PENTAGON.MIL](mailto:James.Caplan@OSD.PENTAGON.MIL)>,  
AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
In-Reply-To: <[3A22404E3AD8C5408248608AB0E99856937793@HARLEM.ds.dhra.osd.mil](mailto:3A22404E3AD8C5408248608AB0E99856937793@HARLEM.ds.dhra.osd.mil)>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Why would the Pentagon be surveying local elections officials?

At 12:41 PM 1/22/2008, Caplan, James R CIV DMDC wrote:

>Dear AAPOR colleagues,

>We have been asked to survey local election officials. We know of  
>Election Data Services, but wonder if there are other resources from  
>which we could obtain a database (sampling frame) of the various  
>election jurisdictions and their addresses?

>Thanks,

>Jim

>

>Ref:

>James R. Caplan, Ph.D.

>Chief, Survey Technology Branch

>DMDC

>Department of Defense

>1600 Wilson Blvd.

>Arlington, VA 22209

>

>Ph: 703-696-5848

>DNS: 426-5848

>

>

>Ref:

>James R. Caplan, Ph.D.

>Chief, Survey Technology Branch

>DMDC

>Department of Defense

>1600 Wilson Blvd.

>Arlington, VA 22209

>

>Ph: 703-696-5848

>DNS: 426-5848

>

>-----

>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 this: set aapornet mail

>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Hugh M. Clark, Ph.D.

President

CJI Research Corporation

180 South Ardmore Road

Columbus, Ohio 43209

614-338-1008

[cji@columbus.rr.com](mailto:cji@columbus.rr.com)

-----



Robert O. Wyatt

Senior Scholar in Communication Research  
Middle Tennessee State University  
Murfreesboro TN 37132  
Rector, St. Helena's Episcopal Church  
Burr Ridge, IL 60527

E-mail: robertowyatt@gmail.com  
Tennessee cell: 615-477-8389  
Illinois cell: 708-269-5473

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jan Werner  
Sent: Tuesday, January 22, 2008 11:26 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Michigan's Generational Split Among African-Americans

Members of the Southern Baptist Convention and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (the largest, and probably most liberal, mainstream Lutheran group in the US) both call themselves "Evangelical Christians."

Contrary to what simpleminded journalists (and pollsters) may think, "Evangelical" is NOT a synonym for religious fundamentalist.

Jan Werner

---

Nick Panagakis wrote:

- > Here is my summary of the Evangelical vote in all state exit polls. No
- > generational data available, but nonetheless, this may be of interest.
- >
- > Huckabee won Iowa by cornering the Evangelical vote with 46%. Romney was
- > a distant second with 19%. Some 60% of Iowa caucus-goers said yes to the
- > question: "Would you describe yourself as a born-again or evangelical
- > Christian?"
- >
- > In three states after Iowa, other candidates began winning shares of the
- > Evangelical vote comparable to Huckabee's.
- >
- > NH share of Evangelicals: Huckabee 28%, McCain 28%, Romney 27%.
- > MI share of Evangelicals: Huckabee 29%, McCain 23%, Romney 34%.
- > NV, pretty much uncontested for Republicans: Huckabee 22%, Romney 39%.
- >
- > In those primaries and caucus Huckabee came in no better than third.
- >
- > Evangelical percentages of Republican primary/caucus voters in the three
- > states were lower than in Iowa: Michigan 39%, Nevada 24%, and New
- > Hampshire 23%.
- >
- > South Carolina had the same percentage of Evangelicals as Iowa, 60%.
- >
- > Huckabee won almost the same percentage of Evangelicals as the 46% he
- > won in Iowa. He won 43% in South Carolina. But he lost the primary with



> 30% to McCain's 33%.  
>  
> In South Carolina McCain won 27% of Evangelicals versus Huckabee's 43%.

> Summary:

> 1. Huckabee has never won a majority of Evangelicals. In three states  
> after Iowa, Huckabee didn't even win a plurality of Evangelicals. They  
> appear not to be single-issue voters. (???)

> 2. Despite claims to the contrary, his campaign seems to be all about  
> winning by winning the Evangelical vote. Only 14% of non-Evangelicals in  
> Iowa and South Carolina voted for him. Huckabee's non-Evangelical vote  
> in the other states was only 3% to 6%.

> 3. In South Carolina, unlike Iowa, one candidate won an appreciable  
> share of the large Evangelical segment. McCain's 27% of Evangelicals was  
> enough for him to win.

> Would appreciate any comments.

> Nick

> Allan L. McCutcheon wrote:

>> There also appears to have been a generational split among South  
>> Carolina's self-identified born-again Christians in the recent  
>> Republican primary. See

>> <http://www.exit-poll.net/pbtn.html>

>> It is not surprising that Clinton received the support of only 4.9% of  
>> all registered MI voters. No candidate--Democrat nor Republican (nor  
>> "uncommitted")--received more than a small fraction of the registered  
>> vote (in the single digits), since the MI Sec. of State reports that a  
>> combined total of 20.7% of all registered voters participated in the  
>> two primary elections.

>> Incidentally, did the panel study of MSU students really show that 100%  
>> of the self-identified Democrats and Independents supported Clinton in  
>> the earlier waves?

>> Best,  
>> Allan

> -----  
> 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 this: set aapornet mail

> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

> 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 this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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 this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====  
Date: Tue, 22 Jan 2008 13:34:12 -0500

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: Michigan's Generational Split Among African-Americans

Comments: To: [amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU](mailto:amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU), [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

In-Reply-To: A<[20080122094018.hh7gcryc08s8og0k@wm-imp-2.unl.edu](mailto:20080122094018.hh7gcryc08s8og0k@wm-imp-2.unl.edu)>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

In reference to your question, " did the panel study of MSU students really show that 100% of the self-identified Democrats and Independents supported Clinton in the earlier waves?" -- what I wrote was " Sen. Clinton's support is 100% from students who consider themselves Democrats or Independents" -- in other words, no students who identified themselves as Republicans chose Sen. Clinton as their first choice.

Sen. Obama was the most popular first choice among (55% of Democrats chose him first) and 14% of self-identified Republicans chose him, as did 52% of self-identified Independents. Sen. Clinton's support numbers were 35% of the Democrats, 0% of the Republicans, and 8% of the Independents.

Nat Ehrlich, Ph.D.

Research Specialist

Michigan State University

Institute for Public Policy and Survey Research

Office for Survey Research

321 Berkey Hall

East Lansing, MI 48824

517-353-2639

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

From: AAPORNET [[mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)] On Behalf Of Allan L. McCutcheon

Sent: Tuesday, January 22, 2008 10:40 AM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: Re: Michigan's Generational Split Among African-Americans

There also appears to have been a generational split among South Carolina's self-identified born-again Christians in the recent Republican primary. See

<http://www.exit-poll.net/pbtn.html>

It is not surprising that Clinton received the support of only 4.9% of all registered MI voters. No candidate--Democrat nor Republican (nor "uncommitted")--received more than a small fraction of the registered vote (in the single digits), since the MI Sec. of State reports that a combined total of 20.7% of all registered voters participated in the two primary elections.

Incidentally, did the panel study of MSU students really show that 100% of the self-identified Democrats and Independents supported Clinton in the earlier waves?

Best,  
Allan

--

Donald O. Clifton Chair of Survey Science

Professor of Statistics &

Survey Research and Methodology

tel. +402.458.2036

fax +402.458.2038

Quoting "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>:

> A few notes here:

> Kucinich was on the Democratic Ballot. Obama and Edwards removed their names.

> If your figures for the number of Democratic ballots is correct, her

> total means that she got 4.9% of the registered voters in the state

> (7.1 million) to support her.

> We have been conducting a panel survey among MSU students. After two

> waves [the first just after Thanksgiving, the second after NH and

> before MI] Sen. Clinton's support is 100% from students who consider

> themselves Democrats or Independents. In terms of Social and Fiscal

> policies, the students who support her are more liberal than those

> who support any other candidate, and her supporters among the

> student panel are -24% male compared to the panel. Obama (top choice

> overall in first two waves) and McCain (third overall, top

> Republican) are the candidates who get the greatest crossover from

> the "other side" on party ID and Social and Fiscal Ideology.

> More complete results and analysis can be found under the heading, "

> Obama Widens Lead Among MSU Students

> McCain Overtakes Giuliani in IPPSR Survey" at our website,

> <http://www.ippsr.msu.edu/>

>

>

>  
> Nat Ehrlich, Ph.D.  
> Research Specialist  
> Michigan State University  
> Institute for Public Policy and Survey Research  
> Office for Survey Research  
> 321 Berkey Hall  
> East Lansing, MI 48824  
> 517-353-2639  
>  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Allan L. McCutcheon  
> Sent: Friday, January 18, 2008 6:47 PM  
> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
> Subject: Re: Michigan's Generational Split Among African-Americans  
>  
> I can't speak to the results of CNN's poll (these are posted on their  
> web page), and I did not see any analysis of African-American voters  
> in Michigan's Dem primary on the CNN.com/politics/ webpage.  
>  
> Your questions are interesting, however, and your cautions are  
> important (see my own cautions in the blog).  
>  
> The turnout for the 2008 MI Dem primary was not so low (592,798),  
> given the weather conditions. This was not so far off from the other  
> turnout figures that are available. We have to go all the way back to  
> 1992 to find another MI Dem primary for president (turnout 585,972).  
> There was also a non-competitive MI Dem senatoral primary in 2006  
> (513,438).  
>  
> The proportion of African-Americans in the MI Dem turnouts in the 2006  
> and 2008 primaries are also fairly comparable (25% vs. 23%).  
>  
> As to whether the "uncommitted" votes among African-American voters  
> were really "not Clinton" votes that would have gone for Obama--it  
> could be that they are Edwards (or Kucinich) supporters, though I am  
> skeptical of that interpretation.  
>  
> As I clearly state in the blog, it is important to be cautious in our  
> interpretations--still, this might suggest an interesting pattern. We  
> will learn more in a week, when the Dems have their SC primary.  
>  
> Best,  
> Allan  
> --  
> Donald O. Clifton Chair of Survey Science  
> Professor of Statistics &  
> Survey Research and Methodology  
> tel. +402.458.2036  
> fax +402.458.2038  
>  
>  
> Quoting "Pollack, Lance" <Lance.Pollack@UCSF.EDU>:

>  
>> Before that they must establish the bonafides of the numbers they are  
>> looking at. Does the "uncommitted" vote really translate into "not  
>> Clinton", or can it mean something else given the primary does not  
>> connect to delegates? Who voted in this non-primary primary? Was the  
>> turnout small, large, about normal? Do they demographically look like  
>> previous turnouts for the democratic primary in Michigan? Let's not do  
>> another Iowa and try to generalize from numbers that may not be  
>> generalizable.  
>>  
>> Lance M. Pollack, PhD  
>> University of California, San Francisco  
>> Center for AIDS Prevention Studies (CAPS)  
>> 50 Beale Street, Suite 1300  
>> San Francisco, CA 94105  
>> tel: 415-597-9302  
>> fax: 415-597-9213  
>> email: Lance.Pollack@ucsf.edu  
>> -----Original Message-----  
>> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Barry Hollander  
>> Sent: Friday, January 18, 2008 2:02 PM  
>> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
>> Subject: Re: Michigan's Generational Split Among African-Americans  
>>  
>> CNN spent a great deal of time on this issue today  
>> but never answered, at least when I was watching,  
>> whether the generational split was also seen among  
>> white voters. Is the degree of a generational  
>> split among African-American voters significantly  
>> larger than any generational split seen among white  
>> voters, assuming there even is one?  
>>  
>>  
>> -----  
>> Barry Hollander  
>> Grady College of Journalism  
>> and Mass Communication  
>> University of Georgia  
>> barry@uga.edu  
>> http://www.barryhollander.com  
>>  
>> -----  
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
>> [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>>  
>> -----  
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>>  
>

>  
>  
>  
> ----- End forwarded message -----

>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](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 this: set aapornet mail  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> 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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Tue, 22 Jan 2008 14:17:05 -0500  
Reply-To: "Bates, Benjamin J" <[bjbates@UTK.EDU](mailto:bjbates@UTK.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Bates, Benjamin J" <[bjbates@UTK.EDU](mailto:bjbates@UTK.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Elections offices  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: A<[20080122175828.QGPE11942.hrndva-omta01.mail.rr.com@hugh-desktop.columbus.rr.com](mailto:20080122175828.QGPE11942.hrndva-omta01.mail.rr.com@hugh-desktop.columbus.rr.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Perhaps to ensure that those in the services get to vote, and ensure that their votes count. (Asking about procedures, viability or attitudes of having polling stations on military bases, etc.)

Ben Bates

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Hugh Clark  
Sent: Tuesday, January 22, 2008 12:58 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Elections offices

Why would the Pentagon be surveying local elections officials?

At 12:41 PM 1/22/2008, Caplan, James R CIV DMDC wrote:

>Dear AAPOR colleagues,  
>We have been asked to survey local election officials. We know of  
>Election Data Services, but wonder if there are other resources from  
>which we could obtain a database (sampling frame) of the various  
>election jurisdictions and their addresses?

>Thanks,

>Jim

>

>Ref:

>James R. Caplan, Ph.D.

>Chief, Survey Technology Branch

>DMDC

>Department of Defense

>1600 Wilson Blvd.

>Arlington, VA 22209

>

>Ph: 703-696-5848

>DNS: 426-5848

>

>

>Ref:

>James R. Caplan, Ph.D.

>Chief, Survey Technology Branch

>DMDC

>Department of Defense

>1600 Wilson Blvd.

>Arlington, VA 22209

>

>Ph: 703-696-5848

>DNS: 426-5848

>

>-----

>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 this: set aapornet mail

>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

[aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

Hugh M. Clark, Ph.D.

President

CJI Research Corporation

180 South Ardmore Road

Columbus, Ohio 43209

614-338-1008

cji@columbus.rr.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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Tue, 22 Jan 2008 13:18:59 -0600  
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)>  
Subject: Re: Michigan's Generational Split Among African-Americans  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <004501c85d23\$05b0f1e0\$1112d5a0\$@com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

>So, how are these troublesome terms be measured in the surveys you are  
>referring to? In other surveys?  
>

"Would you describe yourself as a born-again or evangelical Christian?"

I've noticed how some news stories use "Fundamentalist" and "Religious Right" interchangeably with born-again/evangelical as worded in the question, even in the same story.

The question has been worded in terms of alignment with specific groups: "Do you SUPPORT the political activities of religious conservative organizations such as the Christian Coalition ...or do you NOT SUPPORT them?" Fill in your group of choice here.

Another question is how to describe Huckabee; e.g., Constitution should be "brought more in line with God's law in the Bible" or his campaign "...has confounded the pundits...until they look at it from a just experience beyond human, they'll never figure it out" etc. etc. But he not always consistent.

Nick

Robert Wyatt wrote:



>Jan is right. The terms Evangelical and fundamentalist are very complicated.  
>  
>During the Reformation, Evangelical was basically a synonym for Protestant:  
>belief in justification by freely given grace through faith, the sufficiency  
>of Scripture, and the centrality of the Cross (that's the "good news" in  
>Evangelicalism v. what they imagined as the "works righteousness" of Roman  
>Catholicism). Protestant is basically what Evangelical means in ELCA - and  
>in Germany to this day, I believe. Thus, Catholics v. Evangelicals.  
>  
>For some strident American Evangelicals (who may also be Fundamentalists),  
>Evangelical has come to mean that: 1. I am saved by my beliefs (usually  
>defined by some sort of confession) and personal conversion (usually a "born  
>again" experience in adolescence), and 2. if you want to be saved (usually  
>meaning "go to heaven"), you must believe and experience likewise. Thus,  
>it's my group v. the rest of you - even among subgroups of American  
>Evangelical fundamentalists.  
>  
>[See [http://www.religioustolerance.org/evan\\_defn.htm](http://www.religioustolerance.org/evan_defn.htm) for a variety of quick  
>definitions. And see Garry Wills recent book, Head and Heart: American  
>Christianities, for an analysis of the American context from the Puritans  
>and Deists through Karl Rove.]  
>  
>Fundamentalism is perhaps even harder to define. For example, it is often  
>equated with scriptural literalism even though many fundamentalists (those  
>who believe in the "rapture" for example) use inventive ways of interpreting  
>scripture that go far beyond the literal meaning (whatever that is in  
>context).  
>  
>So, how are these troublesome terms be measured in the surveys you are  
>referring to? In other surveys?  
>  
>Self identification? Score on a certain battery of questions (if so, which  
>and why)?  
>  
>  
>  
>Robert O. Wyatt  
>  
>Senior Scholar in Communication Research  
> Middle Tennessee State University  
> Murfreesboro TN 37132  
>Rector, St. Helena's Episcopal Church  
> Burr Ridge, IL 60527  
>  
>E-mail: robertowyatt@gmail.com  
>Tennessee cell: 615-477-8389  
>Illinois cell: 708-269-5473  
>  
>-----Original Message-----  
>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jan Werner  
>Sent: Tuesday, January 22, 2008 11:26 AM  
>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
>Subject: Re: Michigan's Generational Split Among African-Americans

>  
>Members of the Southern Baptist Convention and the Evangelical Lutheran  
>Church in America (the largest, and probably most liberal, mainstream  
>Lutheran group in the US) both call themselves "Evangelical Christians."  
>  
>Contrary to what simpleminded journalists (and pollsters) may think,  
>"Evangelical" is NOT a synonym for religious fundamentalist.  
>  
>Jan Werner  
>  
>  
>Nick Panagakis wrote:  
>  
>  
>>Here is my summary of the Evangelical vote in all state exit polls. No  
>>generational data available, but nonetheless, this may be of interest.  
>>  
>>Huckabee won Iowa by cornering the Evangelical vote with 46%. Romney was  
>>a distant second with 19%. Some 60% of Iowa caucus-goers said yes to the  
>>question: "Would you describe yourself as a born-again or evangelical  
>>Christian?"  
>>  
>>In three states after Iowa, other candidates began winning shares of the  
>>Evangelical vote comparable to Huckabee's.  
>>  
>>NH share of Evangelicals: Huckabee 28%, McCain 28%, Romney 27%.  
>>MI share of Evangelicals: Huckabee 29%, McCain 23%, Romney 34%.  
>>NV, pretty much uncontested for Republicans: Huckabee 22%, Romney 39%.  
>>  
>>In those primaries and caucus Huckabee came in no better than third.  
>>  
>>Evangelical percentages of Republican primary/caucus voters in the three  
>>states were lower than in Iowa: Michigan 39%, Nevada 24%, and New  
>>Hampshire 23%.  
>>  
>>South Carolina had the same percentage of Evangelicals as Iowa, 60%.  
>>  
>>Huckabee won almost the same percentage of Evangelicals as the 46% he  
>>won in Iowa. He won 43% in South Carolina. But he lost the primary with  
>>30% to McCain's 33%.  
>>  
>>In South Carolina McCain won 27% of Evangelicals versus Huckabee's 43%.  
>>  
>>Summary:  
>>  
>>1. Huckabee has never won a majority of Evangelicals. In three states  
>>after Iowa, Huckabee didn't even win a plurality of Evangelicals. They  
>>appear not to be single-issue voters. (???)  
>>  
>>2. Despite claims to the contrary, his campaign seems to be all about  
>>winning by winning the Evangelical vote. Only 14% of non-Evangelicals in  
>>Iowa and South Carolina voted for him. Huckabee's non-Evangelical vote  
>>in the other states was only 3% to 6%.  
>>

>>>3. In South Carolina, unlike Iowa, one candidate won an appreciable  
>>share of the large Evangelical segment. McCain's 27% of Evangelicals was  
>>enough for him to win.

>>  
>>Would appreciate any comments.

>>  
>>Nick

>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>Allan L. McCutcheon wrote:

>>  
>>  
>>  
>>>There also appears to have been a generational split among South  
>>>Carolina's self-identified born-again Christians in the recent  
>>>Republican primary. See

>>>  
>>><http://www.exit-poll.net/pbtn.html>

>>>  
>>>It is not surprising that Clinton received the support of only 4.9% of  
>>>all registered MI voters. No candidate--Democrat nor Republican (nor  
>>>"uncommitted")--received more than a small fraction of the registered  
>>>vote (in the single digits), since the MI Sec. of State reports that a  
>>>combined total of 20.7% of all registered voters participated in the  
>>>two primary elections.

>>>  
>>>Incidentally, did the panel study of MSU students really show that 100%  
>>>of the self-identified Democrats and Independents supported Clinton in  
>>>the earlier waves?

>>>  
>>>Best,  
>>>Allan

>>>  
>>>  
>>>-----  
>>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 this: set aapornet mail  
>>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>>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 this: set aapornet mail  
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>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 this: set aapornet mail

>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>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 this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====  
Date: Tue, 22 Jan 2008 15:59:38 -0500

Reply-To: Howard Fienberg <[hfienberg@CMOR.ORG](mailto:hfienberg@CMOR.ORG)>

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

From: Howard Fienberg <[hfienberg@CMOR.ORG](mailto:hfienberg@CMOR.ORG)>

Subject: Ethical Issues of Working with Minors

Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

CMOR is hosting a web seminar, titled "MarKID: Ethical Issues of Working with Minors", on February 5 at noon EST.

Between email, instant messaging, and social networking, kids, tweens and teens offer up extensive personal information online. But what is legal for researchers to collect, and in what circumstances? When conducting research by phone or in person, what ethical issues apply in different circumstances and environments? When must researchers seek parental consent and involvement, to what extent, and how often? Let CMOR guide you through the laws and ethics of research with minors.

