



WORLD ASSOCIATION FOR PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH

NEWSLETTER

Second Quarter 2010

Executive Council

President

Dr. Thomas Petersen, Germany

Past President

Prof. Dr. Michael Traugott, USA

Vice President & President-Elect

Dr. Tom W. Smith, USA

Secretary-Treasurer

Prof. Claire Durand, Canada

Liaison Committee Chair

Prof. Ting-yiu Robert Chung, HK

Publications Chair

Mr. Alejandro Moreno, Mexico

Professional Standards Committee Chair

Prof. Patricia Moy, USA

General Secretary

Prof. Dr. Allan L. McCutcheon, USA

Conference Committee Chair

Prof. Patricia Moy, USA

Media Relations Committee Chair

Mr. Alejandro Moreno, Mexico

Membership Committee Chair

Prof. Dr. Connie de Boer, Netherlands

ESOMAR Liaison

Dr. Frits Spangenberg, Netherlands

IJPOR Managing Editor

Prof. Peter Neijens, Netherlands

Historian

Prof. Philip Meyer, USA

Executive Coordinator

Ms. Renae Reis, USA

National Representatives

Argentina, Ms. Maria Braun

Chile, Ms. Marta Lagos

Colombia, Mr. Hernando Rojas

Costa Rica, Dr. Carlos F. Denton

Czech Republic, Dr. Hynek Jerabek

Germany, Dr. Thomas Petersen

Hong Kong, Prof. Robert Chung

India, Mr. Prakash Nijhara

Japan, Mr. Kazuo Kobayashi

Mexico, Mr. Pablo Paras

Netherlands, Mr. Jeroen Slot

Norway, Prof. Ottar Hellevik

Philippines, Dr. Mahar K. Mangahas

Poland, Dr. Krzysztof Zagórski

Russia, Ms. Marina Krasilnikova

Sweden, Mr. Arne Modig

Switzerland, Prof. Dominique Joye

UK, Mr. Nick Moon

USA, Dr. Mark Schulman

Annual Conference Wrap-Up

Contributed by Trevor Tompson (Conference Chair)

WAPOR gathered in Chicago from May 11-13 for its 63rd annual conference, in a joint conference held with the American Association for Public Opinion Research. Nearly a hundred people attended the conference – 99, to be precise – and as far as we can tell that is an all-time record for attendance at an annual North American WAPOR conference. There were seventy-one papers on the program, with representation from North America, Europe, Asia, and South America. There was also a good diversity of papers including representatives from academic, commercial and non-profit research institutions.

The plenary session at the conference was about the challenges and opportunities of cross-national and multi-country surveys from a commercial point of view. WAPOR is grateful to have attracted high-ranking executives from four of the largest companies who are doing this kind of work in the commercial sector, including Robert Manchin, Managing Director at Gallup, Vadim Volos, Vice President of GfK Roper Public Affairs, Darrell Bricker, Global CEO, Ipsos Public Affairs, and Leendert de Voogd, Global Head, TNS Political and Social. The panel included presentations by each company and a thought-provoking exchange with the audience about the work that major research companies are doing around the world. Thanks to WAPOR Vice President Tom Smith for presiding over the plenary session.

The Helen Dinerman Prize for lifetime achievement in public opinion research was presented by WAPOR President Thomas Petersen to Robert Groves, who

(Conference continued on page 5)

Table of Contents

Annual Conference Wrap-Up.....	1
President's Letter.....	2
Call for Nominations....	4
Helen Dinerman Award Citation.....	6
Conferences of other associations.....	9
Ukrainian Elections.....	10
Notes, Dates & Deadlines.....	16

**64th Annual
Conference
Europe (TBD)
September 2011**

Letter from the President

Dear WAPOR members,

“Traversing the world with the homeland in your heart”—that was the motto of Albert Ballin (1857-1918), Hamburg’s great shipowner and director-general of the “Hamburg-Amerikanische Packetfahrt-Actien-Gesellschaft” (HAPAG), whose ships carried the great waves of emigrants over the Atlantic a hundred years ago. In a sense, this motto could also apply to WAPOR, if we don’t think of “homeland” in the sense of a location, but of one’s own origins, one’s own traditions. It is not easy for an association like WAPOR to strike the right balance between maintaining its traditional image, which is important, and adjusting to the changes brought by the passage of time, which is equally important.