[http://www.cmor.org/pdf/2008\\_CMOR\\_WebSeminar\\_Reg.pdf](http://www.cmor.org/pdf/2008_CMOR_WebSeminar_Reg.pdf)

Sincerely,

Howard Fienberg

Director of Government Affairs

CMOR: Promoting & Advocating Survey & Opinion Research

[hfienberg@cmor.org](mailto:hfienberg@cmor.org)

1111 16th St. NW, Suite 120

Washington, DC 20036

(202) 775-5170

Fax: (202) 775-5172

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

<<http://www.youropinioncounts.org/>> <http://www.youropinioncounts.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 this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====  
Date: Tue, 22 Jan 2008 16:21:53 -0500

Reply-To: "Caplan, James R CIV DMDC" <[James.Caplan@OSD.PENTAGON.MIL](mailto:James.Caplan@OSD.PENTAGON.MIL)>

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

From: "Caplan, James R CIV DMDC" <[James.Caplan@OSD.PENTAGON.MIL](mailto:James.Caplan@OSD.PENTAGON.MIL)>

Subject: Re: DoD survey of Elections offices

Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

Comments: cc: "Bates, Benjamin J" <[bjbates@UTK.EDU](mailto:bjbates@UTK.EDU)>

In-Reply-To:

A<[DF8ADDAFC4D62C46898FACD5429F5BF501A5EA6A@KFSVS1.utk.tennessee.edu](mailto:DF8ADDAFC4D62C46898FACD5429F5BF501A5EA6A@KFSVS1.utk.tennessee.edu)>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

We are supporting the Federal Voting Assistance Program which is part of the Department of Defense. As Ben opined below, the largest group of citizens away from home on election day is the military.

As part of our responsibilities, we will design, administer, and analyze post-election surveys on uniformed services voter participation, and overseas nonmilitary voter participation in order to evaluate the effectiveness in presidential election years of assistance under the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act of 1986 (UOCAVA), 42 USC 1973ff. DoD administers the UOCAVA. One of the subject surveys involves local election officials.

Jim

Ref:

James R. Caplan, Ph.D.  
Chief, Survey Technology Branch  
DMDC  
Department of Defense  
1600 Wilson Blvd.  
Arlington, VA 22209

Ph: 703-696-5848

DNS: 426-5848

Ref:

James R. Caplan, Ph.D.  
Chief, Survey Technology Branch  
DMDC  
Department of Defense

1600 Wilson Blvd.  
Arlington, VA 22209

Ph: 703-696-5848  
DNS: 426-5848

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Bates, Benjamin J  
Sent: Tuesday, January 22, 2008 2:17 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Elections offices

Perhaps to ensure that those in the services get to vote, and ensure that their votes count. (Asking about procedures, viability or attitudes of having polling stations on military bases, etc.)

Ben Bates

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Hugh Clark  
Sent: Tuesday, January 22, 2008 12:58 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Elections offices

Why would the Pentagon be surveying local elections officials?

At 12:41 PM 1/22/2008, Caplan, James R CIV DMDC wrote:

>Dear AAPOR colleagues,  
>We have been asked to survey local election officials. We know of  
>Election Data Services, but wonder if there are other resources from  
>which we could obtain a database (sampling frame) of the various  
>election jurisdictions and their addresses?  
>Thanks,  
>Jim  
>  
>Ref:  
>James R. Caplan, Ph.D.  
>Chief, Survey Technology Branch  
>DMDC  
>Department of Defense  
>1600 Wilson Blvd.  
>Arlington, VA 22209  
>  
>Ph: 703-696-5848  
>DNS: 426-5848  
>  
>  
>Ref:  
>James R. Caplan, Ph.D.  
>Chief, Survey Technology Branch  
>DMDC  
>Department of Defense  
>1600 Wilson Blvd.

>Arlington, VA 22209

>

>Ph: 703-696-5848

>DNS: 426-5848

>

>-----

>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 this: set aapornet mail Please ask authors before

>quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

[aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

Hugh M. Clark, Ph.D.

President

CJI Research Corporation

180 South Ardmore Road

Columbus, Ohio 43209

614-338-1008

[cji@columbus.rr.com](mailto:cji@columbus.rr.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 this: set aapornet mail Please ask authors before

quoting outside AAPORNET.

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 this: set aapornet mail Please ask authors before

quoting outside AAPORNET.

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 this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====

Date: Tue, 22 Jan 2008 17:52:37 -0500

Reply-To: Hugh Clark <[cji@COLUMBUS.RR.COM](mailto:cji@COLUMBUS.RR.COM)>

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

From: Hugh Clark <[cji@COLUMBUS.RR.COM](mailto:cji@COLUMBUS.RR.COM)>

Subject: Re: DoD survey of Elections offices

Comments: To: "Caplan, James R CIV DMDC" <[James.Caplan@OSD.PENTAGON.MIL](mailto:James.Caplan@OSD.PENTAGON.MIL)>,

AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

In-Reply-To: <3A22404E3AD8C5408248608AB0E9985693779C@HARLEM.ds.dhra.osd. mil>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Unless the Federal Elections Commission has a database (because of their interest in financial reporting), you might have to go to all of the secretaries of state to get the records.

At 04:21 PM 1/22/2008, Caplan, James R CIV DMDC wrote:

>We are supporting the Federal Voting Assistance Program which is part of  
>the Department of Defense. As Ben opined below, the largest group of  
>citizens away from home on election day is the military.

>

>As part of our responsibilities, we will design, administer, and analyze  
>post-election surveys on uniformed services voter participation, and  
>overseas nonmilitary voter participation in order to evaluate the  
>effectiveness in presidential election years of assistance under the  
>Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act of 1986 (UOCAVA), 42  
>USC 1973ff. DoD administers the UOCAVA. One of the subject surveys  
>involves local election officials.

>

>Jim

>

>Ref:

>James R. Caplan, Ph.D.  
>Chief, Survey Technology Branch  
>DMDC  
>Department of Defense  
>1600 Wilson Blvd.  
>Arlington, VA 22209

>

>Ph: 703-696-5848

>DNS: 426-5848

>

>

>Ref:

>James R. Caplan, Ph.D.  
>Chief, Survey Technology Branch  
>DMDC  
>Department of Defense  
>1600 Wilson Blvd.  
>Arlington, VA 22209

>

>Ph: 703-696-5848

>DNS: 426-5848

>

>

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

>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Bates, Benjamin J

>Sent: Tuesday, January 22, 2008 2:17 PM

>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

>Subject: Re: Elections offices

>



>Perhaps to ensure that those in the services get to vote, and ensure  
>that their votes count. (Asking about procedures, viability or  
>attitudes of having polling stations on military bases, etc.)

>  
>Ben Bates

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

>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Hugh Clark

>Sent: Tuesday, January 22, 2008 12:58 PM

>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

>Subject: Re: Elections offices

>  
>Why would the Pentagon be surveying local elections officials?

>  
>At 12:41 PM 1/22/2008, Caplan, James R CIV DMDC wrote:

>>Dear AAPOR colleagues,

>>We have been asked to survey local election officials. We know of  
>>Election Data Services, but wonder if there are other resources from  
>>which we could obtain a database (sampling frame) of the various  
>>election jurisdictions and their addresses?

>>Thanks,

>>Jim

>>  
>>Ref:

>>James R. Caplan, Ph.D.

>>Chief, Survey Technology Branch

>>DMDC

>>Department of Defense

>>1600 Wilson Blvd.

>>Arlington, VA 22209

>>Ph: 703-696-5848

>>DNS: 426-5848

>>  
>>Ref:

>>James R. Caplan, Ph.D.

>>Chief, Survey Technology Branch

>>DMDC

>>Department of Defense

>>1600 Wilson Blvd.

>>Arlington, VA 22209

>>Ph: 703-696-5848

>>DNS: 426-5848

>>-----  
>>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 this: set aapornet mail Please ask authors before

>>quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

>aapornet-request@asu.edu

>  
>Hugh M. Clark, Ph.D.  
>President  
>CJI Research Corporation  
>180 South Ardmore Road  
>Columbus, Ohio 43209  
>614-338-1008  
>cji@columbus.rr.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 this: set aapornet mail Please ask authors before  
>quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>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 this: set aapornet mail Please ask authors before  
>quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>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 this: set aapornet mail  
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

Hugh M. Clark, Ph.D.  
President  
CJI Research Corporation  
180 South Ardmore Road  
Columbus, Ohio 43209  
614-338-1008  
[cji@columbus.rr.com](mailto:cji@columbus.rr.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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Tue, 22 Jan 2008 17:27:27 -0700  
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>  
Subject: Re: DoD survey of Elections offices  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Here are all 50 Secretary of State web sites.

[http://nass.org/index.php?option=3Dcom\\_content&task=3Dview&id=3D89&Itemid=3D223](http://nass.org/index.php?option=3Dcom_content&task=3Dview&id=3D89&Itemid=3D223)

Nick Panagakis

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Tue, 22 Jan 2008 18:40:24 -0600  
Reply-To: [amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU](mailto:amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Allan L. McCutcheon" <[amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU](mailto:amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Michigan's Generational Split Among African-Americans  
Comments: To: [robertowyatt@gmail.com](mailto:robertowyatt@gmail.com)  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <004501c85d23\$05b0f1e0\$1112d5a0\$@com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; DelSp="Yes"; format="flowed"  
Content-Disposition: inline  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Hi Bob,

As usual, you are right and over-courteous. You are right that the terms "Evangelical" and "fundamentalist" are quite complicated, and you do a nice job of outlining the issues with respect to the term "Evangelical."

You are over-courteous in not pointing out that it was Jan who introduced the term "fundamentalist"--I referred to "self-identified born-again Christians" (and did so in the blog, as well), and Nick was quite clear regarding his use of the term "Evangelical" (he gave the specific question wording).

You are also over-courteous in not commenting on the gratuitous remark regarding "simpleminded journalists (and pollsters)." This is, if not ad hominem, un-collegial at the very least, and we should all remind our younger colleagues in AAPOR that this is not good form.

Best,  
Allan



> Tennessee cell: 615-477-8389

> Illinois cell: 708-269-5473

>

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jan Werner

> Sent: Tuesday, January 22, 2008 11:26 AM

> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

> Subject: Re: Michigan's Generational Split Among African-Americans

>

> Members of the Southern Baptist Convention and the Evangelical Lutheran

> Church in America (the largest, and probably most liberal, mainstream

> Lutheran group in the US) both call themselves "Evangelical Christians."

>

> Contrary to what simpleminded journalists (and pollsters) may think,

> "Evangelical" is NOT a synonym for religious fundamentalist.

>

> Jan Werner

>

> \_\_\_\_\_

>

> Nick Panagakis wrote:

>> Here is my summary of the Evangelical vote in all state exit polls. No

>> generational data available, but nonetheless, this may be of interest.

>>

>> Huckabee won Iowa by cornering the Evangelical vote with 46%. Romney was

>> a distant second with 19%. Some 60% of Iowa caucus-goers said yes to the

>> question: "Would you describe yourself as a born-again or evangelical

>> Christian?"

>>

>> In three states after Iowa, other candidates began winning shares of the

>> Evangelical vote comparable to Huckabee's.

>>

>> NH share of Evangelicals: Huckabee 28%, McCain 28%, Romney 27%.

>> MI share of Evangelicals: Huckabee 29%, McCain 23%, Romney 34%.

>> NV, pretty much uncontested for Republicans: Huckabee 22%, Romney 39%.

>>

>> In those primaries and caucus Huckabee came in no better than third.

>>

>> Evangelical percentages of Republican primary/caucus voters in the three

>> states were lower than in Iowa: Michigan 39%, Nevada 24%, and New

>> Hampshire 23%.

>>

>> South Carolina had the same percentage of Evangelicals as Iowa, 60%.

>>

>> Huckabee won almost the same percentage of Evangelicals as the 46% he

>> won in Iowa. He won 43% in South Carolina. But he lost the primary with

>> 30% to McCain's 33%.

>>

>> In South Carolina McCain won 27% of Evangelicals versus Huckabee's 43%.

>>

>> Summary:

>>

>> 1. Huckabee has never won a majority of Evangelicals. In three states

>> after Iowa, Huckabee didn't even win a plurality of Evangelicals. They

>> appear not to be single-issue voters. (???)

>>  
>> 2. Despite claims to the contrary, his campaign seems to be all about  
>> winning by winning the Evangelical vote. Only 14% of non-Evangelicals in  
>> Iowa and South Carolina voted for him. Huckabee's non-Evangelical vote  
>> in the other states was only 3% to 6%.

>>  
>> 3. In South Carolina, unlike Iowa, one candidate won an appreciable  
>> share of the large Evangelical segment. McCain's 27% of Evangelicals was  
>> enough for him to win.

>>  
>> Would appreciate any comments.

>>  
>> Nick

>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>> Allan L. McCutcheon wrote:

>>  
>>> There also appears to have been a generational split among South  
>>> Carolina's self-identified born-again Christians in the recent  
>>> Republican primary. See

>>>  
>>> <http://www.exit-poll.net/pbtn.html>

>>>  
>>> It is not surprising that Clinton received the support of only 4.9% of  
>>> all registered MI voters. No candidate--Democrat nor Republican (nor  
>>> "uncommitted")--received more than a small fraction of the registered  
>>> vote (in the single digits), since the MI Sec. of State reports that a  
>>> combined total of 20.7% of all registered voters participated in the  
>>> two primary elections.

>>>  
>>> Incidentally, did the panel study of MSU students really show that 100%  
>>> of the self-identified Democrats and Independents supported Clinton in  
>>> the earlier waves?

>>>  
>>> Best,  
>>> Allan

>>  
>> -----

>> 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 this: set aapornet mail  
>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>> 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 this: set aapornet mail

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

Date: Wed, 23 Jan 2008 06:23:23 -0500  
Reply-To: Paul J Lavrakas PhD <[pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET](mailto:pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Paul J Lavrakas PhD <[pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET](mailto:pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET)>  
Subject: Re: Michigan's Generational Split Among African-Americans  
Comments: To: [amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU](mailto:amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU), [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[20080122184024.2wjw43qww000g0w0@wm-imp-2.unl.edu](mailto:20080122184024.2wjw43qww000g0w0@wm-imp-2.unl.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

well said, Allan; thanks.

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Allan L. McCutcheon  
Sent: Tuesday, January 22, 2008 7:40 PM  
To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Subject: Re: Michigan's Generational Split Among African-Americans

Hi Bob,

As usual, you are right and over-courteous. You are right that the terms "Evangelical" and "fundamentalist" are quite complicated, and you do a nice job of outlining the issues with respect to the term "Evangelical."

You are over-courteous in not pointing out that it was Jan who introduced the term "fundamentalist"--I referred to "self-identified born-again Christians" (and did so in the blog, as well), and Nick was quite clear regarding his use of the term "Evangelical" (he gave the specific question wording).

You are also over-courteous in not commenting on the gratuitous remark regarding "simpleminded journalists (and pollsters)." This is, if not ad hominem, un-collegial at the very least, and we should all remind our

younger colleagues in AAPOR that this is not good form.

Best,  
Allan

--

Donald O. Clifton Chair of Survey Science  
Professor of Statistics &  
Survey Research and Methodology  
tel. +402.458.2036  
fax +402.458.2038

Quoting Robert Wyatt <robertowyatt@gmail.com>:

> Jan is right. The terms Evangelical and fundamentalist are very complicated.

>

> During the Reformation, Evangelical was basically a synonym for Protestant:

> belief in justification by freely given grace through faith, the sufficiency

> of Scripture, and the centrality of the Cross (that's the "good news" in

> Evangelicalism v. what they imagined as the "works righteousness" of Roman

> Catholicism). Protestant is basically what Evangelical means in ELCA - and

> in Germany to this day, I believe. Thus, Catholics v. Evangelicals.

>

> For some strident American Evangelicals (who may also be Fundamentalists),

> Evangelical has come to mean that: 1. I am saved by my beliefs (usually

> defined by some sort of confession) and personal conversion (usually a

"born

> again" experience in adolescence), and 2. if you want to be saved (usually

> meaning "go to heaven"), you must believe and experience likewise. Thus,

> it's my group v. the rest of you - even among subgroups of American

> Evangelical fundamentalists.

>

> [See [http://www.religioustolerance.org/evan\\_defn.htm](http://www.religioustolerance.org/evan_defn.htm) for a variety of quick

> definitions. And see Garry Wills recent book, Head and Heart: American

> Christianities, for an analysis of the American context from the Puritans

> and Deists through Karl Rove.]

>

> Fundamentalism is perhaps even harder to define. For example, it is often

> equated with scriptural literalism even though many fundamentalists (those

> who believe in the "rapture" for example) use inventive ways of

interpreting

> scripture that go far beyond the literal meaning (whatever that is in

> context).

>

> So, how are these troublesome terms be measured in the surveys you are

> referring to? In other surveys?

>

> Self identification? Score on a certain battery of questions (if so, which

> and why)?

>





>> won in Iowa. He won 43% in South Carolina. But he lost the primary with  
>> 30% to McCain's 33%.  
>>  
>> In South Carolina McCain won 27% of Evangelicals versus Huckabee's 43%.

>> Summary:

>> 1. Huckabee has never won a majority of Evangelicals. In three states  
>> after Iowa, Huckabee didn't even win a plurality of Evangelicals. They  
>> appear not to be single-issue voters. (???)

>> 2. Despite claims to the contrary, his campaign seems to be all about  
>> winning by winning the Evangelical vote. Only 14% of non-Evangelicals in  
>> Iowa and South Carolina voted for him. Huckabee's non-Evangelical vote  
>> in the other states was only 3% to 6%.

>> 3. In South Carolina, unlike Iowa, one candidate won an appreciable  
>> share of the large Evangelical segment. McCain's 27% of Evangelicals was  
>> enough for him to win.

>> Would appreciate any comments.

>> Nick

>> Allan L. McCutcheon wrote:

>>> There also appears to have been a generational split among South  
>>> Carolina's self-identified born-again Christians in the recent  
>>> Republican primary. See

>>> <http://www.exit-poll.net/pbtn.html>

>>> It is not surprising that Clinton received the support of only 4.9% of  
>>> all registered MI voters. No candidate--Democrat nor Republican (nor  
>>> "uncommitted")--received more than a small fraction of the registered  
>>> vote (in the single digits), since the MI Sec. of State reports that a  
>>> combined total of 20.7% of all registered voters participated in the  
>>> two primary elections.

>>> Incidentally, did the panel study of MSU students really show that 100%  
>>> of the self-identified Democrats and Independents supported Clinton in  
>>> the earlier waves?

>>> Best,

>>> Allan

>> -----

>> 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 this: set aapornet mail

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

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Wed, 23 Jan 2008 08:52:16 -0500  
Reply-To: "Safir, Adam - BLS" <[Safir.Adam@BLS.GOV](mailto:Safir.Adam@BLS.GOV)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Safir, Adam - BLS" <[Safir.Adam@BLS.GOV](mailto:Safir.Adam@BLS.GOV)>  
Subject: Kohut profile in the Washington Examiner  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: A<[000601c85db2\\$5da9cc70\\$8b00a8c0@NYCNMRLAVRAKPB](mailto:000601c85db2$5da9cc70$8b00a8c0@NYCNMRLAVRAKPB)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

For those interested, today's Washington Examiner features a "Power Profile" of Andrew Kohut:

<[http://www.examiner.com/printa-1174329~Power\\_Profile:\\_Andrew\\_Kohut.html](http://www.examiner.com/printa-1174329~Power_Profile:_Andrew_Kohut.html)>  
>

Adam Safir

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics  
safir.adam@bls.gov  
(202) 691-5175

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Wed, 23 Jan 2008 14:22:34 -0000  
Reply-To: Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Iain Noble <Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK>  
Subject: Re: Kohut profile in the Washington Examiner  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
In-Reply-To: A<C3C1925D945BF844911C8EEA752666AE1122F823@psbexmb2.psb.bls.gov>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

So non-response bias is a not 'a technical reason'?

Iain Noble  
Department for Children, Schools and Families  
Young People Analysis Division - YCS and Next Steps Study,  
W606, Moorfoot, Sheffield, S1 4PQ.  
0114 259 1180  
For information about the Next Steps Study go to  
[www.nextstepsstudy.org.uk](http://www.nextstepsstudy.org.uk) or  
<http://www.esds.ac.uk/longitudinal/access/lstype/>

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

>From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Safir, Adam - BLS  
>Sent: 23 January 2008 13:52  
>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
>Subject: Kohut profile in the Washington Examiner

>  
>For those interested, today's Washington Examiner features a "Power  
>Profile" of Andrew Kohut:

>  
><[http://www.examiner.com/printa-1174329~Power\\_Profile:\\_Andrew\\_Kohut.htm](http://www.examiner.com/printa-1174329~Power_Profile:_Andrew_Kohut.htm)

1  
>>

>  
>Adam Safir  
>U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics  
>[safir.adam@bls.gov](mailto:safir.adam@bls.gov)  
>(202) 691-5175

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

>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>

>This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the Government Secure

>Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless in partnership with MessageLabs.

>(CCTM Certificate Number 2007/11/0032.) In case of problems, please call your

>organisation's IT Helpdesk.

>Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for

>legal purposes.

The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intranet virus scanning service supplied by Cable&Wireless in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2007/11/0032.) On leaving the GSi this email was certified virus free.

Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Wed, 23 Jan 2008 15:35:40 -0000

Reply-To: [Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK](mailto:Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK)

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

From: Iain Noble <[Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK](mailto:Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK)>

Subject: Re: Kohut profile in the Washington Examiner

Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

In-Reply-To: A<8CD5D9A623A40E4BAB9DD7531EBDEDBB0465A1A5@MFEXC01.AD.HQ.DEPT>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

And while I'm on the subject, has anyone estimated anything like what percentage difference in response rates between 'poorer, less-educated white voters' and 'wealthier, better-educated whites' would need to be (assuming that the preferences of both split the same as in the collected data) to account for a single percentage point in the difference between poll predicted and actual votes in NH?

Iain Noble

Department for Children, Schools and Families

Young People Analysis Division - YCS and Next Steps Study,

W606, Moorfoot, Sheffield, S1 4PQ.

0114 259 1180

For information about the Next Steps Study go to

[www.nextstepsstudy.org.uk](http://www.nextstepsstudy.org.uk) or

<http://www.esds.ac.uk/longitudinal/access/lstype/>

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

>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Iain Noble

>Sent: 23 January 2008 14:23

>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

>Subject: Re: Kohut profile in the Washington Examiner

>

>So non-response bias is a not 'a technical reason'?

>

>Iain Noble

>Department for Children, Schools and Families

>Young People Analysis Division - YCS and Next Steps Study,

>W606, Moorfoot, Sheffield, S1 4PQ.