Thomas Petersen
President

In the past weeks, we have introduced two changes which will hopefully enable us to proceed in the spirit of Ballin’s motto. Most of you have probably already noticed the first change: in early July 2010, our new website went online—finally, after lengthy preparations—and we hope it will give our organization a more contemporary appearance. On this occasion, we also adopted a new logo, which you may already have noticed on the cover page of the previous edition of

the WAPOR Newsletter. Although I personally did not find it easy to retire the old logo, which has accompanied the association for decades, I realized that it was time to do so. All of us at the WAPOR Council hope you will be pleased by WAPOR’s new public image, which is intended—like the old one in its day—to symbolize the seriousness and high scholarly standards that are so important to us at WAPOR.

“...if we want to claim to be a truly global organization, then we also have to hold our annual conference outside of Europe and North America from time to time...”

Another change that is probably even more important is the Council’s unanimous decision at the annual conference in Chicago to alter the rhythm of our annual conferences—a change that will initially apply for the next six years. Ever since WAPOR was established, our annual conferences have always been held alternately in North America and Europe: together with AAPOR in the even-numbered years and either directly before or after

the ESOMAR conference in odd years. Now, we are going to change this rhythm for the first time: as usual, next year’s conference will again be held in Europe—presumably in late September—right after the ESOMAR conference that is being held in Amsterdam from September 18-20, 2011. Of course, we will let you know the exact dates well ahead of time.

Subsequently, however, in the year 2012, we will not be returning to North America, but will be holding our annual conference for the first time in Asia. The conference will be hosted by Robert Chung of the University of Hong Kong. One year after that, in 2013, we will again hold our conference in conjunction with AAPOR. I believe that this new approach is necessary and even long overdue. The world—and with it the world of survey research—has changed considerably since WAPOR’s fledgling years. We cannot ignore the growing significance of regions of the world such as East Asia and Latin America. And if we want to be true to our name, if we want to claim to be a truly global organization, then we also have to hold our annual conference outside of Europe and North America from time to time, which for the immediate future means once every three years, at least according to our plans for the medium run.

(President continued on page 3)

Although this decision may appear to be a matter of course, it was still not easy to make, since it means breaking with a tradition that goes all the way back to the early days of survey research—a tradition that had a strong influence on WAPOR and its membership structure. Only just recently, at the WAPOR thematic seminar in Vienna on the “Early Days of Survey Research and Their Importance Today,” Tom Smith presented a paper reminding us of the reason why WAPOR has always held its annual conferences alternately with AAPOR and ESOMAR. All three organizations were founded practically simultaneously in the years 1947 and 1948. All three were established by a small group of closely intertwined researchers: three or four dozen pioneers who were convinced that an American, a European and a global association—WAPOR—were needed to promote the development of public opinion research. Even though ESOMAR has taken a different path than AAPOR and WAPOR over the past decades and now focuses almost exclusively on commercial marketing research, it is still our sister organization, just like AAPOR.

By deciding to hold our annual conference outside of North America and Europe once every three years, we are necessarily loosening our ties to our siblings AAPOR and ESOMAR a bit, but we are not turning our back on them. On the contrary: we have signaled to both organizations that our goal is not to weaken our mutual relationship, but rather to work with them as intensively as possible in future. Both organizations have expressed great understanding for our decision. In Chicago, we met with Peter Miller, who was president of AAPOR at the time, to think about ways to maintain our close relationship with AAPOR, especially in the years when we are not convening in North America. It was there that we came up with the idea of establishing a joint committee that can suggest ways to do so. Although Peter Miller, whose term as president concluded only a few days later, did not want to leave his successor with a *fait accompli*, there are signs that the new AAPOR Council also views this idea positively. ESOMAR’s reaction was also extremely positive and constructive. I had several very pleasant telephone conversations with ESOMAR’s president, Gunilla Broadbent, in which she already made several concrete suggestions for joint activities, including the possibility that WAPOR could collaborate on a seminar ESOMAR is planning to hold in the Pacific region in the year 2012. It is still too soon to tell whether these ideas will actually be realized, yet the reactions do indicate that our new orientation may ultimately result in even closer cooperation with our two sister organizations in future.

Best regards,



Thomas Petersen

Coming in the next issue...

The most recent WAPOR Thematic Seminar, “The Early Days of Survey Research and Their Importance Today,” was held at the University of Vienna July 1st through the 3rd. In all there were 29 participants from nine countries. In the next issue of the newsletter, co-organizer of the seminar, Hannes Haas (Chair of the Communications department of the University of Vienna) will provide readers with more details about the seminar including information on the presentations, social happenings and the overall success of the event.

Call for Nominations

Nominations are now being sought for the two WAPOR offices to be filled in this fall's election. The term of each position begins January 1, 2011. This year's elections include **Vice President/President-Elect** and **Chair of the Professional Standards Committee**.

The **Vice President/President-Elect** will serve on the WAPOR Council for a total of six years—two as Vice President, two as President and two as Past President. The WAPOR Constitution states: The President shall be responsible for fulfilling the purposes of the Association as its chief representative. S/He shall preside at Council, Executive Council, and the Business Meeting, and serve as the official representative of WAPOR in its relations with other organizations and the public. S/He shall report from time to time to the membership about his or her activities and the activities of the Council and the Executive Council during the year. The Vice President shall act as the President's deputy. S/He shall automatically become President the following term. S/He shall take over the Presidency if the office becomes vacant."

The WAPOR Constitution requires that the President and Vice President be from different countries. Tom Smith is the current Vice President and will assume the Presidency on January 1st, 2011. Consequently, *for this office, candidates from the United States are not eligible.*

WAPOR is seeking nominations for the office of Vice President/President-Elect.

The current **Vice President/President-Elect** is Tom Smith.

The **Chair of the Professional Standards Committee** serves a two year term. The WAPOR Constitution states: "The Committee on Professional Standards shall review and adjust - where necessary - the Code of Professional Ethics and Practices and propose amendments from time to time to keep it consistent with contemporary needs and technology and to promote its observance within the profession. For this purpose it shall seek cooperation with other associations in the field." WAPOR is seeking nominations for the office of **Chair of the Professional Standards Committee**.

The current **Chair of the Professional Standards Committee** is Patricia Moy.

Any member who receives 20 nominations will automatically appear on the final ballot. The Nominations Committee will select any other candidates. The WAPOR Constitution requires contested elections for Council. All WAPOR members in good standing are eligible to nominate candidates. Candidates must also be members in good standing. The deadline for this year's nominations is **Wednesday, August 25, 2010**. The Nominations Committee is chaired by WAPOR Past President Mike Traugott. Members can send nominations by **mail** or **fax** to the WAPOR Secretariat (FAX: 1 402 472 7727) or **email** them to Renae Reis at renae@wapor.org.



currently holds the position of Director of the U.S. Bureau of the Census. WAPOR was very pleased that Bob (at left) and his wife were able to take the time to join us at the conference.

A team of researchers from IBOPE Inteligência were awarded the Elizabeth H. Nelson Prize for best conference paper from a society in transition for their paper "Brazilian Electoral Scenario in 2010: Changes and Continuities in Post-Lula Brazilian Voting Behavior." The paper, authored by Marcia Cavallari Nuñez (with Thomas Petersen, below), João Francisco Resende, Silvia Cervellini and Malu Giani, evaluates the behavior

of the Brazilian electorate in the presidential election of 2010, looking at how changes and trends in contemporary society are going to be translated into political behavior in the future. Wenlin Liu (shown receiving her award, below), a graduate student at the University of Washington, won the Naomi C. Turner Prize for the best student paper at the conference entitled "*Social Networks, Community Interaction, and Civic Participation of United States Immigrants.*" Her paper looked at the social and political incorporation of immigrant communities in the U.S. and the interconnectivity to their levels of political knowledge and civic participation. And the Robert M. Worcester Prize for the best article in the *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* in 2009 was presented to Alejandro Moreno and Manuel Sánchez-Castro for their article "A Lost Decade? László Radványi and the Origins of Public Opinion Research in Mexico, 1941-1952."



WAPOR is grateful to the many sponsors of the conference who contributed funds and in-kind donations to help make the conference such a success, including NORC at the University of Chicago, D3 Systems, Acsor, and the University of Illinois at Chicago.