>0114 259 1180

>For information about the Next Steps Study go to

>www.nextstepsstudy.org.uk or

><http://www.esds.ac.uk/longitudinal/access/lstype/>

>

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

>>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Safir, Adam - BLS

>>Sent: 23 January 2008 13:52

>>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

>>Subject: Kohut profile in the Washington Examiner

>>

>>For those interested, today's Washington Examiner features a "Power

>>Profile" of Andrew Kohut:

>>

>><[http://www.examiner.com/printa-1174329~Power\\_Profile:\\_Andrew\\_Kohut.htm](http://www.examiner.com/printa-1174329~Power_Profile:_Andrew_Kohut.htm)

m

>l

>>>

>>

>>Adam Safir

>>U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics

>>safir.adam@bls.gov

>>(202) 691-5175

>>

>>-----

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

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

>>signoff aapornet

>>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>>

>>This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the

Government

>Secure

>>Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless in partnership

>with MessageLabs.

>>(CCTM Certificate Number 2007/11/0032.) In case of problems, please

>call your

>>organisation's IT Helpdesk.

>>Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored

>and/or recorded for

>>legal purposes.

>  
>The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government  
Secure Intranet virus  
>scanning service supplied by Cable&Wireless in partnership with  
MessageLabs. (CCTM  
>Certificate Number 2007/11/0032.) On leaving the GSi this email was  
certified virus free.  
>Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored  
and/or recorded for  
>legal purposes.

>  
>-----  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>signoff aapornet  
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>  
>This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the Government  
Secure  
>Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless in partnership  
with MessageLabs.  
>(CCTM Certificate Number 2007/11/0032.) In case of problems, please  
call your  
>organisation's IT Helpdesk.  
>Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored  
and/or recorded for  
>legal purposes.

The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure  
Intranet virus scanning service supplied by Cable&Wireless in partnership with  
MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2007/11/0032.) On leaving the GSi this  
email was certified virus free.  
Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or  
recorded for legal purposes.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Wed, 23 Jan 2008 12:22:14 -0500  
Reply-To: Paul J Lavrakas PhD <[pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET](mailto:pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Paul J Lavrakas PhD <[pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET](mailto:pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET)>  
Subject: Re: Kohut profile in the Washington Examiner  
Comments: To: [Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK](mailto:Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK), [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[8CD5D9A623A40E4BAB9DD7531EBDEDBB0465A1A7@MFEXC01.AD.HQ.DEPT](mailto:8CD5D9A623A40E4BAB9DD7531EBDEDBB0465A1A7@MFEXC01.AD.HQ.DEPT)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

My past survey experience suggests the response rates among that lower  
educational white cohort is about 30%-45% of what it is for higher

educational attainment whites. That is, the upper educational cohort is about 2-3 times more likely to cooperate than the low educational cohort in telephone polls.

Not sure if this differential would make up the difference you are asking about or whether the pre-primary polls were weighting for educational attainment.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Iain Noble  
Sent: Wednesday, January 23, 2008 10:36 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: Kohut profile in the Washington Examiner

And while I'm on the subject, has anyone estimated anything like what percentage difference in response rates between 'poorer, less-educated white voters' and 'wealthier, better-educated whites' would need to be (assuming that the preferences of both split the same as in the collected data) to account for a single percentage point in the difference between poll predicted and actual votes in NH?

Iain Noble  
Department for Children, Schools and Families Young People Analysis Division  
- YCS and Next Steps Study, W606, Moorfoot, Sheffield, S1 4PQ.  
0114 259 1180  
For information about the Next Steps Study go to [www.nextstepsstudy.org.uk](http://www.nextstepsstudy.org.uk)  
or <http://www.esds.ac.uk/longitudinal/access/lstype/>

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

>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Iain Noble  
>Sent: 23 January 2008 14:23  
>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
>Subject: Re: Kohut profile in the Washington Examiner

>  
>So non-response bias is a not 'a technical reason'?

>  
>Iain Noble  
>Department for Children, Schools and Families Young People Analysis  
>Division - YCS and Next Steps Study, W606, Moorfoot, Sheffield, S1 4PQ.  
>0114 259 1180  
>For information about the Next Steps Study go to  
>[www.nextstepsstudy.org.uk](http://www.nextstepsstudy.org.uk) or  
><http://www.esds.ac.uk/longitudinal/access/lstype/>

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

>>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Safir, Adam - BLS  
>>Sent: 23 January 2008 13:52  
>>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
>>Subject: Kohut profile in the Washington Examiner

>>  
>>For those interested, today's Washington Examiner features a "Power Profile" of Andrew Kohut:



>>  
>><[http://www.examiner.com/printa-1174329~Power\\_Profile:\\_Andrew\\_Kohut.htm](http://www.examiner.com/printa-1174329~Power_Profile:_Andrew_Kohut.htm)  
>>m  
>>l  
>>>>  
>>  
>>Adam Safir  
>>U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics  
>>safir.adam@bls.gov  
>>(202) 691-5175  
>>  
>>-----  
>>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>>Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>>signoff aapornet  
>>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>>  
>>This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the  
Government  
>Secure  
>>Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless in partnership  
>with MessageLabs.  
>>(CCTM Certificate Number 2007/11/0032.) In case of problems, please  
>call your  
>>organisation's IT Helpdesk.  
>>Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored  
>and/or recorded for  
>>legal purposes.  
>  
>The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government  
Secure Intranet virus  
>scanning service supplied by Cable&Wireless in partnership with  
MessageLabs. (CCTM  
>Certificate Number 2007/11/0032.) On leaving the GSi this email was  
certified virus free.  
>Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored  
and/or recorded for  
>legal purposes.  
>  
>-----  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>signoff aapornet  
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>  
>This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the Government  
Secure  
>Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless in partnership  
with MessageLabs.  
>(CCTM Certificate Number 2007/11/0032.) In case of problems, please  
call your  
>organisation's IT Helpdesk.  
>Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored  
and/or recorded for

>legal purposes.

The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intranet virus scanning service supplied by Cable&Wireless in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2007/11/0032.) On leaving the GSi this email was certified virus free.

Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Wed, 23 Jan 2008 12:34:17 -0600  
Reply-To: Peter Miller <[p-miller@NORTHWESTERN.EDU](mailto:p-miller@NORTHWESTERN.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Peter Miller <[p-miller@NORTHWESTERN.EDU](mailto:p-miller@NORTHWESTERN.EDU)>  
Subject: Call for Papers -- Special Issue of POQ on Web 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: 7bit  
Content-Disposition: inline

\*Call for Papers for a Special Issue of Public Opinion Quarterly

\*

\*

\*\*Internet Survey Methods

\*

\*

\* \*Mick P. Couper and Peter V. Miller

\*

\*Guest Editors

\*

\*Public Opinion Quarterly\* seeks submissions for a special issue of the journal devoted to papers focusing on Internet surveys. The issue is scheduled for publication in December, 2008. We welcome full-length articles and research notes on the topic of Internet or Web surveys. Topics of interest include, but are not limited to, implications of (non)coverage for inference from Internet surveys; alternative methods of selecting samples for Internet surveys; comparisons of probability-based and self-selected methods; response rates, nonresponse error, and ways to enhance recruitment for Internet surveys; the design of Internet survey instruments; the use of Internet surveys in mixed mode designs; and mode comparisons involving Internet surveys.

The deadline for manuscript submissions is \*June 2, 2008\*. To submit a manuscript, please follow the manuscript preparation instructions provided at the journal's website, <http://poq.oupjournals.org>. Blinded and unblinded copies of the manuscript should be submitted online at <http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/poq>. Please indicate "Special Issue" on the title page of the submission and in your cover letter. Submissions will be peer reviewed in accord with normal journal practice.

Address any questions to the editorial office: [poq@northwestern.edu](mailto:poq@northwestern.edu).

--

Peter V. Miller  
Department of Communication Studies  
Northwestern University  
Editor, Public Opinion Quarterly  
[p-miller@northwestern.edu](mailto:p-miller@northwestern.edu)

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Wed, 23 Jan 2008 15:11:45 -0500  
Reply-To: Lisa Lin <[lilin@IMPAQINT.COM](mailto:lilin@IMPAQINT.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Lisa Lin <[lilin@IMPAQINT.COM](mailto:lilin@IMPAQINT.COM)>  
Subject: Job Opportunity: Survey Center Assistant Manager (eve)  
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

IMPAQ International, LLC specializes in providing exemplary research and consulting services for social program evaluations, economic research and policy analysis in the United States and throughout the world. IMPAQ is located in Columbia, MD between Baltimore and Washington DC. Telephone interviewing is an opportunity to assist in collecting the data needed for multiple federal social science research projects. The Survey Center Assistant Manager is essential to the efficient and effective day-to-day operation of the Survey Center. The Survey Center Assistant Manager is responsible for the evening and weekend operations, ensuring efficiency and productivity of Survey Center operations on a regular, shift-by-shift basis.=20

#### Responsibilities:

- \* Provides leadership to the ongoing Survey Center operations; serves as manager of the evening and weekend shift operations; provides onsite supervision and monitors operations on a regularly scheduled basis; ensures shift schedules have sufficient interviewer capacity on duty to meet production objectives; delegates, with oversight, work-related

tasks; initiates and manages regular and ad hoc meetings with supervisors and interviewers; and oversees performance monitoring to ensure production levels and survey accuracy.

- \* As a member of the Survey Center Management team, works in close collaboration with management staff to ensure that evening/weekend shift activities are effectively integrated into overall Survey Center operations; provides ongoing communication, input, and feedback on issues and concerns impacting evening/weekend shift operations.=20

- \* Serves as Survey Center lead for technical data issues and activities; e.g., provides Survey Center Manager with current, accurate information to facilitate project monitoring; oversees quality of data collection; troubleshoots technical issues, answering project-related questions; ensures project-defined protocol/procedures are followed, uploads sample for survey; develops and implements validation protocol, designs and develops Survey Center reports, establishes and maintains databases, etc.

- \* Works with IT staff to ensure technical issues involving, e.g., phone capabilities, scheduler and dialer, etc., are resolved timely. Works with programmers to address Survey Center needs.

- \* Manages employee performance; obtains input regarding employee performance and provides formal feedback on a regular basis; evaluates and coaches employees on their developmental needs; encourages and motivates supervisors and interviewers to achieve maximum productivity in a pleasant work environment.=20

- \* Manages time and attendance; ensures employee compliance with time and attendance policies and procedures; reviews and approves timesheets on a daily basis; approves or denies leave requests; manages leave requests to ensure adequate work coverage during employee absences.=20

- \* Manages employee conduct; handles performance issues as needed; works with subordinate supervisors to establish and administer Performance Improvement Plans; advises and ensures employee compliance with company policies, procedures and guidelines; implements progressive discipline as needed.=20

#### Required Qualifications:

##### Experience

- \* College graduate or equivalent experience;
- \* Knowledge of principles and processes of survey research/CATI a significant plus;
- \* SQL Server familiarity and/or experience with relational databases a plus.
- \* Prior call center or production environment management experience preferred

##### Skills

- \* Must have excellent oral communication and comprehension skills
- \* Must work well as a team leader and team player.=20

- \* Must be able to manage production schedules and productivity requirements
- \* Must be able to multi-task
- \* Bilingual in English and Spanish a plus

#### Work Schedule

\* Full-time position. Work schedule includes evenings and weekend hours on a regularly scheduled basis.=20

Interested individuals should send their resume via e-mail to: [ccinterviewers@impaqint.com](mailto:ccinterviewers@impaqint.com) <<mailto:ccinterviewers@impaqint.com>> , or by fax to (443) 367-0477. Please reference "Survey Center Assistant Manager."

=20

I-Chun (Lisa) Lin

IMPAQ International

10420 Little Patuxent Parkway, Suite 310

Columbia, MD 21044

Tel: 443 367 0088 x228

Direct: 443 539 1396

Fax: 443 367 0026

[www.impaqint.com](http://www.impaqint.com)

[llin@impaqint.com](mailto:llin@impaqint.com)=20

=20

The information contained in this communication may be confidential, is intended only for the use of the recipient named above, and may be privileged. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication, or any of its contents, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender, by return e-mail and delete the original.

=20

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

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Thu, 24 Jan 2008 13:30:26 -0500

Reply-To: Mark Lindeman <lindeman@BARD.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mark Lindeman <lindeman@BARD.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Citizen exit polling  
Comments: To: Eric Plutzer <exp12@PSU.EDU>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
In-Reply-To: <7.0.1.0.2.20080121165623.04563ca0@psu.edu>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

At 05:07 PM 1/21/2008, Eric Plutzer wrote:

>Colleagues,

>

>I have some recollection of posts to AAPORNET describing a citizen's  
>group conducting their own exit polls during the 2006 and perhaps  
>2004 elections -- perhaps in New Mexico?

Eric, in addition to work mentioned in earlier responses, there have been efforts at what are sometimes called election verification exit polls. E.g.  
[http://www.electionintegrity.org/reports/exit\\_poll\\_first\\_report.shtml](http://www.electionintegrity.org/reports/exit_poll_first_report.shtml)

Similar in intent are "parallel elections." E.g.,  
<http://www.protectcaliforniaballots.org/Pages/whatis.html>

Mark Lindeman  
Bard College

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Thu, 24 Jan 2008 12:36:33 -0700  
Reply-To: Sandie Edwards <sandie.edwards@HSC.UTAH.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Sandie Edwards <sandie.edwards@HSC.UTAH.EDU>  
Subject: Job Opportunity: Research Project Manager - National Children's Study

Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Research Project Manager - National Children's Study

The Department of Pediatrics in the University Of Utah School Of Medicine has an immediate opening for a Research Project Manager for the National Children's Study (NCS). The NCS is the largest long-term study ever undertaken on children's health and development. The NCS will evaluate environmental factors to determine the root causes of many major childhood and adult diseases. In Salt Lake County, and in 100 diverse communities across the country, teams will observe 100,000 children from before birth to age 21 to determine how these factors such as air, water, dust, what children eat, how they are cared for,

neighborhood safety, health care and other environmental factors affect their health and well being. Salt Lake County is one of seven Vanguard Centers across the nation that will be participating in the NCS. Additional Study Centers are being established in Utah and the contiguous states and will work closely with the Salt Lake County Vanguard Center. For additional information about the NCS, please visit <http://www.nationalchildrensstudy.gov/>.

**Excellent Location:** Year round activities, majestic mountains, vibrant city-life, and incredible outdoor opportunities (including world-class skiing, climbing, hiking, biking, & fishing).

**Work-Life Balance:** Focus on both work and play, family friendly environment, easy transportation, wellness program, great benefits package, and competitive salary commensurate with experience.

**Longevity & Stability:** Opportunity to start in at the beginning of something great. This project is NIH funded and will continue for the next 28 years.

**Inspirational Study:** Easy to be inspired and passionate about this study of maternal/child health which will have a significant national impact on children's health in the future. This study will help improve children's health and well being and also discover root causes of many childhood and adult diseases.

**Mentorship Legacy:** Make a difference. Incumbent will oversee the NCS Salt Lake Vanguard Center, Cache County Study Center and other Study Centers as they are established. Opportunity to leave a legacy by mentoring, training, and succession planning.

**Collegial:** Very collegial department. Pediatricians are the best to work with.

The Research Project Manager will work closely with the Principal Investigator (PI) and Project Director in accomplishing study objectives for the NCS. Responsibilities include:

- \* Coordinating the implementation, quality assurance, and completion of study objectives for the NCS; assuring regulatory compliance, participant safety, and data quality.
- \* Managing, training and overseeing the work effort of a large data collection team comprised of research coordinators and field and clinic research staff for the Salt Lake County Vanguard Center, Cache County Study Center, and other study centers as they are established.
- \* Coordinating interactions with the Environmental Sampling Team, and overseeing the Biological Samples Procurement Teams, and field data and sample collection.
- \* Together with the PI, Project Director and Senior Investigators, serves as a liaison between the NCS Vanguard Center (VC), other Study locations, operational team, physicians, participants and others associated with the Study.
- \* Frequent travel to all Study locations is required.
- \* May assist with the development of study protocols by making

recommendations on the feasibility of using certain protocols and procedures.

The requirements are:

Master's degree in Epidemiology, Public Health with emphasis in Epidemiology, other health science field or equivalency; plus six years of progressively more responsible experience managing field research in epidemiological, clinical or basic sciences, and with longitudinal studies. Experience must include:

- \* Management of large field data collection teams
- \* Leadership and Management (recruitment, training, mentoring and development, staffing utilization, etc), Recruitment of study participants and field team coordination
- \* Knowledge of field research methods and data collection procedures.
- \* Incumbent must possess effective organizational, problem solving, human relations and effective
- \* Knowledge of National Institutes of Health (NIH), Department of Health and Human Services and Institutional Review Board (IRB) requirements and guidelines.

This is a full-time, fully benefited position. Salary will be commensurate with education and experience. The University of Utah offers competitive wages and an excellent benefits package. For more information on our benefits package, please visit <http://www.hr.utah.edu/ben/>. Equal opportunity employer.

Interested applicants can apply by sending a letter of interest and resume or CV to [Debbie.gabaldon@hsc.utah.edu](mailto:Debbie.gabaldon@hsc.utah.edu).

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Fri, 25 Jan 2008 06:33:04 -0500  
Reply-To: Paul J Lavrakas PhD <[pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET](mailto:pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Paul J Lavrakas PhD <[pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET](mailto:pjlavrak@OPTONLINE.NET)>  
Subject: POQ's special issue on Cell Phone Numbers and Telephone Surveying in the U.S.  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Comments: cc: "Ganley, Erin" <[erin.ganley@oxfordjournals.org](mailto:erin.ganley@oxfordjournals.org)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Available now - POQ's special issue on Cell Phone Numbers and Telephone



Surveying in the U.S.

The latest special issue of POQ looks into the growing number of Americans who only use cell phones and the effect of this trend on surveying. Articles included in this free-access issue address topics such as the possible future inaccuracy of surveys using only landlines, the effect of the rising percentage of cell-only households on surveys, and the decline in younger respondents in landline-only surveys.

Click here to start reading: <http://www.oxfordjournals.org/page/3122/1>

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

-----  
Date: Fri, 25 Jan 2008 09:06:35 -0500

Reply-To: Pat Lewis <[plewis@AAPOR.ORG](mailto:plewis@AAPOR.ORG)>

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

From: Pat Lewis <[plewis@AAPOR.ORG](mailto:plewis@AAPOR.ORG)>

Subject: AAPOR Adds Election Polling Resource Page to Website

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

Content-Disposition: inline

fyi -- We've added a new page to the site that pulls together election polling related resources -- AAPOR's and others -- in one place -- <http://www.aapor.org/electionpollingresources2>

If you have any comments or suggestions about the page, please let me know.

--

Pat Lewis

Communications Director

American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR)

1405 North George Mason Drive

Arlington, Virginia

703.527-5245

cell 703.201.5070

[www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org)

AAPOR -- the leading association of public opinion and survey research professionals.

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Fri, 25 Jan 2008 09:53:43 -0500  
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: AAPOR Adds Election Polling Resource Page to Website  
Comments: To: Pat Lewis <[plewis@AAPOR.ORG](mailto:plewis@AAPOR.ORG)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[843d88cd0801250606j7e3d1572kfb37ec13124ec6cd@mail.gmail.com](mailto:843d88cd0801250606j7e3d1572kfb37ec13124ec6cd@mail.gmail.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

This is excellent!

Jan Werner

---

Pat Lewis wrote:

> fyi -- We've added a new page to the site that pulls together election  
> polling related resources -- AAPOR's and others -- in one place --  
> <http://www.aapor.org/electionpollingresources2>  
>  
> If you have any comments or suggestions about the page, please let me know.  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Fri, 25 Jan 2008 12:56:35 -0500  
Reply-To: "Thomas P. Duffy" <[Thomas.P.Duffy.Jr@MACROINTERNATIONAL.COM](mailto:Thomas.P.Duffy.Jr@MACROINTERNATIONAL.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Thomas P. Duffy" <[Thomas.P.Duffy.Jr@MACROINTERNATIONAL.COM](mailto:Thomas.P.Duffy.Jr@MACROINTERNATIONAL.COM)>

Subject: Macro's cell phone omnibus  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Posted on behalf of a colleague.

=20

Tom

---

=20

=20

The second round of MacroPoll Wireless is postponed. We now expect the survey to run in February. There's still space on the survey so please contact me if you are interested.

=20

Please contact me at [randal.zuwallack@macrointernational.com](mailto:randal.zuwallack@macrointernational.com) or at 802-863-9600 for more information on the revised schedule, purchasing some questions, or methodology and content. =20

=20

Thanks and I hope to hear from you.

=20

Randy

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

---

Date: Mon, 28 Jan 2008 11:13:41 +0100

Reply-To: Marek Fuchs <[marek.fuchs@UNI-KASSEL.DE](mailto:marek.fuchs@UNI-KASSEL.DE)>

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

From: Marek Fuchs <[marek.fuchs@UNI-KASSEL.DE](mailto:marek.fuchs@UNI-KASSEL.DE)>

Subject: Call for papers - children as respondents

Comments: To: [SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU](mailto:SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU), [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu),  
[methoden@mailman.uni-konstanz.de](mailto:methoden@mailman.uni-konstanz.de)

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Children as Respondents in Surveys – Methodological Aspects

Session on the occasion of the 7th International Conference of the Research Committee on Logic and Methodology of the International Sociological Association

(ISA) hosted in Naples (Italy) September 1-5, 2008

Conference homepage:

<http://www.rc332008.unina.it/>

Deadline for the submission of abstracts to the session organizer: February 11, 2008.

In Recent years, many surveys have addressed samples of children and adolescents. Today, their behaviors, attitudes and beliefs are predominantly collected directly from them. By contrast, proxy-reporting from parents or other caretakers is no longer seen as a sufficient technique of data collection. Children and adolescents are assumed to be competent respondents who can speak for themselves and who are often more knowledgeable about their own activities.