I would like to express my own thanks to the WAPOR members who contributed their time to help make the conference such a success. A panel of WAPOR members helped review the conference abstracts, including Jennifer Agiesta, Mario Callegaro, Claire Durand, Paul Lavrakas, Nick Moon, Patricia Moy, Orlando Pérez, Thomas Petersen, and Nicole Speulda. Conference Committee Chair Patricia Moy offered much support and advice during the planning process. Thanks are due to AAPOR's conference committee,

chaired by Michael Link, and the AAPOR staff, for their assistance in our joint conference. And, of course, without the tireless work of WAPOR's executive coordinator Renae Reis, the conference simply couldn't have happened. Thanks to all of you.

THE WORLD ASSOCIATION FOR PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH

Presents the

2010 Helen Dinerman Award

to

Robert M. Groves

WAPOR is proud to present the Helen Dinerman Award for 2010 to Robert M. Groves, Director of the United States Census Bureau— a job that makes him, as described in *The Washington Post*, “the most important survey researcher in the world.” Although Bob has been serving in that capacity for only 10 months, managing the complex and politically challenging 2010 U.S. Census, this award recognizes his long and distinguished career as a survey methodologist and his contributions to world-wide survey research – in areas like sampling, telephone survey methods, and the study of errors in surveys and how to reduce them. His career path mirrors that of Helen Dinerman, who moved successively from an academic appointment at Columbia University to work for a government agency during World War II, and then to a commercial market research firm.

Prior to joining the Census Bureau, Professor Groves spent his entire academic career at the University of Michigan, with occasional leaves in Washington and Maryland and for guest professorships in Germany and Sweden. Most recently, he was appointed as Research Professor and Director of the Survey Research Center at the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan and Professor of Sociology at both the University of Michigan and the University of Maryland. His past government service has included appointments as a Visiting Statistician and an Associate Director of the Census Bureau.

Professor Groves’s primary research interests lie in sampling theory and understanding survey errors and costs, work that has had global impact. Later, he focused on the growing problem of survey nonresponse and the development of techniques to minimize it. This included work on a leveraged salience model of survey nonresponse as well as the development of responsive survey designs that make daily adjustments to calling protocols to maximize the likelihood of contacting sampled respondents based upon previous call information. He has been recognized by the American Association for Public Opinion Research – multiple times - with its Innovator Award in 2000 for his efforts to establish survey methodology as an academic field; with its 2008 book award for *Non-response in Household Interview Surveys*, co-authored with Mick Couper; and in 2001 he received the AAPOR AWARD—the organization’s highest – for lifetime achievement.

Professor Groves is the author, co-author or editor of eight books, including *Survey Errors and Survey Costs* (Wiley, 1989), *Surveys by Telephone* (Academic Press, 1979); chief editor of *Telephone Survey Methodology* (Wiley, 1988), and co-editor of *Measurement Errors in Surveys* (Wiley, 1991) and *Survey Nonresponse* (Wiley, 2000), as well as more than 60 articles on survey and statistical methods. In recognition of his lifelong research on the survey process and his contributions to improvements in the field and the training of future researchers worldwide, WAPOR is honored to present its award for outstanding contributions to survey research methodology, the 2010 Helen Dinerman Award, to Robert M. Groves.

Presented May 12, 2010
Chicago, Illinois, USA

Worcester Prize

WAPOR Paper Prizes
63rd Annual Conference
Chicago, Illinois, USA

The **Robert M. Worcester Prize** for the best article published in the International Journal of Public Opinion Research (IJPOR) for 2009 was presented to **Alejandro Moreno and Manuel Sánchez-Castro** for their article in the Spring issue of IJPOR entitled: *A Lost Decade? László Radványi and the Origins of Public Opinion Research in Mexico, 1941–1952*. Below are the words Bob Worcester used to describe the paper and its authors:

“Those here for the opening session will recall that we had our first history lesson of this conference, the 40th I have attended to the best of my recollection. Tom spoke about the transatlantic travel of George Gallup’s partner Harry Field to Britain where he hired Henry Durrant (at £50 a year) to open British Gallup in the late 30s. Shortly thereafter French Gallup was founded by my late friend Jean Stoetzel.

I have always had a keen interest in the history of our relatively new trade of survey research. So when my copy of the spring issue last year arrived I fell upon this most interesting (at least to me) of the founding of survey research in Mexico.

In an aside, one of my books, published in 1991, was called “British Public Opinion: a guide to the history and methodology of opinion polls”, a copy of which I found for sale on Amazon several years ago. It may still be there on sale if anyone’s interested, for the seller’s comment was that it was, and I quote, “cheaper than Mogadon”.

Well Alejandro’s and Sanchez-Castro’s article didn’t put me to sleep.

It told me that the spread of public opinion research reached Mexico shortly thereafter by Hungarian professor László Radványi, who immigrated to Mexico at the height of World War II.

As well as conducting research in the days of Gallup, Roper and Crossley, Claude Robinson and Lazarsfeld and other pioneers, Radvanyi was in the forefront during his years in Mexico, founding the Scientific Institute of Mexican Public Opinion, in 1941. But not only that, he founded the *International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research*, in 1947— a forefather of today’s IJPOR.



Bob Worcester and Alejandro Moreno

How could I not recommend it to the current Editors for the Worcester Prize? I was so pleased that they agreed.”

Congratulations to all of the winners!

Photos from Chicago...



Clockwise from top right:
Hans Zetterberg, Steve Kull, Bob Worcester, Alejandro Moreno, Colin
Irwin; Paul Lavrakas; Joye Dillman; Edith de Leeuw; Streets of Chicago;
Robi Manchin; Lei Huang; Mike Traugott



Tom Smith, Bob Groves, AnaLucia Cordova Cazar and Don Dillman



Lotte Willemsen, Alejandro Moreno and Peter Neijens

Conferences of Other Associations

Note: Previously this feature appeared in the JPOR, however, due to space constraints in the journal, we will run the calendar in the WAPOR newsletter .

2010

August 14-17, 2010
American Sociological Association
Annual Meeting
Atlanta, GA, USA
<http://www.asanet.org/2010Homepage.cfm>

September 12-15, 2010
ESOMAR Congress
Athens, Greece
<http://esomar.org>

November 19-20, 2010
Midwest Association for Public Opinion
Research (MAPOR)
Annual Conference
Chicago, IL, USA
<http://mapor.org>

2011

February 27-March 1, 2011
Social and Economic Survey Research
Institute (SESRI)
First International Conference on Survey
Research
Doha, Qatar
<http://www.qu.edu/qa/sesri/conference.php>

March 24-27, 2011
International Workshop on Comparative

Survey Design and Implementation (CSDI)
2011 CSDI Workshop
London, England
<http://csdiworkshop.org>

March 31-April 3, 2011
Midwest Political Science Association
69th Annual Conference
Chicago, IL, USA
<http://www.mpsanet.org>

May 12-15, 2011
American Association for Public Opinion
Research (AAPOR)
66th Annual Conference
Phoenix, AZ, USA
<http://aapor.org>

May 26-30, 2011
International Communication Association
(ICA)
61st Annual Conference
Boston, MA, USA
<http://www.icahdq.org/conferences/2010/>

Please let us know about your organization's upcoming event(s). We would be happy to publish them in upcoming issues of the newsletter.

Thank you!

The Ukraine Presidential Election: Comparing the 2010 and 2004 exit polls

Contributed by N. Kharchenko (Executive Director) and Vladimir Paniotto (Director General)
Kiev International Institute of Sociology

The presidential elections in Ukraine took place this year on January 17 (first round) and February 7 (a second round among the two candidates who received the most votes in the first round). As in 2004, the 2010 election is seen by many political scientists as a choice between the orientation of Ukraine to the European Union and its orientation to Russia.

The 2004 elections were a very dramatic confrontation between the pro-regime candidate, Viktor Yanukovich, and the opposition candidate, Viktor Yushchenko. News of the second round election results declaring Yanukovich's victory was accompanied by massive protests known as "orange revolution", which ultimately led to a change of political elites (politicians who came to power were called "orange"). The opposition argued that the elections were rigged and supported these charges pointing out that there were significant differences between the data of the National Exit Poll and the election results. Following a decision by the Supreme Court, the elections were declared invalid and a revote was scheduled. In the revote, Yushchenko won and became president of Ukraine (see Paniotto, 2004).