Collecting data directly from them will likely improve data quality. By contrast, the literature has shown that children and adolescents respond to standardized questionnaires based on limited cognitive capacities and still developing social skills. Assuming a negative effect of the limited cognitive and social abilities on the question answer process, the quality of data obtained from children and adolescents has been questioned.

This session aims to provide a forum for researchers interested in methodological aspects of surveys among children and juveniles. Papers on a variety of methodological topics are invited. Among others-but not exclusively, the following topics would be suitable for the session: sampling issues, non-response, measurement error, parental consent, incentives, survey modes for samples of children and juveniles.

Please send abstracts of around 250 (max. 500) words to the session organizer by February 11, 2008.

Contact:

--

Prof. Dr. Marek Fuchs  
Universität Kassel  
FB Gesellschaftswissenschaften  
Professur für empirische Sozialforschung  
34109 Kassel  
Germany  
+49.561.804-3102 (fon)  
+49.561.804-3464 (fax)  
marek.fuchs@uni-kassel.de

-----

This mail sent through <http://www.uni-kassel.de/www-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 this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====

Date: Mon, 28 Jan 2008 11:15:36 +0100

Reply-To: Marek Fuchs <[marek.fuchs@UNI-KASSEL.DE](mailto:marek.fuchs@UNI-KASSEL.DE)>

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

From: Marek Fuchs <[marek.fuchs@UNI-KASSEL.DE](mailto:marek.fuchs@UNI-KASSEL.DE)>

Subject: Call for papers - Mobile Phones and other ICT in Survey Data  
Collection

Comments: To: [SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU](mailto:SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU), [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu),  
[methoden@mailman.uni-konstanz.de](mailto:methoden@mailman.uni-konstanz.de)

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Mobile Phones and other ICTs for Survey Data Collection

Session on the occasion of the 7th International Conference of the Research  
Committee on Logic and Methodology of the International Sociological  
Association

(ISA) hosted in Naples (Italy) September 1-5, 2008

Conference homepage:

<http://www.rc332008.unina.it/>

Deadline for the submission of abstracts to the session organizer: February  
11,  
2008.

The technological advancements on the wireless communication market have  
influenced people's everyday life dramatically. Mobile phones and other  
wireless  
communications devices are becoming more and more popular and widely accepted.  
In developed countries the mobile penetration is approaching to the  
saturation.

Many of those mobile phones offer Internet access and video telephony, thus,  
allow researcher to approach potential respondent using multiple modes.

This offers many challenges and opportunities to expand the existing options  
of

the telephone survey methodology. However, at the same time many  
methodological

problems arise, from coverage, sampling, non-response to measurement error.  
Papers on a variety of methodological topics are invited. Among others-but not  
exclusively, the following topics would be suitable for the session:  
experiences

with surveys using mobile phones and other mobile devices in different countries, surveys conducted over messenger systems and voice-over-IP shall.

Please send abstracts of around 250 (max. 500) words to the session organizer by February 11, 2008.

Contact:

Prof. Dr. Marek Fuchs  
University of Kassel  
Social Science Department  
Nora-Platiel-Str. 1  
34109 Kassel  
Germany  
marek.fuchs@uni-kassel.de

---

This mail sent through <http://www.uni-kassel.de/www-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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Tue, 29 Jan 2008 10:31:23 -0500  
Reply-To: Nicole Sturges <[nls17@PSU.EDU](mailto:nls17@PSU.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nicole Sturges <[nls17@PSU.EDU](mailto:nls17@PSU.EDU)>  
Subject: Focus group recruiting  
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 am coordinating a series of focus group sessions on tobacco use and health in rural Pennsylvania. I am trying to recruit participants between the ages of 21 and 35. Does anyone have any suggestions for recruiting strategies that might help me with this demographic?

Thank you!

Nicole L. Sturges  
Project Coordinator

Penn State Harrisburg  
Center for Survey Research  
777 West Harrisburg Pike  
Middletown, PA 17057  
Phone: (717) 948-6117  
Fax: (717) 948-6306

<mailto:nls17@psu.edu> nls17@psu.edu

<http://csr.hbg.psu.edu/> http://csr.hbg.psu.edu

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Tue, 29 Jan 2008 17:00:22 -0500  
Reply-To: Richard Clark <[clark@CVIOG.UGA.EDU](mailto:clark@CVIOG.UGA.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Richard Clark <[clark@CVIOG.UGA.EDU](mailto:clark@CVIOG.UGA.EDU)>  
Organization: Carl Vinson Institute of Government  
Subject: Job posting  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

\*Research Professional II\*

\*Survey Research Unit\*

\*Carl Vinson Institute of Government\*

\*University\*\* of Georgia\*\*\*

The Carl Vinson Institute of Government at the University of Georgia invites applications for a Research Professional in the Survey Research Unit of the Research and Policy Analysis Division. Review of applications will begin immediately and continue until a qualified applicant is hired. This position seeks applicants with a Masters

degree, of a Bachelors and survey research experience.

Job summary:

Familiar with questionnaire design, basic sampling methods, and data analysis. Familiarity with SPSS is essential. The selected candidate will work in the Survey Research Unit, assisting faculty and working with external clients on survey research projects. Successful applicants will also demonstrate the ability to write clearly and concisely.

To apply, please visit the iPAWS University of Georgia employment web site (<http://www.hr.uga.edu/recruitment/employment/Employment.html>) -- \*see job #20080143\*. For more information about the Carl Vinson Institute of Government, visit our website (<http://www.cviog.uga.edu> <<http://www.cviog.uga.edu/>>).

The University of Georgia is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Institution.

--

---

Richard L. Clark, Ph.D.  
Survey Research Unit  
Governmental Services and Research Division  
Carl Vinson Institute of Government  
University of Georgia  
201 N. Milledge Avenue  
Athens, GA 30602  
Phone: 706-542-9404  
FAX: 706-542-9301

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Tue, 29 Jan 2008 22:27:00 -0500  
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: South Carolina polling?  
Comments: To: AAPORnet List server <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0



Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Content-Disposition: inline

Did I get this wrong, or were the results of the Democratic primary in SC last Saturday quite different than what the pre-election polls predicted? Is there a reason why this is not a subject of discussion here? In particular, doesn't Obama's showing in SC, which exceeded what the polls predicted, make the "Bradley/Wilder effect" thesis that was trotted out by some commentators on NH a bit less tenable?

Tom

PS: Pollster.com doesn't seem to be talking about this right now, either .

..

Thomas M. Guterbock                      Voice: (434)243-5223  
Director                      CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222  
Center for Survey Research              FAX: (434)982-5524  
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> .

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Tue, 29 Jan 2008 22:36:08 -0500

Reply-To: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <[tmg1p@cms.mail.virginia.edu](mailto:tmg1p@cms.mail.virginia.edu)>

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

From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <[tmg1p@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU](mailto:tmg1p@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU)>

Subject: Re: South Carolina polling?

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

In-Reply-To: <[12376015.1201645620@\[192.168.0.5\]](mailto:12376015.1201645620@[192.168.0.5])>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Disposition: inline

Correction: I see now that Charles Franklin has indeed posted about the amount of error in SC on pollster.com. He shows that the error was far greater in SC than in NH, but that nobody got it wrong about Obama taking first place despite the large inaccuracies in estimating the percentage of the vote he would receive. He suggests that the errors got less media attention than NH because expectations about Obama winning were not overturned by the actual result.

You can read Franklin at:

[http://www.pollster.com/blogs/south\\_carolina\\_poll\\_errors.php](http://www.pollster.com/blogs/south_carolina_poll_errors.php)

Very cool graphs in there, BTW.

Tom

--On Tuesday, January 29, 2008 10:27 PM -0500 "Thomas M. Guterbock"  
<tmglp@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU> wrote:

- > Did I get this wrong, or were the results of the Democratic primary in SC
- > last Saturday quite different than what the pre-election polls predicted?
- > Is there a reason why this is not a subject of discussion here? In
- > particular, doesn't Obama's showing in SC, which exceeded what the polls
- > predicted, make the "Bradley/Wilder effect" thesis that was trotted out
- > by some commentators on NH a bit less tenable?

Tom

- >
- > PS: Pollster.com doesn't seem to be talking about this right now, either
- > ...

> Thomas M. Guterbock                      Voice: (434)243-5223  
> Director                                  CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222  
> Center for Survey Research              FAX: (434)982-5524  
> 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> .
- > Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:
- > signoff aapornet
- > Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Thomas M. Guterbock                      Voice: (434)243-5223  
Director                                  CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222  
Center for Survey Research              FAX: (434)982-5524  
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> .
- Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:
- signoff aapornet
- Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date:        Tue, 29 Jan 2008 23:19:34 -0500  
Reply-To:    "Murray, Patrick" <[pdmurray@MONMOUTH.EDU](mailto:pdmurray@MONMOUTH.EDU)>  
Sender:      AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From:        "Murray, Patrick" <[pdmurray@MONMOUTH.EDU](mailto:pdmurray@MONMOUTH.EDU)>  
Subject:     Re: South Carolina polling?  
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

My guess is that black voters who refuse to speak to pollsters are much =  
less likely to vote for a white candidate than black voters who do =  
participate in polls. Perhaps Andy Kohut can clear this up.

Patrick Murray  
Monmouth University

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

From: AAPORNET on behalf of Thomas M. Guterbock

Sent: Tue 1/29/2008 10:36 PM

To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

Subject: Re: South Carolina polling?

=20

Correction: I see now that Charles Franklin has indeed posted about the =  
amount of error in SC on pollster.com. He shows that the error was far=20  
greater in SC than in NH, but that nobody got it wrong about Obama =  
taking first place despite the large inaccuracies in estimating the =  
percentage of=20

the vote he would receive. He suggests that the errors got less media =  
attention than NH because expectations about Obama winning were not=20  
overturned by the actual result. You can read Franklin at: =  
[http://www.pollster.com/blogs/south\\_carolina\\_poll\\_errors.php](http://www.pollster.com/blogs/south_carolina_poll_errors.php)

Very cool graphs in there, BTW.

Tom

--On Tuesday, January 29, 2008 10:27 PM -0500 "Thomas M. Guterbock" =  
wrote:

> Did I get this wrong, or were the results of the Democratic primary in =  
SC last Saturday quite different than what the pre-election polls =  
predicted?

> Is there a reason why this is not a subject of discussion here? In =  
particular, doesn't Obama's showing in SC, which exceeded what the polls  
> predicted, make the "Bradley/Wilder effect" thesis that was trotted =  
out by some commentators on NH a bit less tenable?

Tom

>

> PS: Pollster.com doesn't seem to be talking about this right now, =  
either

> ...

>

> Thomas M. Guterbock                      Voice: (434)243-5223  
> Director                                  CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222  
> Center for Survey Research                FAX: (434)982-5524  
> 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> .

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

signoff aapornet

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Wed, 30 Jan 2008 04:29:07 +0000

Reply-To: "mail@marketsharescorp.com" <[mkshares@COMCAST.NET](mailto:mkshares@COMCAST.NET)>

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

From: "mail@marketsharescorp.com" <[mkshares@COMCAST.NET](mailto:mkshares@COMCAST.NET)>

Subject: Re: South Carolina polling?

Comments: To: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <[tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu](mailto:tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)

Comments: cc: [nickp@marketsharescorp.com](mailto:nickp@marketsharescorp.com)

Higher errors in SC got less attention simply because they got the right winners. That's all there is to it.

SC and NH Dem primary polls were the only ones so far where polls were off - for obvious reasons.

Successes include FL tonight. Congratulations FL pollsters!

I don't get 5 rings from 10 rings in Franklin's charts. But watch out for margin error differences; i.e., polls minus election margins. Divide those errors by two to get the estimate error, the only error that counts.

Here is the drill.

1. Elections are zero-sum games. This means that two points high for one candidate MEANS two points low for the other. So estimate error is the more valid measure. Estimate errors are not additive which is the effect of using the difference between election and poll margins.

2. This is also the only error measure that can be compared with sample margin of error always included in poll reports. Whatever method is used, it should be comparable to stated statistical margin error. Only error of the estimates does that.

All for now.

Nick

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

From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <[tmglp@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU](mailto:tmglp@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU)>

> Correction: I see now that Charles Franklin has indeed posted about the  
> amount of error in SC on pollster.com. He shows that the error was far  
> greater in SC than in NH, but that nobody got it wrong about Obama taking  
> first place despite the large inaccuracies in estimating the percentage of  
> the vote he would receive. He suggests that the errors got less media  
> attention than NH because expectations about Obama winning were not  
> overturned by the actual result.

> You can read Franklin at:

> [http://www.pollster.com/blogs/south\\_carolina\\_poll\\_errors.php](http://www.pollster.com/blogs/south_carolina_poll_errors.php)

> Very cool graphs in there, BTW.

>  
> Tom  
>  
> --On Tuesday, January 29, 2008 10:27 PM -0500 "Thomas M. Guterbock"  
> <tmglp@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU> wrote:  
>  
>> Did I get this wrong, or were the results of the Democratic primary in SC  
>> last Saturday quite different than what the pre-election polls predicted?  
>> Is there a reason why this is not a subject of discussion here? In  
>> particular, doesn't Obama's showing in SC, which exceeded what the polls  
>> predicted, make the "Bradley/Wilder effect" thesis that was trotted out  
>> by some commentators on NH a bit less tenable?

> Tom  
>>  
>> PS: Pollster.com doesn't seem to be talking about this right now, either  
>> ...

>> Thomas M. Guterbock                      Voice: (434)243-5223  
>> Director                                  CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222  
>> Center for Survey Research              FAX: (434)982-5524  
>> 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> .  
>> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>> signoff aapornet  
>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

> Thomas M. Guterbock                      Voice: (434)243-5223  
> Director                                  CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222  
> Center for Survey Research              FAX: (434)982-5524  
> 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> .  
> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
> signoff aapornet  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Tue, 29 Jan 2008 23:11:32 -0800  
Reply-To: Douglas Rivers <doug@POLIMETRIX.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Douglas Rivers <doug@POLIMETRIX.COM>  
Subject: Re: South Carolina polling?  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
In-Reply-To:  
<013020080429.28221.479FFD130008CE2300006E3D22007374789C0A9D0E089C0503@comcast.net>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII; format=flowed; delsp=yes  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Mime-Version: 1.0 (Apple Message framework v915)

This does not explain the problem, since the standard error of the lead is always less than the sum of the standard errors. To see this, let  $p$  and  $q$  be the proportions supporting two candidates so

$$\begin{aligned}\text{var}(\text{lead}) &= \text{var}(p - q) = \text{var}(p) + \text{var}(q) - 2 \text{cov}(p, q) \\ &= [p(1-p) + q(1-q) + 2pq]/n \\ &\leq [p(1-p) + q(1-q) + 2 \sqrt{p(1-p)q(1-q)}]/n \\ &= [\text{s.e.}(p) + \text{s.e.}(q)]^2\end{aligned}$$

and taking square roots. (This is just Minkowski's inequality.) The same result goes through with finite population corrections and design effects. Thus, you can add the standard errors or MOE's for the proportions and get a (slightly) conservative s.e. or MOE for the lead.

Doug Rivers

On Jan 29, 2008, at 8:29 PM, mail@marketsharescorp.com wrote:

- > Higher errors in SC got less attention simply because they got the
- > right winners. That's all there is to it.
- >
- > SC and NH Dem primary polls were the only ones so far where polls
- > were off - for obvious reasons.
- >
- > Successes include FL tonight. Congratulations FL pollsters!
- >
- > I don't get 5 rings from 10 rings in Franklin's charts. But watch
- > out for margin error differences; i.e., polls minus election
- > margins. Divide those errors by two to get the estimate error, the
- > only error that counts.
- >
- > Here is the drill.
- >
- > 1. Elections are zero-sum games. This means that two points high for
- > one candidate MEANS two points low for the other. So estimate error
- > is the more valid measure. Estimate errors are not additive which is

> the effect of using the difference between election and poll margins.

>

> 2. This is also the only error measure that can be compared with  
> sample margin of error always included in poll reports. Whatever  
> method is used, it should be comparable to stated statistical margin  
> error. Only error of the estimates does that.

>

> All for now.

>

> Nick

>

> ----- Original message -----

> From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmglp@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU>

>> Correction: I see now that Charles Franklin has indeed posted

>> about the

>> amount of error in SC on pollster.com. He shows that the error was

>> far

>> greater in SC than in NH, but that nobody got it wrong about Obama

>> taking

>> first place despite the large inaccuracies in estimating the

>> percentage of

>> the vote he would receive. He suggests that the errors got less

>> media

>> attention than NH because expectations about Obama winning were not

>> overturned by the actual result.

>> You can read Franklin at:

>> [http://www.pollster.com/blogs/south\\_carolina\\_poll\\_errors.php](http://www.pollster.com/blogs/south_carolina_poll_errors.php)

>> Very cool graphs in there, BTW.

>>

>> Tom

>>

>> --On Tuesday, January 29, 2008 10:27 PM -0500 "Thomas M. Guterbock"

>> <tmglp@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU> wrote:

>>

>>> Did I get this wrong, or were the results of the Democratic

>>> primary in SC

>>> last Saturday quite different than what the pre-election polls

>>> predicted?

>>> Is there a reason why this is not a subject of discussion here? In

>>> particular, doesn't Obama's showing in SC, which exceeded what the

>>> polls

>>> predicted, make the "Bradley/Wilder effect" thesis that was

>>> trotted out

>>> by some commentators on NH a bit less tenable?

>> Tom

>>>

>>> PS: Pollster.com doesn't seem to be talking about this right now,

>>> either

>>> ...

>>>

>>>

>>> Thomas M. Guterbock                      Voice: (434)243-5223

>>> Director                                  CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222

>>> Center for Survey Research                      FAX: (434)982-5524  
>>> 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> .  
>>> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>>> signoff aapornet  
>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>>> Thomas M. Guterbock                      Voice: (434)243-5223  
>>> Director                      CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222  
>>> Center for Survey Research                      FAX: (434)982-5524  
>>> 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> .  
>>> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>>> signoff aapornet  
>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>>> -----  
>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>>> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>>> signoff aapornet  
>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Douglas Rivers, Ph.D.  
President & CEO  
YouGov/Polimetrix  
285 Hamilton Ave., Suite 200  
Palo Alto, CA 94301  
(650) 462-8002  
[doug@polimetrix.com](mailto:doug@polimetrix.com)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Date:            Wed, 30 Jan 2008 12:34:06 +0000  
Reply-To:        "mail@marketsharescorp.com" <[mkshares@COMCAST.NET](mailto:mkshares@COMCAST.NET)>  
Sender:          AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From:            "mail@marketsharescorp.com" <[mkshares@COMCAST.NET](mailto:mkshares@COMCAST.NET)>  
Subject:         Re: South Carolina polling?  
Comments: To:    Douglas Rivers <[doug@POLIMETRIX.COM](mailto:doug@POLIMETRIX.COM)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)



Back up a minute.

Poll said Smith was ahead of Jones 50% to 42%. 8 point lead for Smith.  
Election showed Smith won 52% to 48%. Smith won by a 4 point margin.  
By how points was the poll off the mark?

Nick

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

From: Douglas Rivers <doug@POLIMETRIX.COM>

> This does not explain the problem, since the standard error of the  
> lead is always less than the sum of the standard errors. To see this,  
> let p and q be the proportions supporting two candidates so

>  
>  $\text{var}(\text{lead}) = \text{var}(p - q) = \text{var}(p) + \text{var}(q) - 2 \text{cov}(p, q)$   
>  $= [p(1-p) + q(1-q) + 2pq]/n$   
>  $\leq [p(1-p) + q(1-q) + 2 \sqrt{p(1-p)q(1-q)}]/n$   
>  $= [\text{s.e.}(p) + \text{s.e.}(q)]^2$

>  
> and taking square roots. (This is just Minkowski's inequality.) The  
> same result goes through with finite population corrections and design  
> effects. Thus, you can add the standard errors or MOE's for the  
> proportions and get a (slightly) conservative s.e. or MOE for the lead.

>  
> Doug Rivers

>  
>  
>  
>  
> On Jan 29, 2008, at 8:29 PM, mail@marketsharescorp.com wrote:

>  
>> Higher errors in SC got less attention simply because they got the  
>> right winners. That's all there is to it.

>>  
>> SC and NH Dem primary polls were the only ones so far where polls  
>> were off - for obvious reasons.

>>  
>> Successes include FL tonight. Congratulations FL pollsters!

>>  
>> I don't get 5 rings from 10 rings in Franklin's charts. But watch  
>> out for margin error differences; i.e., polls minus election  
>> margins. Divide those errors by two to get the estimate error, the  
>> only error that counts.

>>  
>> Here is the drill.

>>  
>> 1. Elections are zero-sum games. This means that two points high for  
>> one candidate MEANS two points low for the other. So estimate error  
>> is the more valid measure. Estimate errors are not additive which is  
>> the effect of using the difference between election and poll margins.

>>  
>> 2. This is also the only error measure that can be compared with  
>> sample margin of error always included in poll reports. Whatever

>> method is used, it should be comparable to stated statistical margin  
>> error. Only error of the estimates does that.  
>>  
>> All for now.  
>>  
>> Nick  
>>  
>> ----- Original message -----  
>> From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmg1p@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU>  
>>> Correction: I see now that Charles Franklin has indeed posted  
>>> about the  
>>> amount of error in SC on pollster.com. He shows that the error was  
>>> far  
>>> greater in SC than in NH, but that nobody got it wrong about Obama  
>>> taking  
>>> first place despite the large inaccuracies in estimating the  
>>> percentage of  
>>> the vote he would receive. He suggests that the errors got less  
>>> media  
>>> attention than NH because expectations about Obama winning were not  
>>> overturned by the actual result.  
>>> You can read Franklin at:  
>>> [http://www.pollster.com/blogs/south\\_carolina\\_poll\\_errors.php](http://www.pollster.com/blogs/south_carolina_poll_errors.php)  
>>> Very cool graphs in there, BTW.  
>>>  
>>> Tom  
>>>  
>>> --On Tuesday, January 29, 2008 10:27 PM -0500 "Thomas M. Guterbock"  
>>> <tmg1p@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>> Did I get this wrong, or were the results of the Democratic  
>>>> primary in SC  
>>>> last Saturday quite different than what the pre-election polls  
>>>> predicted?  
>>>> Is there a reason why this is not a subject of discussion here? In  
>>>> particular, doesn't Obama's showing in SC, which exceeded what the  
>>>> polls  
>>>> predicted, make the "Bradley/Wilder effect" thesis that was  
>>>> trotted out  
>>>> by some commentators on NH a bit less tenable?  
>>>  
>>> Tom  
>>>>  
>>>> PS: Pollster.com doesn't seem to be talking about this right now,  
>>>> either  
>>>> ...  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> Thomas M. Guterbock                      Voice: (434)243-5223  
>>>> Director                                  CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222  
>>>> Center for Survey Research                FAX: (434)982-5524  
>>>> 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> .