The 2010 presidential elections represented a revenge of Viktor Yanukovich, who won and became president. There are

some differences between the election campaigns in 2010 and 2004 that can be highlighted. First of all, the "orange" team experienced several splits, lost its unity, and was represented at the 2010 elections by several candidates. Secondly, the actual pace of democratic and economic reforms did not meet the high expectations of society. Thirdly, the "Orange" team changed its leadership, placing the then Prime Minister, Yulia Tymoshenko, at the front. Fourthly, support for President Viktor Yushchenko during these six years decreased from 39.9% in the first round of the 2004 elections, to only 5.5% in the first round of the 2010 elections. Finally, confrontation between the frontrunners did not have such a polarizing effect on society: while in 2004 the total support of the two major candidates was 79.2% of vote, it was significantly less in 2010: 60.4%. Over the past five years, new political leaders such as Tigipko and Yatsenyuk rose and managed to get into the top four contestants in the first round of the 2010 election.

Region of residence remained the determining factor of the voters' electoral preferences in 2010, similarly to all previous elections in independent Ukraine. Residents of North-Western regions tend to support pro-Western politicians, and South-Eastern regions prefer pro-Russian politicians. Thus, the North-

Western part voted predominantly for Yulia Tymoshenko (70% of voters), whereas the South-Eastern part supported more heavily the pro-Russian candidate, Viktor Yanukovich (76%).

Pre-Election Polls

In the 2004 presidential elections, the majority of sociological companies had a slight discrepancy in the level of support for the major candidates (Yushchenko and Yanukovich), which was in the range of 2 to 4%. In contrast, the margin for Yanukovich, who was ahead in all the polls, was much higher in 2010, ranging from 7 to 10%. Changes in the political situation in the country led to the fact that respondents informed more freely and honestly about their electoral preferences. This is proven by a smaller difference in the ratings of presidential candidates by applying questionnaire and secret ballot compared to 2004.

Exit Polls

Exit polls in Ukraine have been conducted since 1998. These surveys quickly gained popularity and became an essential part of elections. As with exit polls in other new democracies, a peculiarity of Ukrainian exit polls lies in their excessive politicization and perception as a means for political struggle. "It is often used to 'check the correctness' of the elections, validate or oppose the result of elections and sometimes as an argument in the electoral battle" (Andreenkova, 2005).

Exit poll customers in Ukraine are international NGOs and opposition parties, which are interested in verifying the integrity of elections and the absence of fraud in the vote counting. Ukrainian society expresses a very low confidence in public authori-

(see page 11)

(continued from page 10)

ties and political forces, and the majority of voters question the fairness of elections. Exit poll data attract considerable attention from the public, and are widely discussed in the media and on Internet forums.

Even minor discrepancies between the various sources of exit poll data and election outcomes are interpreted either as a falsification of election results, or as evidence of polling agencies corruption. Thus, researchers are under close public attention and pressure.

Another feature of the exit polls in Ukraine is the lack of infrastructure (transport and telecommunications), as well as the lack of openness of the electoral statistical information. In Ukraine there is no single register of voters, the number and territorial boundaries of the electoral districts change frequently and something similar happens to electoral legislation. In the 2010 elections the information about the size of electoral districts was inaccessible, which greatly complicated sample design.

Nonetheless, many exit-polls are generally conducted in Ukraine. This is also a manifestation of political groups' distrust towards each other. During the 2004 elections (round 1, round 2 and revote of the second round) there were 15 exit-polls, while in 2010 there were a total of 12 exit polls conducted. Taking into account all the financial burdens it creates a ground for improvement of research methodology by the polling agencies. Unfortunately, the release of the exit poll data is accompanied by a very little methodological information and the actual data are not available for analysts, with the exception of the National Exit Poll.

The Exit Polls Results in 2010 and 2004 and their Public Resonance

Round 1 exit poll results are presented in Table 1 (see page 14). All exit-polls correctly "predicted" Viktor Yanukovich and Yulia Tymoshenko getting into the second round. The average error for each of the candidates is less than one percent, the maximum error for the leaders comprises 3.5% for Yanukovich and 2.2% for Tymoshenko. This mistake was made by the National Exit Poll mainly due to the lack of funding. In contrast to other exit polls, which do not disclose their sources of funding or are supported by the media, the 2010 National Exit Poll is a public initiative financed by a forum of international donors, Ukrainian NGOs, physical persons and controlled by the Oversight Council of domestic and foreign experts: (http://www.exitpoll.org.ua/en/about_project.htm).

In the conditions of a cold winter (the temperature in some regions of Ukraine was below 15 degrees Celsius or below 5 degrees Fahrenheit) it was necessary to have three interviewers at each polling station (one counts every k-th voter, the other is conducting an interview, and the third one is getting warm, every half-hour interviewers replace each other). The National Exit Poll budget (in contrast to other exit polls) allowed having two interviewers only. Thus, it was decided that interviewers would rest during 30 minutes every hour and to reduce the selection step twofold to keep the sufficient number of respondents. For the big cities this step was not sufficient, thus the interviewers missed part of the respondents, therefore the big cities were under-represented. These cities are located mostly in south-eastern part of Ukraine, where high levels of Yanukovich support prevail, as a result Yanukovich was underestimated, and Yulia Tymoshenko overestimated. Without taking into account this error, the maximum error in all other exit polls did not exceed 2%.

In the second round (see Table 2, page 14) exit polls were more accurate. *National Exit Poll* received more funding and its results were among the most accurate estimates. In the second round the average error of all the exit polls turned out to be 0.3%, and the maximum error no more than 1%.

10 727	15 000	17 512	10 000
350	420	402	500

Analyzing the methodology of the exit-polls that are applied in Ukraine, we can say that their common feature is the very large sample size (number of precincts and voters). The number of precincts vary from 300 to 1500, the number of respondents vary from 6000 to 50000. All of the exit polls use short questionnaires (1-2 pages) and collect very little information for further analysis. With regard to the differences, they are related to 1) the method of precinct selection, 2) the method of selection of respondents at the

(see page 12)

precincts, and 3) data collection methods - interviews or self-administered questionnaires.

Method of participant's selection. The most widely used sampling procedure for exit polls in Ukraine is a stratified probability sample. Stratification of PSU (primary sample units) is based on the regional structure and urbanization type. In general, the selection of PSU is carried out in two ways. First, precincts are allocated by the strata in proportion to the number of precincts at each stratum. Then, within each stratum precincts are selected randomly.

The following are considered PSUs: electoral districts, administrative units or individual settlements, which are selected with probability proportional to the number of registered voters or vote total in recent elections. On a second stage precincts are selected randomly or based on other considerations.

Method of respondent selection. There are two competing approaches: quotas, i.e. assigning a number of respondents per precinct and distribute them on a time interval of interviewing, and a "single step method", when the interviewers do not receive a task for the fixed number of interviews, but must carry out interviews during the entire election day of every k-th voter, while k is the same for all precincts.

Data collection methods. In the professional milieu of Ukrainian polling agencies there is an ongoing debate about which method of data collection provides more accurate data on the voter's choice: personal interviews or self-administered questionnaires (with a secret-ballot procedure). Supporters of the secret-ballot procedure argue that self-administered ballots minimize socially desirable responses (Bishop and Fisher, 1995) and supporters of the face-to-face interview believe that the use of self-administered questionnaire reduces participation in the exit poll of the senior people with lower educational levels and poor eyesight. The secret-ballot procedure provides a higher response rate and is usually closer to election results, which we consider to be a more reliable method.

Conclusions

Despite the different methodologies the results of exit polls in 2010 were very close to the election outcomes. We attribute this to the fact that while the election results mainly depend on the place of residence of voters, strict maintenance of the regional proportions in the sample is sufficient to obtain good results, and other factors (nonresponse, interviewers' influence, the respondents' sincerity, etc.) are insignificant.

The concurrence of data from all exit polls clearly promoted the legitimacy of the elections in the eyes of the public, journalists, political elites and the international community.

At present, after assumption of power by the new president, a new majority in parliament and a new cabinet are established. The society actively discusses the issues of Ukraine's refusal from the integration in Europe, degree of closeness of relations with Russia, possibility of independence loss by Ukraine, preserving the democratic gains of 2004, in particular, freedom of the press, etc., with the rise to power of the pro-Russian president, which Viktor Yanukovich is considered to be. Currently these issues are not clear.

References

Andreenkova, A. (2005). "Conducting exit-polls in countries of former Soviet Union: the example of Ukraine". Paper presented at the Joint Statistical Meetings of the American Statistical Association, August 7-11. 2005.