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

>>>> signoff aapornet

>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> Thomas M. Guterbock Voice: (434)243-5223

>>>> Director CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222

>>>> Center for Survey Research FAX: (434)982-5524

>>>> 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> .

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

>>>> signoff aapornet

>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>>>>

>>>> -----

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

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

>>>> signoff aapornet

>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>>>>

>>>> Douglas Rivers, Ph.D.

>>>> President & CEO

>>>> YouGov/Polimetrix

>>>> 285 Hamilton Ave., Suite 200

>>>> Palo Alto, CA 94301

>>>> (650) 462-8002

>>>> [doug@polimetrix.com](mailto:doug@polimetrix.com)

>>>>

>>>> -----

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

>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====  
Date: Wed, 30 Jan 2008 08:49:24 -0500

Reply-To: Phillip Downs <[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: Sexual harassment questionnaire

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

For a pro bono community survey, I'm going to present work-place scenarios to residents who will decide if each represents sexual harassment. (we have a public official accused of sexual harassment for an action). Does anyone know of questionnaires that present various scenarios - for example:

A male supervisor touches a female supervisor's shoulder when passing behind her at the water cooler.

Is this sexual harassment if it happens only once or twice?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes

\_\_\_\_\_ No

Is this sexual harassment if it happens often?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes

\_\_\_\_\_ No

Thanks,

Phillip Downs

Professor of Marketing, FSU

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Wed, 30 Jan 2008 07:26:44 -0800  
Reply-To: Douglas Rivers <doug@POLIMETRIX.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Douglas Rivers <doug@POLIMETRIX.COM>  
Subject: Re: South Carolina polling?  
Comments: To: "mail@marketsharescorp.com" <mkshares@COMCAST.NET>  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
In-Reply-To:  
<013020081234.9082.47A06EBE0000CF4D0000237A22007358349C0A9D0E089C0503@comcast.net>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII; format=flowed; delp=yes  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Mime-Version: 1.0 (Apple Message framework v915)

Not sure what your point is. I was explaining how to calculate standard error for the lead given the standard errors for the proportions. In South Carolina it made no difference which you used, since the outcome was outside the MOE for both the lead and the Obama vote proportion. In other cases, one might be within the MOE and the other not--they are different parameters. (One case where they must be identical is a two-candidate race with no undecideds.)

On Jan 30, 2008, at 4:34 AM, mail@marketsharescorp.com wrote:

> Back up a minute.

>

> Poll said Smith was ahead of Jones 50% to 42%. 8 point lead for Smith.

> Election showed Smith won 52% to 48%. Smith won by a 4 point margin.

> By how points was the poll off the mark?

>

> Nick

>

> ----- Original message -----

> From: Douglas Rivers <doug@POLIMETRIX.COM>

>> This does not explain the problem, since the standard error of the

>> lead is always less than the sum of the standard errors. To see this,

>> let p and q be the proportions supporting two candidates so

>>

>>  $\text{var}(\text{lead}) = \text{var}(p - q) = \text{var}(p) + \text{var}(q) - 2 \text{cov}(p, q)$

>>  $= [p(1-p) + q(1-q) + 2pq]/n$

>>  $\leq [p(1-p) + q(1-q) + 2 \sqrt{p(1-p)q(1-q)}]/n$

>>  $= [\text{s.e.}(p) + \text{s.e.}(q)]^2$

>>

>> and taking square roots. (This is just Minkowski's inequality.) The

>> same result goes through with finite population corrections and

>> design

>> effects. Thus, you can add the standard errors or MOE's for the

>> proportions and get a (slightly) conservative s.e. or MOE for the

>> lead.

>>

>> Doug Rivers

>>

>>

>>

>>

>> On Jan 29, 2008, at 8:29 PM, mail@marketsharescorp.com wrote:

>>

>>> Higher errors in SC got less attention simply because they got the

>>> right winners. That's all there is to it.

>>>

>>> SC and NH Dem primary polls were the only ones so far where polls

>>> were off - for obvious reasons.

>>>

>>> Successes include FL tonight. Congratulations FL pollsters!

>>>

>>> I don't get 5 rings from 10 rings in Franklin's charts. But watch

>>> out for margin error differences; i.e., polls minus election

>>> margins. Divide those errors by two to get the estimate error, the  
>>> only error that counts.  
>>>  
>>> Here is the drill.  
>>>  
>>> 1. Elections are zero-sum games. This means that two points high for  
>>> one candidate MEANS two points low for the other. So estimate error  
>>> is the more valid measure. Estimate errors are not additive which is  
>>> the effect of using the difference between election and poll  
>>> margins.  
>>>  
>>> 2. This is also the only error measure that can be compared with  
>>> sample margin of error always included in poll reports. Whatever  
>>> method is used, it should be comparable to stated statistical margin  
>>> error. Only error of the estimates does that.  
>>>  
>>> All for now.  
>>>  
>>> Nick  
>>>  
>>> ----- Original message -----  
>>> From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmglp@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU>  
>>>> Correction: I see now that Charles Franklin has indeed posteed  
>>>> about the  
>>>> amount of error in SC on pollster.com. He shows that the error was  
>>>> far  
>>>> greater in SC than in NH, but that nobody got it wrong about Obama  
>>>> taking  
>>>> first place despite the large inaccuracies in estimating the  
>>>> percentage of  
>>>> the vote he would receive. He suggests that the errors got less  
>>>> media  
>>>> attention than NH because expectations about Obama winning were not  
>>>> overturned by the actual result.  
>>>> You can read Franklin at:  
>>>> [http://www.pollster.com/blogs/south\\_carolina\\_poll\\_errors.php](http://www.pollster.com/blogs/south_carolina_poll_errors.php)  
>>>> Very cool graphs in there, BTW.  
>>>>  
>>>> Tom  
>>>>  
>>>> --On Tuesday, January 29, 2008 10:27 PM -0500 "Thomas M. Guterbock"  
>>>> <tmglp@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>>> Did I get this wrong, or were the results of the Democratic  
>>>>> primary in SC  
>>>>> last Saturday quite different than what the pre-election polls  
>>>>> predicted?  
>>>>> Is there a reason why this is not a subject of discussion here?  
>>>>> In  
>>>>> particular, doesn't Obama's showing in SC, which exceeded what the  
>>>>> polls  
>>>>> predicted, make the "Bradley/Wilder effect" thesis that was  
>>>>> trotted out  
>>>>> by some commentators on NH a bit less tenable?

>>>> Tom

>>>>>

>>>>> PS: Pollster.com doesn't seem to be talking about this right now,  
>>>>> either

>>>>> . . .

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>> Thomas M. Guterbock                      Voice: (434)243-5223  
>>>>> Director                                      CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222  
>>>>> Center for Survey Research                      FAX: (434)982-5524  
>>>>> 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> .  
>>>>> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>>>>> signoff aapornet  
>>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> Thomas M. Guterbock                      Voice: (434)243-5223  
>>>> Director                                      CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222  
>>>> Center for Survey Research                      FAX: (434)982-5524  
>>>> 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> .  
>>>> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>>>> signoff aapornet  
>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>>>>

>>>> -----

>>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>>>> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>>>> signoff aapornet  
>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>>

>> Douglas Rivers, Ph.D.  
>> President & CEO  
>> YouGov/Polimetrix  
>> 285 Hamilton Ave., Suite 200  
>> Palo Alto, CA 94301  
>> (650) 462-8002  
>> [doug@polimetrix.com](mailto:doug@polimetrix.com)

>>

>> -----

>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

Douglas Rivers, Ph.D.  
President & CEO  
YouGov/Polimetrix  
285 Hamilton Ave., Suite 200  
Palo Alto, CA 94301  
(650) 462-8002  
[doug@polimetrix.com](mailto:doug@polimetrix.com)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Wed, 30 Jan 2008 11:46:15 -0500  
Reply-To: [hochschild@gov.harvard.edu](mailto:hochschild@gov.harvard.edu)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jennifer Hochschild <[hochschild@GOV.HARVARD.EDU](mailto:hochschild@GOV.HARVARD.EDU)>  
Organization: Harvard  
Subject: [Fwd: Sexual harassment questionnaire]]  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

FYI. I sent the 2 articles as attachments to Phillip Downs, but deleted them from this note to the whole listserv. best, JH

----- Original Message -----  
Subject: Re: [Fwd: Sexual harassment questionnaire]  
Date: Wed, 30 Jan 2008 11:10:34 -0500  
From: Francis X. Shen <[fxshen@fas.harvard.edu](mailto:fxshen@fas.harvard.edu)>  
To: [hochschild@gov.harvard.edu](mailto:hochschild@gov.harvard.edu)  
References: <[47A08310.7020100@gov.harvard.edu](mailto:47A08310.7020100@gov.harvard.edu)>  
<[Pine.LNX.4.64.0801300906110.26399@ls01.fas.harvard.edu](mailto:Pine.LNX.4.64.0801300906110.26399@ls01.fas.harvard.edu)>  
<[47A08533.5010303@gov.harvard.edu](mailto:47A08533.5010303@gov.harvard.edu)>

This took about 15 minutes -- I remembered seeing some of this stuff, but just needed to track it down. I don't know if Roger Tourangeau is on the list-serv already, if so he'd be someone to get in touch with I'd think. I'm attaching both articles, but don't know if you'd want to forward them on or not given file sizes.



---

A good recent piece is by Roger Tourangeau and Mirta Galesic: "What is sexual harassment? It depends on who asks! Framing effects on survey responses," Applied Cognitive Psychology, Mar2007, Vol. 21 Issue 2, p189-202. It has cites at the end where other question wording options could be found. Website with abstract:  
<http://www.psc.isr.umich.edu/people/profile.html?ID=707>

An older piece, but a nice synthesis of some of the major issues, is "Sexual Harassment Research: A Methodological Critique" by Lengnick-Hall, Mark L.. Personnel Psychology, Winter95, Vol. 48 Issue 4, p841-864.

---

At 09:09 AM 1/30/2008, you wrote:

>it would be nice of you,.... j

>

>Francis Xavier Shen wrote:

>

>>

>>yes, i have some cites that i think may be useful. i'll track them  
>>down and email them to you to forward. responses can be quite  
>>sensitive to framing i believe, but i need to look up the question wording.

>>

>>

>>On Wed, 30 Jan 2008, Jennifer Hochschild wrote:

>>

>>>is this anything you know about, or could weigh in on? If you want  
>>>to respond, you'll need to join AAPORNET or just send me the note  
>>>and I can forward it to the listserv. j

>>>

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

>>>Subject: Sexual harassment questionnaire

>>>Date: Wed, 30 Jan 2008 08:49:24 -0500

>>>From: Phillip Downs <pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM>

>>>Reply-To: Phillip Downs <pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM>

>>>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>>For a pro bono community survey, I'm going to present work-place scenarios  
>>>to residents who will decide if each represents sexual harassment.

>>>(we have

>>>a public official accused of sexual harassment for an action). Does anyone  
>>>know of questionnaires that present various scenarios - for example:

>>>

>>>A male supervisor touches a female supervisor's shoulder when passing  
behind

>>>her at the water cooler.

>>>

>>>Is this sexual harassment if it happens only once or twice?

>>>

>>> \_\_\_\_ Yes

>>>

>>> \_\_\_\_ No

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>>Is this sexual harassment if it happens often?

>>>

>>> \_\_\_\_ Yes

>>>

>>> \_\_\_\_ No

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>>Thanks, Phillip Downs

>>>

>>>Professor of Marketing, FSU

>>>

>>>

>>>-----

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

>>>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

>>>

>>>

>>>--

>>>Jennifer L. Hochschild Harvard University Henry LaBarre Jayne

>>>Professor of Government,

>>>Professor of African and African American Studies, and

>>>Harvard College Professor Department of Government Harvard

>>>University CGIS -- 1737 Cambridge Street Cambridge, MA 02138

>>>Phone: 617-496-0181 Fax: 617-495-0438 Hochschild@gov.harvard.edu

>

>--

>Jennifer L. Hochschild Harvard University Henry LaBarre Jayne

>Professor of Government,

>Professor of African and African American Studies, and

>Harvard College Professor

>Department of Government Harvard University CGIS -- 1737 Cambridge

>Street Cambridge, MA 02138 Phone: 617-496-0181 Fax: 617-495-0438

>Hochschild@gov.harvard.edu

--

Jennifer L. Hochschild

Harvard University

Henry LaBarre Jayne Professor of Government,

Professor of African and African American Studies, and

Harvard College Professor

Department of Government

Harvard University

CGIS -- 1737 Cambridge Street  
Cambridge, MA 02138  
Phone: 617-496-0181  
Fax: 617-495-0438  
Hochschild@gov.harvard.edu

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Wed, 30 Jan 2008 09:58:29 -0700  
Reply-To: Mike O'Neil <[mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU](mailto:mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mike O'Neil <[mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU](mailto:mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU)>  
Subject: Edwards/Giuliani follow up questions  
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  
Content-Disposition: inline

I have not seen any of the major public polls report the results of obvious follow-up question of supporters of Giuliani/Edwards :

"If your candidate were to drop out of the race, whom would you be most likely to support?"

Of course, the two-way polls that will come out in about in a couple of days will be superior to this. And the Guilaini case is different (since it is coupled with an endorsement).

But, for those of us who can't wait for the two days it will take to get the first two-candidate polls in each party, have any of the major polls asked this question?

--

Mike O'Neil  
[www.oneilresearch.com](http://www.oneilresearch.com)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Wed, 30 Jan 2008 12:03:41 -0600  
Reply-To: Donald Kotecki <[donald.kotecki@SNC.EDU](mailto:donald.kotecki@SNC.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Donald Kotecki <[donald.kotecki@SNC.EDU](mailto:donald.kotecki@SNC.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Edwards/Giuliani follow up questions  
Comments: To: Mike O'Neil <[mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU](mailto:mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[17ee023d0801300858v7bb7458ftd12dfc50f969903c@mail.gmail.com](mailto:17ee023d0801300858v7bb7458ftd12dfc50f969903c@mail.gmail.com)>

MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Did Richardson declare his delegates

Mike O'Neil wrote:

> I have not seen any of the major public polls report the results of obvious  
> follow-up question of supporters of Giuliani/Edwards :  
>  
> "If your candidate were to drop out of the race, whom would you be most  
> likely to support?"  
>  
> Of course, the two-way polls that will come out in about in a couple of days  
> will be superior to this. And the Guilaini case is different (since it is  
> coupled with an endorsement).  
>  
> But, for those of us who can't wait for the two days it will take to get the  
> first two-candidate polls in each party, have any of the major polls asked  
> this question?  
>  
>

--

>  
> Donald P. Kotecki, Director  
> St. Norbert College Survey Center  
> F.K. Bemis International Center  
> 100 Grant St.  
> De Pere, WI 54115-2099  
>  
> donald.kotecki@snc.edu  
> (920)403-3960 (Direct)  
> (920)1-877-214-7183 (Toll Free)  
> (920)403-4036 FAX  
> Visit us on the web at <http://www.snc.edu/survey/>  
>

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Wed, 30 Jan 2008 13:49:37 -0500  
Reply-To: Bruce Altschuler <[altschul@OSWEGO.EDU](mailto:altschul@OSWEGO.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Bruce Altschuler <[altschul@OSWEGO.EDU](mailto:altschul@OSWEGO.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Edwards/Giuliani follow up questions  
Comments: To: Donald Kotecki <[donald.kotecki@SNC.EDU](mailto:donald.kotecki@SNC.EDU)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[47A0BBFD.4010300@snc.edu](mailto:47A0BBFD.4010300@snc.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

According to the Washington Post, Richardson remains undecided (he's a superdelegate):

**\*In Background, a Battle for Superdelegates\***

**Clinton Ahead Among Party Leaders, but Threat of a Wholesale Shift Remains**

By Shailagh Murray and Paul Kane

Washington Post Staff Writers

Wednesday, January 30, 2008; A06

Bill Richardson

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/related/topic/Bill+Richardson+%28Politician%29?tid=informline>'s

phone has been ringing off the hook.

Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton

<http://projects.washingtonpost.com/congress/members/c001041/> called Sunday night, followed by her husband, and then Pennsylvania Gov. Edward G. Rendell

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/related/topic/Edward+Rendell?tid=informline>,

a Clinton backer. Sen. Barack Obama

<http://projects.washingtonpost.com/congress/members/o000167/> called twice Monday morning. Monday afternoon, Richardson spent 15 minutes on the phone with Sen. Edward M. Kennedy

<http://projects.washingtonpost.com/congress/members/k000105/>.

But the New Mexico

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/related/topic/New+Mexico?tid=informline> governor, who dropped out of the presidential race after a dismal finish in the New Hampshire

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/related/topic/New+Hampshire?tid=informline> primary, is torn. "I have a history with the Clintons," said Richardson, who served in the Clinton administration, first as ambassador to the United Nations

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/related/topic/United+Nations?tid=informline>,

then as energy secretary. "And I've always liked her," he said. But he considers Kennedy "a mentor" who helped to get him elected to Congress in 1982. He also likes Obama but remains undecided.

Obama allies are hoping to make Richardson take part in a stream of high-profile endorsements from Democratic Party

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/related/topic/U.S.+Democratic+Party?tid=informline>

leaders, who will help to dismantle what the Clinton campaign calls its "firewall" in the nomination battle: a clear advantage among superdelegates, who account for about a quarter of the total number of delegates who will determine the nominee.

Bruce Altschuler

Donald Kotecki wrote:

> Did Richardson declare his delegates  
>  
> Mike O'Neil wrote:  
>> I have not seen any of the major public polls report the results of  
>> obvious  
>> follow-up question of supporters of Giuliani/Edwards :  
>>  
>> "If your candidate were to drop out of the race, whom would you be most  
>> likely to support?"  
>>  
>> Of course, the two-way polls that will come out in about in a couple  
>> of days  
>> will be superior to this. And the Guilaini case is different (since  
>> it is  
>> coupled with an endorsement).  
>>  
>> But, for those of us who can't wait for the two days it will take to  
>> get the  
>> first two-candidate polls in each party, have any of the major polls  
>> asked  
>> this question?  
>>  
>>  
>

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Wed, 30 Jan 2008 14:15:05 -0500  
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: Pollsters, Political Telemarketing and '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: 8bit

The MRA has a press release on Push polls

Pollsters, Political Telemarketing and 'Push Polls':  
<http://sev.prnewswire.com/publishing-information-services/20080130/DC1273230012008-1.html>

GLASTONBURY, Conn., Jan. 30 /PRNewswire-USNewswire/ -- As the Presidential primary season reaches a climax with Super Tuesday, expect to hear reports about waves of push polls. Both the general public and targeted candidates are increasingly annoyed by push polls or political telemarketing, which often include negative -- even inflammatory -- information about a candidate. The media describe these telephone calls as "push polls" because they seek to "push" a certain candidate or position.

These are not legitimate polls being conducted for research purposes. Rather, they are persuasion calls: Quick sales efforts; not the collection of unbiased responses of legitimate polls or surveys.

SNIP

The Marketing Research Association is the leading and largest association of the opinion and marketing research profession, a multi-billion dollar a year industry dedicated to providing valuable information to guide the decisions of companies that provide products and services to consumers and businesses. For more information, visit <http://www.mra-net.org>.

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

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Wed, 30 Jan 2008 16:55:52 -0600  
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)>  
Subject: Re: South Carolina polling?  
Comments: To: Douglas Rivers <[doug@polimetrix.com](mailto:doug@polimetrix.com)>, [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[2141A030-B8DF-4C0A-A653-320D29C7E375@polimetrix.com](mailto:2141A030-B8DF-4C0A-A653-320D29C7E375@polimetrix.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I agree that they were outside their margins of error just as you described.

My issue is how error (not statistical) but error between polls and election outcomes should be characterized. Margin error or estimate error?

Nick

Douglas Rivers wrote:

> Not sure what your point is. I was explaining how to calculate  
> standard error for the lead given the standard errors for the  
> proportions. In South Carolina it made no difference which you used,  
> since the outcome was outside the MOE for both the lead and the Obama  
> vote proportion. In other cases, one might be within the MOE and the  
> other not--they are different parameters. (One case where they must

> be identical is a two-candidate race with no undecideds.)

>

> On Jan 30, 2008, at 4:34 AM, mail@marketsharescorp.com wrote:

>

>> Back up a minute.

>>

>> Poll said Smith was ahead of Jones 50% to 42%. 8 point lead for Smith.

>> Election showed Smith won 52% to 48%. Smith won by a 4 point margin.

>> By how points was the poll off the mark?

>>

>> Nick

>>

>> ----- Original message -----

>> From: Douglas Rivers <doug@POLIMETRIX.COM>

>>

>>> This does not explain the problem, since the standard error of the

>>> lead is always less than the sum of the standard errors. To see this,

>>> let p and q be the proportions supporting two candidates so

>>>

>>>  $\text{var}(\text{lead}) = \text{var}(p - q) = \text{var}(p) + \text{var}(q) - 2 \text{cov}(p, q)$

>>>  $= [p(1-p) + q(1-q) + 2pq]/n$

>>>  $\leq [p(1-p) + q(1-q) + 2 \sqrt{p(1-p)q(1-q)}]/n$

>>>  $= [\text{s.e.}(p) + \text{s.e.}(q)]^2$

>>>

>>> and taking square roots. (This is just Minkowski's inequality.) The

>>> same result goes through with finite population corrections and design

>>> effects. Thus, you can add the standard errors or MOE's for the

>>> proportions and get a (slightly) conservative s.e. or MOE for the

>>> lead.