Bishop, G.F. and B.S. Fisher (1995). "Secret Ballots and Self-Reports in an Exit Poll. Experiment," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 59: 568-588.

Paniotto, V. (2004). "Ukrainian Presidential Elections 2004: Exit-polls and Public Repercussions" WAPOR Newsletter, fourth quarter.

Thank you to the
sponsors of the annual
conference:



NORC
at the UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO



The WAPOR Newsletter is published by the
World Association for Public Opinion Research

Please contact:

WAPOR Secretariat

UNL Gallup Research Center

University of Nebraska-Lincoln

201 North 13th Street

Lincoln, Nebraska 68588-0242, USA

phone: 001 402 472 7720

fax: 001 402 472 7727

email: renae@wapor.org

Editor: Renae Reis

Calendar

August 25, 2010

Deadline for nominations (see page 4)

Did you notice...

WAPOR has a new logo. While in the process of updating the website, Council thought it would be a good idea to update the WAPOR logo as well. After a number of drafts and many good ideas, the logo on the front page of this newsletter is the winner.

WAPOR will be transitioning to this new logo as quickly as possible. All of our electronic communications will have the new logo in place immediately, but it may take some time to transition away from the former logo on any printed materials.

We hope you feel that this change is a positive one.

-
-
- Do you have an idea for an article in the newsletter?
 - Is there an event happening in your part of the world?
 - Are you interested in organizing a conference?
 - Do you have photos you'd like to contribute?
 - Do you have ideas on how to improve the website or newsletter?

If so, please contact the WAPOR office by sending an email to renae@wapor.org or to Alejandro Moreno (Publications Chair) at Alejandro.Moreno@reforma.com.

Let us know your upcoming events.

*Please note, the deadline date for the
3rd quarter newsletter is
September 15, 2010*

Tables: Estimates of exit-poll accuracy: comparative data of exit-polls and elections.

Table 1. First Round of Ukraine Presidential Elections 2010

	Initiators and Polling Agencies							Mean diff. with result	Max diff. with result
	Election Result	Consortium 'National Exit Poll'	ICTV, GFK	Shuster live studio	Inter, FOM-Ukraine, USS, Socis	A&F, UISR	R&B Group		
RESULTS									
Yanukovich	35,32	31,8	34,5	34,7	36,6	34,5	37,66	0,4	-3,5
Tymoshenko	25,05	27,2	25,63	25	25,8	24,8	26,13	-0,7	2,2
Tigipko	13,06	13,6	13,79	13,2	13,5	12,6	11,64	0,0	-1,4
Yatsenyuk	6,96	7,8	7,01	7,1	6,6	8,9	7,09	-0,5	1,9
Yushchenko	5,45	5,9	5,65	5,8	5,2	5,4	5,12	-0,1	0,5
Others 13 candidates together	10,24	10,7	10,45	11,5	9,4	10,3	9,8	-0,1	1,3
SURVEY DESIGN									
Number of voters	36576763	12520	25 105	10 727	15 000	17 512	10 000		
Number of precinct	33667	240	300	350	420	402	500		
Type of voters selection on last sampling stage		systematic	n/a	systematic	quota	n/a	quota		
Data collection method		secret-ballot	secret-ballot	secret-ballot	face-to-face interview	face-to-face interview	secret-ballot		
Nonresponse		27%	15%	n/a	26,4%	24%	27,5%		

Table 2. Second Round of Ukraine Presidential Elections 2010

	Election Result	Polling Agencies						Mean diff. with result	Max diff. with result
		Consortium 'National Exit Poll'	ICTV, GFK	Shuster live studio	Inter, FOM-Ukraine, USS	Inter, Socis	R&B Group		
RESULTS									
Yanukovich	48.95	48,4	49,3	48,7	49,52	49,6	49,7	0,3	0,8
Tymoshenko	45.47	45,7	45,3	45,6	44,90	44,5	44,8	-0,3	-1,0
SURVEY DESIGN									
Number of voters	36576763	16123	21 635	20 000	15 000	20 000	10 000		
Number of precinct	33667	300	n/a	350	300	602	500		
Type of voters selection on last sampling stage		systematic	n/a	systematic	quota	quota	quota		
Data collection method		secret-ballot	n/a	secret-ballot	face-to-face interview	face-to-face interview	secret-ballot		
Nonresponse		23%	13.1%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		