>>>

>>> Doug Rivers

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>> On Jan 29, 2008, at 8:29 PM, mail@marketsharescorp.com wrote:

>>>

>>>> Higher errors in SC got less attention simply because they got the

>>>> right winners. That's all there is to it.

>>>>

>>>> SC and NH Dem primary polls were the only ones so far where polls

>>>> were off - for obvious reasons.

>>>>

>>>> Successes include FL tonight. Congratulations FL pollsters!

>>>>

>>>> I don't get 5 rings from 10 rings in Franklin's charts. But watch

>>>> out for margin error differences; i.e., polls minus election

>>>> margins. Divide those errors by two to get the estimate error, the

>>>> only error that counts.

>>>>

>>>> Here is the drill.

>>>>

>>>> 1. Elections are zero-sum games. This means that two points high for

>>>> one candidate MEANS two points low for the other. So estimate error



>>>> is the more valid measure. Estimate errors are not additive which is  
>>>> the effect of using the difference between election and poll margins.

>>>> 2. This is also the only error measure that can be compared with  
>>>> sample margin of error always included in poll reports. Whatever  
>>>> method is used, it should be comparable to stated statistical margin  
>>>> error. Only error of the estimates does that.

>>>> All for now.

>>>> Nick

>>>> ----- Original message -----

>>>> From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmg1p@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU>

>>>>> Correction: I see now that Charles Franklin has indeed posted  
>>>>> about the  
>>>>> amount of error in SC on pollster.com. He shows that the error was  
>>>>> far  
>>>>> greater in SC than in NH, but that nobody got it wrong about Obama  
>>>>> taking  
>>>>> first place despite the large inaccuracies in estimating the  
>>>>> percentage of  
>>>>> the vote he would receive. He suggests that the errors got less  
>>>>> media  
>>>>> attention than NH because expectations about Obama winning were not  
>>>>> overturned by the actual result.

>>>>> You can read Franklin at:  
>>>>> [http://www.pollster.com/blogs/south\\_carolina\\_poll\\_errors.php](http://www.pollster.com/blogs/south_carolina_poll_errors.php)  
>>>>> Very cool graphs in there, BTW.

>>>>> Tom

>>>>> --On Tuesday, January 29, 2008 10:27 PM -0500 "Thomas M. Guterbock"  
>>>>> <tmg1p@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU> wrote:

>>>>>> Did I get this wrong, or were the results of the Democratic  
>>>>>> primary in SC  
>>>>>> last Saturday quite different than what the pre-election polls  
>>>>>> predicted?  
>>>>>> Is there a reason why this is not a subject of discussion here? In  
>>>>>> particular, doesn't Obama's showing in SC, which exceeded what the  
>>>>>> polls  
>>>>>> predicted, make the "Bradley/Wilder effect" thesis that was  
>>>>>> trotted out  
>>>>>> by some commentators on NH a bit less  
>>>>>> tenable?

>>>>>> Tom

>>>>>> PS: Pollster.com doesn't seem to be talking about this right now,  
>>>>>> either  
>>>>>> . . .

>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Thomas M. Guterbock Voice: (434)243-5223  
>>>>> Director CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222  
>>>>> Center for Survey Research FAX: (434)982-5524  
>>>>> 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> .  
>>>>> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>>>>> signoff aapornet  
>>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Thomas M. Guterbock Voice: (434)243-5223  
>>>>> Director CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222  
>>>>> Center for Survey Research FAX: (434)982-5524  
>>>>> 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> .  
>>>>> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>>>>> signoff aapornet  
>>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>>>>>  
>>>>> -----  
>>>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>>>>> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>>>>> signoff aapornet  
>>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>>>>  
>>>> Douglas Rivers, Ph.D.  
>>>> President & CEO  
>>>> YouGov/Polimetrix  
>>>> 285 Hamilton Ave., Suite 200  
>>>> Palo Alto, CA 94301  
>>>> (650) 462-8002  
>>>> [doug@polimetrix.com](mailto:doug@polimetrix.com)

>>>> -----  
>>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>>>> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:

>>> aapornet-request@asu.edu

>>

>>

>> -----

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

>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

>> aapornet-request@asu.edu

>

>

> Douglas Rivers, Ph.D.

> President & CEO

> YouGov/Polimetrix

> 285 Hamilton Ave., Suite 200

> Palo Alto, CA 94301

> (650) 462-8002

> doug@polimetrix.com

>

>

>

>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====  
Date: Wed, 30 Jan 2008 18:21:20 -0500

Reply-To: "Leve, Jay" <jleve@SURVEYUSA.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Leve, Jay" <jleve@SURVEYUSA.COM>

Subject: Re: South Carolina polling?

Comments: To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Nick,

To my knowledge, there are 8 ways to measure the error in the problem you pose.

Those 8 measures, and the error each produces, are:

Mosteller 1: 2 points

Mosteller 2: 2.35 points

Mosteller 3: 4 points

Mosteller 4: 8.17 points

Mosteller 5: 4 points

Mosteller 6: 6 points

Traugott: 9.43 points

Shipman: 6 points

Jay H Leve  
SurveyUSA  
15 Bloomfield Ave  
Verona NJ 07044  
973-857-8500 x 551  
jleve@surveyusa.com

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Nick Panagakis  
Sent: Wednesday, January 30, 2008 5:56 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: South Carolina polling?

I agree that they were outside their margins of error just as you described.

My issue is how error (not statistical) but error between polls and election outcomes should be characterized. Margin error or estimate error?

Nick

Douglas Rivers wrote:

> Not sure what your point is. I was explaining how to calculate  
> standard error for the lead given the standard errors for the  
> proportions. In South Carolina it made no difference which you used,  
> since the outcome was outside the MOE for both the lead and the Obama

> vote proportion. In other cases, one might be within the MOE and the  
> other not--they are different parameters. (One case where they must  
> be identical is a two-candidate race with no undecideds.)

>  
> On Jan 30, 2008, at 4:34 AM, mail@marketsharescorp.com wrote:

>  
>> Back up a minute.

>>  
>> Poll said Smith was ahead of Jones 50% to 42%. 8 point lead for Smith.

>> Election showed Smith won 52% to 48%. Smith won by a 4 point margin.  
>> By how points was the poll off the mark?

>>  
>> Nick

>>  
>> ----- Original message -----

>> From: Douglas Rivers <doug@POLIMETRIX.COM>  
>>

>>> This does not explain the problem, since the standard error of the  
>>> lead is always less than the sum of the standard errors. To see  
this,

>>> let p and q be the proportions supporting two candidates so

>>>

>>>  $\text{var}(\text{lead}) = \text{var}(p - q) = \text{var}(p) + \text{var}(q) - 2 \text{cov}(p, q)$

>>> = [p(1-p) + q(1-q) + 2pq]/n  
>>> <= [p(1-p) + q(1-q) + 2 sqrt(p(1-p)q(1-q))]/n  
>>> = [s.e.(p) + s.e.(q)]^2

>>>  
>>> and taking square roots. (This is just Minkowski's inequality.) The  
>>> same result goes through with finite population corrections and  
design  
>>> effects. Thus, you can add the standard errors or MOE's for the  
>>> proportions and get a (slightly) conservative s.e. or MOE for the  
>>> lead.

>>>  
>>> Doug Rivers

>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> On Jan 29, 2008, at 8:29 PM, mail@marketsharescorp.com wrote:

>>>  
>>>> Higher errors in SC got less attention simply because they got the  
>>>> right winners. That's all there is to it.

>>>>  
>>>> SC and NH Dem primary polls were the only ones so far where polls  
>>>> were off - for obvious reasons.

>>>>  
>>>> Successes include FL tonight. Congratulations FL pollsters!

>>>>  
>>>> I don't get 5 rings from 10 rings in Franklin's charts. But watch  
>>>> out for margin error differences; i.e., polls minus election  
>>>> margins. Divide those errors by two to get the estimate error, the  
>>>> only error that counts.

>>>>  
>>>> Here is the drill.

>>>>  
>>>> 1. Elections are zero-sum games. This means that two points high  
for  
>>>> one candidate MEANS two points low for the other. So estimate error  
>>>> is the more valid measure. Estimate errors are not additive which  
is  
>>>> the effect of using the difference between election and poll  
margins.

>>>>  
>>>> 2. This is also the only error measure that can be compared with  
>>>> sample margin of error always included in poll reports. Whatever  
>>>> method is used, it should be comparable to stated statistical  
margin  
>>>> error. Only error of the estimates does that.

>>>>  
>>>> All for now.

>>>>  
>>>> Nick

>>>> ----- Original message -----

>>>> From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmg1p@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU>

>>>>

>>>>> Correction: I see now that Charles Franklin has indeed posted  
>>>>> about the  
>>>>> amount of error in SC on pollster.com. He shows that the error  
was  
>>>>> far  
>>>>> greater in SC than in NH, but that nobody got it wrong about Obama  
>>>>> taking  
>>>>> first place despite the large inaccuracies in estimating the  
>>>>> percentage of  
>>>>> the vote he would receive. He suggests that the errors got less  
>>>>> media  
>>>>> attention than NH because expectations about Obama winning were  
not  
>>>>> overturned by the actual result.  
>>>>> You can read Franklin at:  
>>>>> [http://www.pollster.com/blogs/south\\_carolina\\_poll\\_errors.php](http://www.pollster.com/blogs/south_carolina_poll_errors.php)  
>>>>> Very cool graphs in there, BTW.

>>>>>  
>>>>> Tom  
>>>>>  
>>>>> --On Tuesday, January 29, 2008 10:27 PM -0500 "Thomas M.  
Guterbock"  
>>>>> <tmg1p@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU> wrote:

>>>>>  
>>>>>> Did I get this wrong, or were the results of the Democratic  
>>>>>> primary in SC  
>>>>>> last Saturday quite different than what the pre-election polls  
>>>>>> predicted?  
>>>>>> Is there a reason why this is not a subject of discussion here?

In  
>>>>>> particular, doesn't Obama's showing in SC, which exceeded what  
the  
>>>>>> polls  
>>>>>> predicted, make the "Bradley/Wilder effect" thesis that was  
>>>>>> trotted out  
>>>>>> by some commentators on NH a bit less  
>>>>>> tenable?

>>>>>  
>>>>> Tom  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>> PS: Pollster.com doesn't seem to be talking about this right  
now,  
>>>>>> either  
>>>>>> . . .

>>>>>  
>>>>>> Thomas M. Guterbock                      Voice: (434)243-5223  
>>>>>> Director                                  CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222  
>>>>>> Center for Survey Research                FAX: (434)982-5524  
>>>>>> 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> .  
>>>>> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>>>>> signoff aapornet  
>>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>> Thomas M. Guterbock                      Voice: (434)243-5223  
>>>>> Director                                      CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222  
>>>>> Center for Survey Research                      FAX: (434)982-5524  
>>>>> 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> .  
>>>>> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>>>>> signoff aapornet  
>>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>> -----

>>>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>>>>> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>>>>> signoff aapornet  
>>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> Douglas Rivers, Ph.D.  
>>>> President & CEO  
>>>> YouGov/Polimetrix  
>>>> 285 Hamilton Ave., Suite 200  
>>>> Palo Alto, CA 94301  
>>>> (650) 462-8002  
>>>> [doug@polimetrix.com](mailto:doug@polimetrix.com)

>>>>

>>>> -----

>>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>>>> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
>>>> [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> -----

>>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>>>> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
>>>> [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

>

>  
> Douglas Rivers, Ph.D.  
> President & CEO  
> YouGov/Polimetrix  
> 285 Hamilton Ave., Suite 200  
> Palo Alto, CA 94301  
> (650) 462-8002  
> doug@polimetrix.com

>  
>  
>  
>

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
[aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Wed, 30 Jan 2008 23:20:24 -0500  
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: South Carolina polling?  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
In-Reply-To: <[033131AB4310364FB652738936135D00D62695@exchange.hypotenuse.com](mailto:033131AB4310364FB652738936135D00D62695@exchange.hypotenuse.com)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Content-Disposition: inline

I appreciate the clarification on how to calculate error. Has anyone figured out what CAUSED the error in the South Carolina pre-election polls? Did they underestimate turnout of African-Americans? The turnout of all Obama voters? The percentage for Obama among blacks? Among others?

Tom G.

--On Wednesday, January 30, 2008 6:21 PM -0500 "Leve, Jay" <[jleve@SURVEYUSA.COM](mailto:jleve@SURVEYUSA.COM)> wrote:

> Nick,  
>  
> To my knowledge, there are 8 ways to measure the error in the problem  
> you pose.  
>  
> Those 8 measures, and the error each produces, are:  
>  
> Mosteller 1: 2 points  
> Mosteller 2: 2.35 points



> Mosteller 3: 4 points  
> Mosteller 4: 8.17 points  
> Mosteller 5: 4 points  
> Mosteller 6: 6 points  
> Traugott: 9.43 points  
> Shipman: 6 points

>  
>  
>

> Jay H Leve  
> SurveyUSA  
> 15 Bloomfield Ave  
> Verona NJ 07044  
> 973-857-8500 x 551  
> jleve@surveyusa.com

>

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Nick Panagakis  
> Sent: Wednesday, January 30, 2008 5:56 PM  
> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
> Subject: Re: South Carolina polling?

>

> I agree that they were outside their margins of error just as you  
> described.

>

> My issue is how error (not statistical) but error between polls and  
> election outcomes should be  
> characterized. Margin error or estimate error?

>

> Nick

>

> Douglas Rivers wrote:

>

>> Not sure what your point is. I was explaining how to calculate  
>> standard error for the lead given the standard errors for the  
>> proportions. In South Carolina it made no difference which you used,  
>> since the outcome was outside the MOE for both the lead and the Obama

>

>> vote proportion. In other cases, one might be within the MOE and the  
>> other not--they are different parameters. (One case where they must  
>> be identical is a two-candidate race with no undecideds.)

>>

>> On Jan 30, 2008, at 4:34 AM, mail@marketsharescorp.com wrote:

>>

>>> Back up a minute.

>>>

>>> Poll said Smith was ahead of Jones 50% to 42%. 8 point lead for  
> Smith.

>>> Election showed Smith won 52% to 48%. Smith won by a 4 point margin.

>>> By how points was the poll off the mark?

>>>

>>> Nick

>>>

>>> ----- Original message -----

>>>> From: Douglas Rivers <doug@POLIMETRIX.COM>

>>>>

>>>> This does not explain the problem, since the standard error of the  
>>>> lead is always less than the sum of the standard errors. To see  
> this,

>>>> let p and q be the proportions supporting two candidates so

>>>>

>>>>  $\text{var}(\text{lead}) = \text{var}(p - q) = \text{var}(p) + \text{var}(q) - 2 \text{cov}(p, q)$

>>>>  $= [p(1-p) + q(1-q) + 2pq]/n$

>>>>  $\leq [p(1-p) + q(1-q) + 2 \sqrt{p(1-p)q(1-q)}]/n$

>>>>  $= [\text{s.e.}(p) + \text{s.e.}(q)]^2$

>>>>

>>>> and taking square roots. (This is just Minkowski's inequality.) The

>>>> same result goes through with finite population corrections and

> design

>>>> effects. Thus, you can add the standard errors or MOE's for the

>>>> proportions and get a (slightly) conservative s.e. or MOE for the

>>>> lead.

>>>>

>>>> Doug Rivers

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> On Jan 29, 2008, at 8:29 PM, mail@marketsharescorp.com wrote:

>>>>

>>>>> Higher errors in SC got less attention simply because they got the  
>>>>> right winners. That's all there is to it.

>>>>>

>>>>> SC and NH Dem primary polls were the only ones so far where polls  
>>>>> were off - for obvious reasons.

>>>>>

>>>>> Successes include FL tonight. Congratulations FL pollsters!

>>>>>

>>>>> I don't get 5 rings from 10 rings in Franklin's charts. But watch  
>>>>> out for margin error differences; i.e., polls minus election  
>>>>> margins. Divide those errors by two to get the estimate error, the  
>>>>> only error that counts.

>>>>>

>>>>> Here is the drill.

>>>>>

>>>>> 1. Elections are zero-sum games. This means that two points high  
> for

>>>>> one candidate MEANS two points low for the other. So estimate error

>>>>> is the more valid measure. Estimate errors are not additive which

> is

>>>>> the effect of using the difference between election and poll

> margins.

>>>>>

>>>>> 2. This is also the only error measure that can be compared with

>>>>> sample margin of error always included in poll reports. Whatever

>>>>> method is used, it should be comparable to stated statistical

> margin

>>>>> error. Only error of the estimates does that.

>>>>>  
>>>>> All for now.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Nick  
>>>>>  
>>>>> ----- Original message -----  
>>>>> From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmg1p@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>> Correction: I see now that Charles Franklin has indeed posted  
>>>>>> about the  
>>>>>> amount of error in SC on pollster.com. He shows that the error  
> was  
>>>>>> far  
>>>>>> greater in SC than in NH, but that nobody got it wrong about Obama  
>>>>>> taking  
>>>>>> first place despite the large inaccuracies in estimating the  
>>>>>> percentage of  
>>>>>> the vote he would receive. He suggests that the errors got less  
>>>>>> media  
>>>>>> attention than NH because expectations about Obama winning were  
> not  
>>>>>> overturned by the actual result.  
>>>>>> You can read Franklin at:  
>>>>>> [http://www.pollster.com/blogs/south\\_carolina\\_poll\\_errors.php](http://www.pollster.com/blogs/south_carolina_poll_errors.php)  
>>>>>> Very cool graphs in there, BTW.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Tom  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> --On Tuesday, January 29, 2008 10:27 PM -0500 "Thomas M.  
> Guterbock"  
>>>>>> <tmg1p@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU> wrote:  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Did I get this wrong, or were the results of the Democratic  
>>>>>>> primary in SC  
>>>>>>> last Saturday quite different than what the pre-election polls  
>>>>>>> predicted?  
>>>>>>> Is there a reason why this is not a subject of discussion here?  
> In  
>>>>>>> particular, doesn't Obama's showing in SC, which exceeded what  
> the  
>>>>>>> polls  
>>>>>>> predicted, make the "Bradley/Wilder effect" thesis that was  
>>>>>>> trotted out  
>>>>>>> by some commentators on NH a bit less  
>>>>>>> tenable?  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Tom  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> PS: Pollster.com doesn't seem to be talking about this right  
> now,  
>>>>>>> either  
>>>>>>> . . .  
>>>>>>>

>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Thomas M. Guterbock Voice: (434)243-5223  
>>>>>> Director CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222  
>>>>>> Center for Survey Research FAX: (434)982-5524  
>>>>>> 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> .  
>>>>>> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>>>>>> signoff aapornet  
>>>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Thomas M. Guterbock Voice: (434)243-5223  
>>>>>> Director CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222  
>>>>>> Center for Survey Research FAX: (434)982-5524  
>>>>>> 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> .  
>>>>>> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>>>>>> signoff aapornet  
>>>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>>>>>> -----  
>>>>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>>>>>> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>>>>>> signoff aapornet  
>>>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>>>> Douglas Rivers, Ph.D.  
>>>> President & CEO  
>>>> YouGov/Polimetrix  
>>>> 285 Hamilton Ave., Suite 200  
>>>> Palo Alto, CA 94301  
>>>> (650) 462-8002  
>>>> [doug@polimetrix.com](mailto:doug@polimetrix.com)

>>>> -----  
>>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>>>> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
>>>> [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

>>>

>>>

>>> -----

>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>>> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
>>> [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

>>

>>

>> Douglas Rivers, Ph.D.  
>> President & CEO  
>> YouGov/Polimetrix  
>> 285 Hamilton Ave., Suite 200  
>> Palo Alto, CA 94301  
>> (650) 462-8002  
>> [doug@polimetrix.com](mailto:doug@polimetrix.com)

>>

>>

>>

>>

>

> -----

> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
> [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

>

> -----

> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
> [aapornet-request@asu.edu](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)982-5524  
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> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Thu, 31 Jan 2008 02:35:12 -0800  
Reply-To: Jon Krosnick <[krosnick@STANFORD.EDU](mailto:krosnick@STANFORD.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jon Krosnick <[krosnick@STANFORD.EDU](mailto:krosnick@STANFORD.EDU)>  
Subject: Job Opening: Researcher to Join the American National Election

Study Staff

Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Job Opening: Social scientist to join the staff of the American National Election Studies (ANES) at Stanford University.

We are seeking a social scientist to join our team in carrying out the American National Election Studies (ANES) surveys.

The ANES is the best-known and most widely cited ongoing study of how Americans participate in elections, form attitudes, make political choices, and are influenced by campaigns. Since 1948, the ANES has interviewed tens of thousands of Americans in national surveys of representative samples and has equipped scholars with data to publish more than 5,000 books, journal articles, and conference papers.

ANES is funded by the National Science Foundation, with one of the largest grants in the social sciences, to generate huge datasets to be distributed free to all interested researchers inside and outside of academia.

ANES is a partnership between Stanford University and the University of Michigan. Our major projects include two forms of data collection from representative national samples of American adults: an innovative Internet Panel survey collecting data each month between January 2008 and mid-2009, and a large face-to-face survey with hour-long interviews conducted both before and after the November 2008 elections. To learn more about the ANES, visit our website: [www.electionstudies.org](http://www.electionstudies.org)

We are seeking a researcher to join our terrific staff and to contribute to all aspects of running the ANES. We do data analysis and manuscript writing for publication. We design questionnaires. We receive and evaluate proposals from researchers (mostly professors and graduate students) suggesting particular research agendas to be pursued in the questionnaires, and we evaluate those proposals and provide feedback to the proposers, sometimes requesting proposal revisions. We test the functioning of questionnaires that will be administered via computers and orally to assure that they are effective measurement tools. We write study documentation and provide support to our large community of data users. And we edit data files, analyze data, conduct methodological research, supervise data collection firms, run a web site, manage a budget, and conduct administrative tasks, all for the purpose of advancing the scientific study of public opinion and political behavior.

Our new staff member will accomplish this work collaboratively with the study's Principal Investigators -- Jon Krosnick at Stanford and Arthur Lupia at Michigan -- professional staff, and research assistants.

The new staff member's work will include:

- \* Working collaboratively with a multidisciplinary team of researchers.
- \* Writing, editing, and reviewing questionnaires and their programming specifications.
- \* Testing computer implementation of questionnaires.
- \* Reviewing and analyzing data files using statistical software (SPSS, Stata, or SAS), conducting comparisons with other contemporaneous surveys.
- \* Monitoring panel survey sample composition over time.
- \* Preparing data files for public release.
- \* Writing, editing, and reviewing survey documentation and reports.
- \* Reviewing and designing methods for survey data collection.
- \* Managing and monitoring the activities of firms doing data collection.
- \* Supervising undergraduate research assistants.
- \* Managing administrative tasks for the project.
- \* Coauthoring journal articles for publication.
- \* Collaborating with ANES personnel at the University of Michigan.

Qualifications (desirable but not all required):

- \*Master's or doctoral degree in a quantitative social science (e.g., psychology, political science, sociology, communication, economics), statistics, or a related field.
- \*Experience conducting social science research.
- \*Proficiency using statistical software (e.g., SPSS, SAS, or Stata).
- \*Experience planning and conducting surveys.
- \*Experience writing articles for academic journal publication.
- \*Expertise in one or more of the following areas: American politics, survey sampling, statistical data analysis, questionnaire design, research methodology, project management.

The position is a full-time, exempt, term appointment through December 2009, with full benefits, with the possibility of extension after December 2009 dependent on renewal of the NSF grant.

Interviewing of qualified applicants will begin immediately in order to fill the position as soon as possible.

To apply:

Please apply through the Stanford Jobs web site, [http://jobs.stanford.edu/find\\_a\\_job.html](http://jobs.stanford.edu/find_a_job.html). From the Stanford Jobs search page, enter 28970 in the keyword search field to find the job listing and apply online by submitting your cover letter and resume or vita.

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

---

Date: Thu, 31 Jan 2008 12:44:21 -0000

Reply-To: Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Iain Noble <Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK>  
Subject: Re: South Carolina polling?  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
In-Reply-To: A<11266812.1201735224@[192.168.0.2]>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I think we're in danger of confusing 'error' in the narrow sense, as in sampling error, and error as in a mistake in calculation or estimation.

Iain Noble  
Department for Children, Schools and Families  
Young People Analysis Division - YCS and Next Steps Study,  
W606, Moorfoot, Sheffield, S1 4PQ.  
0114 259 1180  
For information about the Next Steps Study go to  
[www.nextstepsstudy.org.uk](http://www.nextstepsstudy.org.uk) or  
<http://www.esds.ac.uk/longitudinal/access/lstype/>

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

>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Thomas M. Guterbock

>Sent: 31 January 2008 04:20

>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

>Subject: Re: South Carolina polling?

>

>I appreciate the clarification on how to calculate error. Has anyone  
>figured out what CAUSED the error in the South Carolina pre-election  
polls?

>Did they underestimate turnout of African-Americans? The turnout of  
all

>Obama voters? The percentage for Obama among blacks? Among others?

> Tom G.

>

>--On Wednesday, January 30, 2008 6:21 PM -0500 "Leve, Jay"

><jleve@SURVEYUSA.COM> wrote:

>

>> Nick,

>>

>> To my knowledge, there are 8 ways to measure the error in the problem  
>> you pose.

>>

>> Those 8 measures, and the error each produces, are:

>>

>> Mosteller 1: 2 points

>> Mosteller 2: 2.35 points

>> Mosteller 3: 4 points

>> Mosteller 4: 8.17 points

>> Mosteller 5: 4 points

>> Mosteller 6: 6 points

>> Traugott: 9.43 points



>> Shipman: 6 points

>>

>>

>>

>> Jay H Leve

>> SurveyUSA

>> 15 Bloomfield Ave

>> Verona NJ 07044

>> 973-857-8500 x 551

>> jleve@surveyusa.com

>>

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

>> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Nick Panagakis

>> Sent: Wednesday, January 30, 2008 5:56 PM

>> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

>> Subject: Re: South Carolina polling?

>>

>> I agree that they were outside their margins of error just as you

>> described.

>>

>> My issue is how error (not statistical) but error between polls and

>> election outcomes should be

>> characterized. Margin error or estimate error?

>>

>> Nick

>>

>> Douglas Rivers wrote:

>>

>>> Not sure what your point is. I was explaining how to calculate

>>> standard error for the lead given the standard errors for the

>>> proportions. In South Carolina it made no difference which you used,

>>> since the outcome was outside the MOE for both the lead and the

Obama

>>

>>> vote proportion. In other cases, one might be within the MOE and the

>>> other not--they are different parameters. (One case where they must

>>> be identical is a two-candidate race with no undecideds.)

>>>

>>> On Jan 30, 2008, at 4:34 AM, mail@marketsharescorp.com wrote:

>>>

>>>> Back up a minute.

>>>>

>>>> Poll said Smith was ahead of Jones 50% to 42%. 8 point lead for

>> Smith.

>>>> Election showed Smith won 52% to 48%. Smith won by a 4 point margin.

>>>> By how points was the poll off the mark?

>>>>

>>>> Nick

>>>>

>>>> ----- Original message -----

>>>> From: Douglas Rivers <doug@POLIMETRIX.COM>

>>>>

>>>>> This does not explain the problem, since the standard error of the

>>>>> lead is always less than the sum of the standard errors. To see  
>> this,  
>>>>> let p and q be the proportions supporting two candidates so  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  $\text{var}(\text{lead}) = \text{var}(p - q) = \text{var}(p) + \text{var}(q) - 2 \text{cov}(p,q)$   
>>>>>  $= [p(1-p) + q(1-q) + 2pq]/n$   
>>>>>  $\leq [p(1-p) + q(1-q) + 2 \sqrt{p(1-p)q(1-q)}]/n$   
>>>>>  $= [\text{s.e.}(p) + \text{s.e.}(q)]^2$   
>>>>>  
>>>>> and taking square roots. (This is just Minkowski's inequality.)  
The  
>>>>> same result goes through with finite population corrections and  
>> design  
>>>>> effects. Thus, you can add the standard errors or MOE's for the  
>>>>> proportions and get a (slightly) conservative s.e. or MOE for the  
>>>>> lead.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Doug Rivers  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>> On Jan 29, 2008, at 8:29 PM, mail@marketsharescorp.com wrote:  
>>>>>  
>>>>>> Higher errors in SC got less attention simply because they got  
the  
>>>>>> right winners. That's all there is to it.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> SC and NH Dem primary polls were the only ones so far where polls  
>>>>>> were off - for obvious reasons.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Successes include FL tonight. Congratulations FL pollsters!  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> I don't get 5 rings from 10 rings in Franklin' s charts. But  
watch  
>>>>>> out for margin error differences; i.e., polls minus election  
>>>>>> margins. Divide those errors by two to get the estimate error,  
the  
>>>>>> only error that counts.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Here is the drill.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> 1. Elections are zero-sum games. This means that two points high  
>> for  
>>>>>> one candidate MEANS two points low for the other. So estimate  
error  
>>>>>> is the more valid measure. Estimate errors are not additive which  
>> is  
>>>>>> the effect of using the difference between election and poll  
>> margins.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> 2. This is also the only error measure that can be compared with  
>>>>>> sample margin of error always included in poll reports. Whatever  
>>>>>> method is used, it should be comparable to stated statistical

>> margin  
>>>>> error. Only error of the estimates does that.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> All for now.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Nick  
>>>>>  
>>>>> ----- Original message -----  
>>>>> From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmg1p@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>> Correction: I see now that Charles Franklin has indeed posted  
>>>>>> about the  
>>>>>> amount of error in SC on pollster.com. He shows that the error  
>> was  
>>>>>> far  
>>>>>> greater in SC than in NH, but that nobody got it wrong about  
Obama  
>>>>>> taking  
>>>>>> first place despite the large inaccuracies in estimating the  
>>>>>> percentage of  
>>>>>> the vote he would receive. He suggests that the errors got less  
>>>>>> media  
>>>>>> attention than NH because expectations about Obama winning were  
>> not  
>>>>>> overturned by the actual result.  
>>>>>> You can read Franklin at:  
>>>>>> [http://www.pollster.com/blogs/south\\_carolina\\_poll\\_errors.php](http://www.pollster.com/blogs/south_carolina_poll_errors.php)  
>>>>>> Very cool graphs in there, BTW.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Tom  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> --On Tuesday, January 29, 2008 10:27 PM -0500 "Thomas M.  
>> Guterbock"  
>>>>>> <tmg1p@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU> wrote:  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Did I get this wrong, or were the results of the Democratic  
>>>>>>> primary in SC  
>>>>>>> last Saturday quite different than what the pre-election polls  
>>>>>>> predicted?  
>>>>>>> Is there a reason why this is not a subject of discussion here?  
>> In  
>>>>>>> particular, doesn't Obama's showing in SC, which exceeded what  
>> the  
>>>>>>> polls  
>>>>>>> predicted, make the "Bradley/Wilder effect" thesis that was  
>>>>>>> trotted out  
>>>>>>> by some commentators on NH a bit less  
>>>>>>> tenable?  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Tom  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> PS: Pollster.com doesn't seem to be talking about this right  
>> now,

>>>>>>> either

>>>>>>> . . .

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Thomas M. Guterbock                      Voice: (434)243-5223  
>>>>>>> Director                                      CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222  
>>>>>>> Center for Survey Research                      FAX: (434)982-5524  
>>>>>>> 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> .  
>>>>>>> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>>>>>>> signoff aapornet  
>>>>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Thomas M. Guterbock                      Voice: (434)243-5223  
>>>>>>> Director                                      CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222  
>>>>>>> Center for Survey Research                      FAX: (434)982-5524  
>>>>>>> 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> .  
>>>>>>> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>>>>>>> signoff aapornet  
>>>>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> -----

>>>>>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>>>>>>> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>>>>>>> signoff aapornet  
>>>>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Douglas Rivers, Ph.D.  
>>>>>>> President & CEO  
>>>>>>> YouGov/Polimetrix  
>>>>>>> 285 Hamilton Ave., Suite 200  
>>>>>>> Palo Alto, CA 94301  
>>>>>>> (650) 462-8002  
>>>>>>> [doug@polimetrix.com](mailto:doug@polimetrix.com)

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> -----

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

>>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

>>>>> aapornet-request@asu.edu

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> -----

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

>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

>>>> aapornet-request@asu.edu

>>>>

>>>>

>>> Douglas Rivers, Ph.D.

>>> President & CEO

>>> YouGov/Polimetrix

>>> 285 Hamilton Ave., Suite 200

>>> Palo Alto, CA 94301

>>> (650) 462-8002

>>> doug@polimetrix.com

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>

>> -----

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

>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

>> aapornet-request@asu.edu

>>

>> -----

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

>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

>> aapornet-request@asu.edu

>

>

>

>

>Thomas M. Guterbock                      Voice: (434)243-5223

>Director                                  CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222

>Center for Survey Research              FAX: (434)982-5524

>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> .

>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

aapornet-request@asu.edu

>

>This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the Government

Secure

>Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless in partnership with MessageLabs.  
>(CCTM Certificate Number 2007/11/0032.) In case of problems, please call your  
>organisation's IT Helpdesk.  
>Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for  
>legal purposes.

The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intranet virus scanning service supplied by Cable&Wireless in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2007/11/0032.) On leaving the GSi this email was certified virus free.

Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Thu, 31 Jan 2008 10:09:42 -0500  
Reply-To: Cristine Delnevo <[delnevo@UMDNJ.EDU](mailto:delnevo@UMDNJ.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Cristine Delnevo <[delnevo@UMDNJ.EDU](mailto:delnevo@UMDNJ.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: South Carolina polling?  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[11266812.1201735224@\[192.168.0.2\]](mailto:11266812.1201735224@[192.168.0.2])>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

i've not seen this discussed w/respect to SC yet, but wonder if some of this underestimation is attributed to wireless substitution, which we know is higher in the south. moreover, rates are higher among minorities and young people, two groups that obama did well w/

thoughts?

Cristine Delnevo, PhD, MPH  
UMDNJ-School of Public Health

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

From: AAPORNET [[mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)] On Behalf Of Thomas M. Guterbock  
Sent: Wednesday, January 30, 2008 11:20 PM  
To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Subject: Re: South Carolina polling?

I appreciate the clarification on how to calculate error. Has anyone figured out what CAUSED the error in the South Carolina pre-election polls?

Did they underestimate turnout of African-Americans? The turnout of all Obama voters? The percentage for Obama among blacks? Among others?

Tom G.

--On Wednesday, January 30, 2008 6:21 PM -0500 "Leve, Jay"

<jleve@SURVEYUSA.COM> wrote:

> Nick,

>

> To my knowledge, there are 8 ways to measure the error in the problem

> you pose.

>

> Those 8 measures, and the error each produces, are:

>

> Mosteller 1: 2 points

> Mosteller 2: 2.35 points

> Mosteller 3: 4 points

> Mosteller 4: 8.17 points

> Mosteller 5: 4 points

> Mosteller 6: 6 points

> Traugott: 9.43 points

> Shipman: 6 points

>

>

>

> Jay H Leve

> SurveyUSA

> 15 Bloomfield Ave

> Verona NJ 07044

> 973-857-8500 x 551

> jleve@surveyusa.com

>

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Nick Panagakis

> Sent: Wednesday, January 30, 2008 5:56 PM

> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

> Subject: Re: South Carolina polling?

>

> I agree that they were outside their margins of error just as you

> described.

>

> My issue is how error (not statistical) but error between polls and

> election outcomes should be

> characterized. Margin error or estimate error?

>

> Nick

>

> Douglas Rivers wrote:

>

>> Not sure what your point is. I was explaining how to calculate

>> standard error for the lead given the standard errors for the

>> proportions. In South Carolina it made no difference which you used,

>> since the outcome was outside the MOE for both the lead and the Obama

>

>> vote proportion. In other cases, one might be within the MOE and the  
>> other not--they are different parameters. (One case where they must  
>> be identical is a two-candidate race with no undecideds.)

>>> On Jan 30, 2008, at 4:34 AM, mail@marketsharescorp.com wrote:

>>>> Back up a minute.

>>>> Poll said Smith was ahead of Jones 50% to 42%. 8 point lead for  
> Smith.

>>>> Election showed Smith won 52% to 48%. Smith won by a 4 point margin.

>>>> By how points was the poll off the mark?

>>>> Nick

>>>> ----- Original message -----

>>>> From: Douglas Rivers <doug@POLIMETRIX.COM>

>>>>> This does not explain the problem, since the standard error of the  
>>>>> lead is always less than the sum of the standard errors. To see  
> this,

>>>>> let p and q be the proportions supporting two candidates so

>>>>>  $\text{var}(\text{lead}) = \text{var}(p - q) = \text{var}(p) + \text{var}(q) - 2 \text{cov}(p, q)$

>>>>>  $= [p(1-p) + q(1-q) + 2pq]/n$

>>>>>  $\leq [p(1-p) + q(1-q) + 2 \sqrt{p(1-p)q(1-q)}]/n$

>>>>>  $= [\text{s.e.}(p) + \text{s.e.}(q)]^2$

>>>>> and taking square roots. (This is just Minkowski's inequality.) The  
>>>>> same result goes through with finite population corrections and  
> design

>>>>> effects. Thus, you can add the standard errors or MOE's for the  
>>>>> proportions and get a (slightly) conservative s.e. or MOE for the  
>>>>> lead.

>>>>> Doug Rivers

>>>>> On Jan 29, 2008, at 8:29 PM, mail@marketsharescorp.com wrote:

>>>>>> Higher errors in SC got less attention simply because they got the  
>>>>>> right winners. That's all there is to it.

>>>>>> SC and NH Dem primary polls were the only ones so far where polls  
>>>>>> were off - for obvious reasons.

>>>>>> Successes include FL tonight. Congratulations FL pollsters!

>>>>>> I don't get 5 rings from 10 rings in Franklin' s charts. But watch  
>>>>>> out for margin error differences; i.e., polls minus election  
>>>>>> margins. Divide those errors by two to get the estimate error, the  
>>>>>> only error that counts.



>>>>>  
>>>>> Here is the drill.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> 1. Elections are zero-sum games. This means that two points high  
> for  
>>>>> one candidate MEANS two points low for the other. So estimate error  
>>>>> is the more valid measure. Estimate errors are not additive which  
> is  
>>>>> the effect of using the difference between election and poll  
> margins.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> 2. This is also the only error measure that can be compared with  
>>>>> sample margin of error always included in poll reports. Whatever  
>>>>> method is used, it should be comparable to stated statistical  
> margin  
>>>>> error. Only error of the estimates does that.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> All for now.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Nick  
>>>>>  
>>>>> ----- Original message -----  
>>>>> From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmg1p@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>> Correction: I see now that Charles Franklin has indeed posteed  
>>>>>> about the  
>>>>>> amount of error in SC on pollster.com. He shows that the error  
> was  
>>>>>> far  
>>>>>> greater in SC than in NH, but that nobody got it wrong about Obama  
>>>>>> taking  
>>>>>> first place despite the large inaccuracies in estimating the  
>>>>>> percentage of  
>>>>>> the vote he would receive. He suggests that the errors got less  
>>>>>> media  
>>>>>> attention than NH because expectations about Obama winning were  
> not  
>>>>>> overturned by the actual result.  
>>>>>> You can read Franklin at:  
>>>>>> [http://www.pollster.com/blogs/south\\_carolina\\_poll\\_errors.php](http://www.pollster.com/blogs/south_carolina_poll_errors.php)  
>>>>>> Very cool graphs in there, BTW.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Tom  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> --On Tuesday, January 29, 2008 10:27 PM -0500 "Thomas M.  
> Guterbock"  
>>>>>>> <tmg1p@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU> wrote:  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> Did I get this wrong, or were the results of the Democratic  
>>>>>>>> primary in SC  
>>>>>>>> last Saturday quite different than what the pre-election polls  
>>>>>>>> predicted?  
>>>>>>>> Is there a reason why this is not a subject of discussion here?  
> In

>>>>>> particular, doesn't Obama's showing in SC, which exceeded what  
> the  
>>>>>> polls  
>>>>>> predicted, make the "Bradley/Wilder effect" thesis that was  
>>>>>> trotted out  
>>>>>> by some commentators on NH a bit less  
>>>>>> tenable?

>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Tom

>>>>>>  
>>>>>> PS: Pollster.com doesn't seem to be talking about this right  
> now,  
>>>>>> either  
>>>>>> . . .

>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Thomas M. Guterbock                      Voice: (434)243-5223  
>>>>>> Director                                  CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222  
>>>>>> Center for Survey Research              FAX: (434)982-5524  
>>>>>> 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> .  
>>>>>> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>>>>>> signoff aapornet  
>>>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Thomas M. Guterbock                      Voice: (434)243-5223  
>>>>>> Director                                  CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222  
>>>>>> Center for Survey Research              FAX: (434)982-5524  
>>>>>> 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> .  
>>>>>> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>>>>>> signoff aapornet  
>>>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

>>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> Douglas Rivers, Ph.D.

>>>> President & CEO

>>>> YouGov/Polimetrix

>>>> 285 Hamilton Ave., Suite 200

>>>> Palo Alto, CA 94301

>>>> (650) 462-8002

>>>> doug@polimetrix.com

>>>>

>>>> -----

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

>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

>>>> aapornet-request@asu.edu

>>>

>>>

>>> -----

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

>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

>>> aapornet-request@asu.edu

>>

>>

>> Douglas Rivers, Ph.D.

>> President & CEO

>> YouGov/Polimetrix

>> 285 Hamilton Ave., Suite 200

>> Palo Alto, CA 94301

>> (650) 462-8002

>> doug@polimetrix.com

>>

>>

>>

>>

>

> -----

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

> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

> aapornet-request@asu.edu

>

> -----

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

> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

> aapornet-request@asu.edu

Thomas M. Guterbock  
Director

Voice: (434)243-5223  
CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222

Center for Survey Research                      FAX: (434)982-5524  
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> .  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Unsubscribe?-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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Thu, 31 Jan 2008 10:53:47 -0500  
Reply-To: Jonathan Brill <[brillje@UMDNJ.EDU](mailto:brillje@UMDNJ.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jonathan Brill <[brillje@UMDNJ.EDU](mailto:brillje@UMDNJ.EDU)>  
Subject: bigotry effects on the vote  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT  
Content-disposition: inline  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Although my interest in AAPOR is unrelated to political polling, it has occurred to me that the present Presidential campaign season offers a fascinating laboratory for studying the effects of bigotry on candidate choice. For the first time, this election features a black candidate who is truly a serious contender to be elected President. Simultaneously, for the first time, this election features a female candidat who is truly a serious contender to be elected President. Wow! Two firsts represented by two different candidates. Could it get any better than this from a sociological perspective?

I have to wonder:

How many people will and won't vote for Senator Obama because his racial identity is the overriding consideration? How many people will and won't vote for Senator Clinton because her gender is the overriding consideration?

Assuming that either Obama or Clinton becomes the democratic nominee, what will be the crossover/desertion rate among Democrats who will vote for the white male GOP nominee? And what will be the crossover/desertion rate among Republicans who will vote for Obama or Clinton because of race/gender?

And what are the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics and party affiliations that characterize each group? How strong will the discriminatory power of these attributes be in predicting the voter

choice patterns in the general election?

Does anyone know if there is a large-scale and serious academic effort underway to investigate these issues? If so, who are the investigators leading the effort?

Regards,  
Jonathan

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.  
General Manager, ORANJ BOWL(sm) Panel Research Program  
Associate Director, Research Call Center & Panel Research  
NEW JERSEY INSTITUTE FOR SUCCESSFUL AGING  
School of Osteopathic Medicine  
University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey  
42 East Laurel Road, UDP Suite 2300  
Stratford, New Jersey 08084  
Telephone (direct): 856.566-6727  
Fax (research group): 856.566-6874  
E-mail: [brillje@umdnj.edu](mailto:brillje@umdnj.edu)  
[www.oranjbowl.info](http://www.oranjbowl.info)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email communication may contain private, confidential, or legally privileged information intended for the sole use of the designated and/or duly authorized recipient(s). If you are not the intended recipient or have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by email and permanently delete all copies of this email including all attachments without reading them. If you are the intended recipient, secure the contents in a manner that conforms to all applicable state and/or federal requirements related to privacy and confidentiality of such information.

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Thu, 31 Jan 2008 11:25:34 -0500  
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: South Carolina polling?  
Comments: To: [Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK](mailto:Iain.NOBLE@DCSF.GSI.GOV.UK)  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
In-Reply-To: <[8CD5D9A623A40E4BAB9DD7531EBDEDBB0465A1F3@MFEXC01.AD.HQ.DEPT](mailto:8CD5D9A623A40E4BAB9DD7531EBDEDBB0465A1F3@MFEXC01.AD.HQ.DEPT)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Verily.

The MOE only describes a level of random variation of repeated survey statistics around a population parameter.

What Charles Franklin's excellent graphics show is bias that appears to affect all the listed surveys in much the same manner. Random variation due to sampling error should be plotted around the center of gravity of the results of the various surveys, because that is what they are actually measuring (even if this is incorrect, as it turns out).

Even if the survey results all fell within their MOE of the "true" outcome, the fact that they are all clustered in the same direction would indicate consistent bias, which is the only thing that should be of analytical interest here.

Jan Werner

---

Iain Noble wrote:

> I think we're in danger of confusing 'error' in the narrow sense, as in  
> sampling error, and error as in a mistake in calculation or estimation.

>

> Iain Noble

> Department for Children, Schools and Families

> Young People Analysis Division - YCS and Next Steps Study,

> W606, Moorfoot, Sheffield, S1 4PQ.

> 0114 259 1180

> For information about the Next Steps Study go to

> [www.nextstepsstudy.org.uk](http://www.nextstepsstudy.org.uk) or

> <http://www.esds.ac.uk/longitudinal/access/lsype/>

>

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

>> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Thomas M.

> Guterbock

>> Sent: 31 January 2008 04:20

>> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU

>> Subject: Re: South Carolina polling?

>>

>> I appreciate the clarification on how to calculate error. Has anyone

>> figured out what CAUSED the error in the South Carolina pre-election

> polls?

>> Did they underestimate turnout of African-Americans? The turnout of

> all

>> Obama voters? The percentage for Obama among blacks? Among others?

>> Tom G.

>>

>> --On Wednesday, January 30, 2008 6:21 PM -0500 "Leve, Jay"

>> <jleve@SURVEYUSA.COM> wrote:

>>

>>> Nick,

>>>  
>>> To my knowledge, there are 8 ways to measure the error in the problem  
>>> you pose.

>>>  
>>> Those 8 measures, and the error each produces, are:

>>>  
>>> Mosteller 1: 2 points  
>>> Mosteller 2: 2.35 points  
>>> Mosteller 3: 4 points  
>>> Mosteller 4: 8.17 points  
>>> Mosteller 5: 4 points  
>>> Mosteller 6: 6 points  
>>> Traugott: 9.43 points  
>>> Shipman: 6 points

>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> Jay H Leve  
>>> SurveyUSA  
>>> 15 Bloomfield Ave  
>>> Verona NJ 07044  
>>> 973-857-8500 x 551  
>>> jleve@surveyusa.com

>>>  
>>> -----Original Message-----  
>>> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Nick Panagakis  
>>> Sent: Wednesday, January 30, 2008 5:56 PM  
>>> To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
>>> Subject: Re: South Carolina polling?

>>>  
>>> I agree that they were outside their margins of error just as you  
>>> described.

>>>  
>>> My issue is how error (not statistical) but error between polls and  
>>> election outcomes should be  
>>> characterized. Margin error or estimate error?

>>>  
>>> Nick

>>>  
>>> Douglas Rivers wrote:

>>>  
>>>> Not sure what your point is. I was explaining how to calculate  
>>>> standard error for the lead given the standard errors for the  
>>>> proportions. In South Carolina it made no difference which you used,  
>>>> since the outcome was outside the MOE for both the lead and the  
> Obama  
>>>> vote proportion. In other cases, one might be within the MOE and the  
>>>> other not--they are different parameters. (One case where they must  
>>>> be identical is a two-candidate race with no undecideds.)

>>>>  
>>>> On Jan 30, 2008, at 4:34 AM, mail@marketsharescorp.com wrote:

>>>>  
>>>>> Back up a minute.

>>>>>

>>>>> Poll said Smith was ahead of Jones 50% to 42%. 8 point lead for  
>>> Smith.

>>>>> Election showed Smith won 52% to 48%. Smith won by a 4 point  
> margin.

>>>>> By how points was the poll off the mark?

>>>>>

>>>>> Nick

>>>>>

>>>>> ----- Original message -----

>>>>> From: Douglas Rivers <doug@POLIMETRIX.COM>

>>>>>

>>>>>> This does not explain the problem, since the standard error of the  
>>>>>> lead is always less than the sum of the standard errors. To see

>>> this,

>>>>>> let p and q be the proportions supporting two candidates so

>>>>>>

>>>>>>  $\text{var}(\text{lead}) = \text{var}(p - q) = \text{var}(p) + \text{var}(q) - 2 \text{cov}(p, q)$

>>>>>>  $= [p(1-p) + q(1-q) + 2pq]/n$

>>>>>>  $\leq [p(1-p) + q(1-q) + 2 \sqrt{p(1-p)q(1-q)}]/n$

>>>>>>  $= [\text{s.e.}(p) + \text{s.e.}(q)]^2$

>>>>>>

>>>>>> and taking square roots. (This is just Minkowski's inequality.)

> The

>>>>>> same result goes through with finite population corrections and

>>> design

>>>>>> effects. Thus, you can add the standard errors or MOE's for the

>>>>>> proportions and get a (slightly) conservative s.e. or MOE for the

>>>>>> lead.

>>>>>>

>>>>>> Doug Rivers

>>>>>>

>>>>>>

>>>>>>

>>>>>>

>>>>>> On Jan 29, 2008, at 8:29 PM, mail@marketsharescorp.com wrote:

>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Higher errors in SC got less attention simply because they got

> the

>>>>>>> right winners. That's all there is to it.

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> SC and NH Dem primary polls were the only ones so far where polls

>>>>>>> were off - for obvious reasons.

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Successes include FL tonight. Congratulations FL pollsters!

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> I don't get 5 rings from 10 rings in Franklin's charts. But

> watch

>>>>>>> out for margin error differences; i.e., polls minus election

>>>>>>> margins. Divide those errors by two to get the estimate error,

> the

>>>>>>> only error that counts.

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Here is the drill.

>>>>>>>



>>>>>> 1. Elections are zero-sum games. This means that two points high  
>>> for  
>>>>>> one candidate MEANS two points low for the other. So estimate  
> error  
>>>>>> is the more valid measure. Estimate errors are not additive which  
>>> is  
>>>>>> the effect of using the difference between election and poll  
>>> margins.

>>>>>> 2. This is also the only error measure that can be compared with  
>>>>>> sample margin of error always included in poll reports. Whatever  
>>>>>> method is used, it should be comparable to stated statistical  
>>> margin  
>>>>>> error. Only error of the estimates does that.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> All for now.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Nick  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> ----- Original message -----  
>>>>>> From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmg1p@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU>  
>>>>>>

>>>>>> Correction: I see now that Charles Franklin has indeed posted  
>>>>>> about the  
>>>>>> amount of error in SC on pollster.com. He shows that the error  
>>> was  
>>>>>> far  
>>>>>> greater in SC than in NH, but that nobody got it wrong about  
> Obama  
>>>>>> taking  
>>>>>> first place despite the large inaccuracies in estimating the  
>>>>>> percentage of  
>>>>>> the vote he would receive. He suggests that the errors got less  
>>>>>> media  
>>>>>> attention than NH because expectations about Obama winning were  
>>> not  
>>>>>> overturned by the actual result.  
>>>>>> You can read Franklin at:  
>>>>>> [http://www.pollster.com/blogs/south\\_carolina\\_poll\\_errors.php](http://www.pollster.com/blogs/south_carolina_poll_errors.php)  
>>>>>> Very cool graphs in there, BTW.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Tom  
>>>>>>

>>>>>> --On Tuesday, January 29, 2008 10:27 PM -0500 "Thomas M.  
>>> Guterbock"  
>>>>>> <tmg1p@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU> wrote:  
>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Did I get this wrong, or were the results of the Democratic  
>>>>>>> primary in SC  
>>>>>>> last Saturday quite different than what the pre-election polls  
>>>>>>> predicted?  
>>>>>>> Is there a reason why this is not a subject of discussion here?  
>>> In  
>>>>>>> particular, doesn't Obama's showing in SC, which exceeded what  
>>> the

>>>>>>>> polls  
>>>>>>>> predicted, make the "Bradley/Wilder effect" thesis that was  
>>>>>>>> trotted out  
>>>>>>>> by some commentators on NH a bit less  
>>>>>>>> tenable?

>>>>>>> Tom

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> PS: Pollster.com doesn't seem to be talking about this right  
>>> now,

>>>>>>>> either

>>>>>>>> ...

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> Thomas M. Guterbock                      Voice: (434)243-5223  
>>>>>>>> Director                                      CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222  
>>>>>>>> Center for Survey Research                      FAX: (434)982-5524  
>>>>>>>> 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> .  
>>>>>>>> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>>>>>>>> signoff aapornet  
>>>>>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> Thomas M. Guterbock                      Voice: (434)243-5223  
>>>>>>>> Director                                      CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222  
>>>>>>>> Center for Survey Research                      FAX: (434)982-5524  
>>>>>>>> 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> .  
>>>>>>>> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>>>>>>>> signoff aapornet  
>>>>>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> -----

>>>>>>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>>>>>>>> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>>>>>>>> signoff aapornet  
>>>>>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> Douglas Rivers, Ph.D.  
>>>>>>>> President & CEO  
>>>>>>>> YouGov/Polimetrix  
>>>>>>>> 285 Hamilton Ave., Suite 200

>>>>> Palo Alto, CA 94301  
>>>>> (650) 462-8002  
>>>>> doug@polimetrix.com

>>>>> -----  
>>>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>>>>> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
>>>>> aapornet-request@asu.edu

>>>>> -----  
>>>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>>>>> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
>>>>> aapornet-request@asu.edu

>>>> Douglas Rivers, Ph.D.  
>>>> President & CEO  
>>>> YouGov/Polimetrix  
>>>> 285 Hamilton Ave., Suite 200  
>>>> Palo Alto, CA 94301  
>>>> (650) 462-8002  
>>>> doug@polimetrix.com

>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> -----  
>>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>>>> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
>>>> aapornet-request@asu.edu

>>>> -----  
>>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> .  
>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>>>> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
>>>> aapornet-request@asu.edu

>>>> Thomas M. Guterbock                      Voice: (434)243-5223  
>>>> Director                                  CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222  
>>>> Center for Survey Research                FAX: (434)982-5524  
>>>> 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> .  
>>>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>>>> Unsubscribe?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
>>>> aapornet-request@asu.edu

>> This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the Government  
> Secure  
>> Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless in partnership  
> with MessageLabs.  
>> (CCTM Certificate Number 2007/11/0032.) In case of problems, please  
> call your  
>> organisation's IT Helpdesk.  
>> Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored  
> and/or recorded for  
>> legal purposes.  
>  
> The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure  
Intranet virus scanning service supplied by Cable&Wireless in partnership with  
MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2007/11/0032.) On leaving the GSi this  
email was certified virus free.  
> Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or  
recorded for legal purposes.  
>  
> -----  
> 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 this: set aapornet mail  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> 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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Thu, 31 Jan 2008 12:43:37 -0500  
Reply-To: [boyds1@ohio.edu](mailto:boyds1@ohio.edu)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Sara Boyd <[boyds1@OHIO.EDU](mailto:boyds1@OHIO.EDU)>  
Subject: Seeking recommendations for a web survey software program  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi Everyone

We would much appreciate hearing recommendations for web survey software programs. We currently have a license for Persius Enterprise, but that program is no longer being supported since the company was bought out. We are only interested in programs that we can host on our own server, and it must allow for custom scripting and programming (be compatible with programs such as Dreamweaver and/or Visual Studio). And of course the surveys need to be esthetically pleasing.

If you have a suggestion, please respond to me off list. In case there are other members interested in this information will compile the results and submit that the the list serve.

Thank you very much.

Sara Boyd

--

Sara Lichtin Boyd, Senior Project Manager

Ohio University's Voinovich School for Leadership and Public Affairs

Building 22, The Ridges, Athens, OH 45701

(P) 740.593.9798

(F) 740.593.4398

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====  
Date: Thu, 31 Jan 2008 12:56:47 -0500

Reply-To: Pat Lewis <[plewis@AAPOR.ORG](mailto:plewis@AAPOR.ORG)>

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

From: Pat Lewis <[plewis@AAPOR.ORG](mailto:plewis@AAPOR.ORG)>

Subject: AAPOR Announces Members of Special Committee on 2008

Presidential

Primary Polling

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

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=WINDOWS-1252

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: inline

Here's the press release on the committee members:

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Contact: Dale Leibach o=

r

Mike Tetuan

January 31, 2008

Prism Public Affairs

202-207-3638

\*AAPOR NAMES COMMITTEE TO STUDY PRE-ELECTION POLLING \*

\* \*

\*Panel to Assess Results of Presidential Primary Polls\*

WASHINGTON, D.C. — The American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) today named a special panel of leading academic and business experts on public opinion research to help shed light on pre-election polling results in the New Hampshire presidential primary.

The eleven-member AAPOR Special Committee on 2008 Presidential Primary Polling will review the New Hampshire pre-election polls. It is also examining subsequent 2008 pre-election polls to see if they help explain what occurred in New Hampshire.

"New Hampshire pre-election polls did not accurately reflect the outcome of the Democratic Party race, raising questions about the accuracy and reliability of pre-election polls," said Nancy Mathiowetz, President of AAPOR. "We are taking steps to examine what occurred, provide a timely report of our findings, and promote future research on pre-election primary polls. What we learn from this review will help us to continue to improve our methodology and ensure continued accuracy."

Michael W. Traugott, Professor of Communication Studies and Senior Research Scientist in the Center for Political Studies at the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan, will serve as the panel's chair. Traugott is a past president of AAPOR and the current President of the World Association of Public Opinion Research. The committee plans to issue its report in April 2008.

"There are a lot of different explanations floating around about what happened with the polls, but the committee will look at the available data to see which ideas have more merit than others," said Traugott. "Pre-election polling has a long history of accuracy. This committee's work will help to make sure that it continues to remain accurate and reliable."

AAPOR is the premier professional organization of public opinion and survey research professionals in the United States. According to its mission statement, the panel's goals are to "aid the public, journalists and pollsters in understanding the scientific, technical and 'real world' factors involved" in the New Hampshire polls, which have stirred controversy because of the difference between pre-election survey results and the outcome of the Democratic race.

-- MORE --

As part of its examination, the committee will review pre-election polling conducted for all primaries, including all of the Feb. 5 Super Tuesday primaries.

The committee has tentatively scheduled a Spring 2008 public forum on the topic of polling in the 2008 primaries. It will be hosted by the Kaiser Family Foundation at its Barbara Jordan Conference Center in Washington, D.C., on a date to be announced later.

The members of the committee are:

- Glen Bolger, a partner and co-founder of Public Opinion Strategies
- Darren W. Davis, Professor of Political Science at the University of Notre Dame
- Charles Franklin, Professor of Political Science at the University of Wisconsin and co-developer of Pollster.com <<http://pollster.com/>>
- Robert M. Groves, Director, the University of Michigan Survey Research Center, Professor of Sociology at the University of Michigan, Research Professor at its Institute for Social Research, and Research Professor at the Joint Program in Survey Methodology at the University of Maryland.
- Paul J. Lavrakas, a methodological research consultant
- Mark S. Mellman, CEO of The Mellman Group
- Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism at the University of North Carolina
- Kristen Olsen, Assistant Professor of Survey Research and Methodology and Assistant Professor of Sociology at the University of Nebraska.
- J. Ann Selzer, President of Selzer & Company.
- Michael W. Traugott, Professor of Communication Studies and Senior Research Scientist in the Center for Political Studies at the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan
- Christopher Wlezien, Professor of Political Science and Faculty Affiliate in the Institute for Public Affairs at Temple University

The ad hoc committee's full mission statement can be viewed at  
<http://www.aapor.org/aaporadhoccommitteemissionstatement>.

The member bios are at: <http://www.aapor.org/specialcommitteemembersandbios>

-- ### --

--=20

Pat Lewis  
Communications Director  
American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR)  
1405 North George Mason Drive  
Arlington, Virginia  
703.527-5245  
cell 703.201.5070  
[www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org)

AAPOR -- the leading association of public opinion and survey research  
professionals.

-----  
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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Thu, 31 Jan 2008 10:27:57 -0800  
Reply-To: Joel Moskowitz <[jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU](mailto:jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
Comments: RFC822 error: <W> MESSAGE-ID field duplicated. Last occurrence  
was retained.  
From: Joel Moskowitz <[jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU](mailto:jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU)>  
Subject: Traditional Polling Methods Do Not Work for Nontraditional  
Candidates  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Traditional Polling Methods Do Not Work for Nontraditional Candidates

Joel Weinberger and Robert F. Bornstein, Huffington Post, Jan 30, 2008

The New Hampshire polls indicated that John McCain would handily beat  
Mitt Romney, with the rest of the candidates coming in as also-rans.  
That's exactly what happened. Barack Obama was said to be ahead of  
Hillary Clinton by double digits. All the polls said so, including



the internal polls of the Obama and Clinton campaigns. The polls were wrong, and Clinton won the New Hampshire primary.

Why were the polls so right on the Republican side and so wrong on the Democratic side? One possibility is that the polling methods used in New Hampshire were fine. Something happened in the last few days that overcame their predictions. That is where all of the pundits and media went. They said that Clinton overcame a double-digit deficit in a day or two. Perhaps her emotional display shortly before the primary made her a more sympathetic figure. Perhaps she did better in the last debate than Obama. Perhaps Clinton got her people to the polls whereas Obama did not. Maybe Obama's lack of experience finally registered with the notoriously independent voters of New Hampshire.

The same kind of thing happened in Nevada. The polls predicted a Romney victory and it happened. Clinton and Obama were supposed to be neck in neck. Instead, Clinton beat Obama. Now we hear that Obama's supporters didn't make it to the polls. We hear that the rough and tumble of the Clinton team damaged Obama. Once again, the polls were accurate measures but late developments changed the predicted outcome.

We move on to South Carolina and Florida. McCain was predicted to win Florida with Romney a close second. That is what happened. And what of Clinton and Obama? As in Nevada, the two were supposed to be neck in neck in South Carolina. Obama crushed Clinton. Now we hear that voters were offended by the Clintons' negative tactics (the same that seemed to have worked in Nevada), particularly as they may have regarded "race." In all of these cases, the polls are presumed to be correct with last minute events accounting for their inaccuracies. Somehow, these last minute events always affect the Clinton and Obama predictions but never the McCain Romney predictions.

In science, there is always a second possibility when a measure fails to predict a behavior: The measure was off. If that is the case, then nothing special happened in the last few days of any of these races. The measure was not accurately measuring voting behavior to begin with. The pundits have mentioned one possibility of this sort. People may have been dissembling to the pollsters. Past upsets of the sort that took place in New Hampshire (for example, the Bradley electoral defeat in California a while back) have a disturbing factor in common: In each case, the polls had African American candidates comfortably ahead, but the African American candidate unexpectedly lost. Maybe people told the pollsters they would vote for Obama but in the privacy of the voting booth they did not do what they told the pollsters they would. To put it bluntly, unadmitted racism raised its ugly head. In South Carolina it happened in reverse but now it was racial pride. After all, as Bill Clinton said, Jesse Jackson won South Carolina twice in the 1980s. About half the voters are African American. Perhaps they just voted for one of their own, Barak Obama, and did not admit they would do this to the pollsters.

But there is a second way a measure can fail to predict behavior that no one has commented on. There may be something wrong with the measure itself. A great deal of psychological research has shown that

what people say about gender and race does not always match how they behave toward women and African Americans. This is not because people are lying--they genuinely believe they are not sexist or racist. And on the surface most of them (and us) are not. Psychologists understand this attitude-behavior discrepancy in terms of explicit and implicit processes.

Traditional polls measure explicit processes. They measure how people say they feel about race and gender--how people think they will vote. But they do not measure implicit, underlying attitudes. Psychologists repeatedly find that white people who report they have no racial prejudice will still act less comfortably in the presence of an African American than in the presence of another white person. Ditto for other racial attitudes and behaviors, and for gender-related ones as well. Such discrepancies can be strengthened by surreptitiously bringing up racial or gender stereotypes (a procedure called "priming" by researchers).

These implicit attitudes and priming effects might not show up in polls, but they are readily detected by other kinds of measures (such as differences in response time to race-related words or reactions to gender-related stimuli people are unaware of having experienced). There are many such examples in the psychological research literature (some are reviewed in Drew Westen's book *The Political Mind*). Most important as Super Tuesday and the November election draw near, these findings hold for most of us, not just those who are overtly sexist or racist.

What this all means is that traditional polling might be wonderfully predictive in a traditional race (i.e., two Caucasian men), but woefully inadequate in 2008 when we have the historically unprecedented case of an African American and a woman competing. Extraordinary times require new, innovative methods, and traditional polling alone just won't be enough. Traditional polls will not work for non-traditional candidates.

If I were you, I would take whatever the polls say about Clinton vs. Obama on Super Tuesday with a grain of salt. I would readily accept their findings for the Romney McCain race however.

Joel Weinberger, PhD  
Robert F. Bornstein, PhD

Derner Institute of Advanced Psychological Studies  
Adelphi University, Garden City, NY

[http://www.huffingtonpost.com/joel-weinberger-and-robert-f-bornstein/traditional-polling-metho\\_b\\_84072.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/joel-weinberger-and-robert-f-bornstein/traditional-polling-metho_b_84072.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 this: set aapornet mail  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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