



# NEWSLETTER

Third &amp; Fourth Quarter

2008

## Executive Council

### *President*

Prof. Dr. Michael Traugott, USA

### *Past President*

Prof. Esteban López-Escobar, Spain

### *Vice President & President-Elect*

Dr. Thomas Petersen, Germany

### *Secretary-Treasurer*

Prof. Dr. Allan McCutcheon, USA

### *Liaison Committee Chair*

Lic. Marita Carballo, UK

### *Publications Chair*

Mr. Nick Moon, UK

### *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

Kenya, Mr. George Waititu

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

## Cadenabbia VII: On Misapprehended Quality Criteria, Online Polls and Horoscopes

By Thomas Petersen, Allensbach Institute

For the seventh time, WAPOR members gathered this summer under the dazzling Italian sun at a conference being held at an historic location—the summer residence of West Germany's first chancellor, Konrad Adenauer—in Cadenabbia at Lake Como, Italy. Here they discussed the issue of how quality in survey research can be defended in view of the growing onslaught of bad and misleading surveys and how the scientific and ethical principles, and thus the overall value of the survey method as an investigative tool, can be preserved.

The ongoing success of the Cadenabbia seminars, which have been held regularly every two years since 1996, is in itself a clear indication that the issue is no less charged today than it was a decade ago. On the contrary, the mood among the 25 participants, who traveled to Cadenabbia from 11 countries on four different continents, seemed at times to almost border on resignation; for along with information on current election polls in the United States and Italy, as well as the special difficulties involved in ensuring quality in internationally comparative surveys, the seminar focused even more strongly than prior conferences on the unfortunate and at times erroneous ways in which surveys are used and presented in public. Thus, for example, Thomas Roessing of the University of Mainz (Germany) presented a model for distinguishing between scientific, semi-scientific, non-scientific and, in part, even completely worthless "survey research," vividly demonstrating to conference participants how surveys in the latter category have become particularly

(Cadenabbia continued on page 4)

### *Table of Contents*

Cadenabbia VII: We Meet Again.....	1
President's Letter.....	2
Conferences of Other Associations.....	3
ESS Call for Proposals.....	5
Letter from Britain.....	6
Election Results.....	7
II WAPOR Latin American Conference Call for Papers.....	8

*62nd Annual  
Conference  
September 11-13, 2009  
Lausanne, Switzerland*

---

## *Letter from the President*

I am writing my last letter to the membership as we prepare for the turn-over in WAPOR governance. As of the New Year, Thomas Petersen will become President and Tom Smith will take office as Vice-President and President elect. You also know that Patricia Moy has been reelected as Standards Chair, and she will continue on the WAPOR Council.



WAPOR  
President  
Prof. Mike  
Traugott

Since my last letter, I have been able to attend some events that represent an investment in WAPOR's future. In November I attended the 27<sup>th</sup> General Assembly of the International Social Science Council (ISSC), held outside of Cape Town, South Africa. In three days of meetings, we discussed a number of topics, including ways to develop the infrastructure for the social sciences in several locations in the world where it currently is not as strong as it should be. In particular, the ISSC is very interested in capacity building in Latin America and in the Middle East, two areas in which WAPOR also is interested in growing membership and fostering public opinion research. As a result, there may be some possibilities for mutual efforts in the future in these areas. I also made a contact with someone from the United Nations in New York who may be able to help us with our interest in fostering peace polls and I will follow up with this.

The ISSC has two major projects underway that should interest WAPOR members. The first is a source book of social science research around the world. It is scheduled to be in draft form by the end of the year for publication soon after. The ISSC has also organized a first World Congress on Social Science Research to be held in Bergen, Norway from May 10 to 12, 2009. Most of the panel sessions will involve invited papers, but the organizers are in the active phase of soliciting poster session proposals. More information about the meeting, travel arrangements, and other activities in this area of Norway can be found at their web site, <http://www.rokkan.uib.no/wssf/>. The ISSC has also been assigned a project from UNESCO to produce an updated World Social Science Report, the first update since 1999. You can find out more about this project at [http://www.unesco.org/ngo/issc/3\\_activities/3\\_worldreport.htm](http://www.unesco.org/ngo/issc/3_activities/3_worldreport.htm).

We have several WAPOR events coming up in the next few months as well. The planning for a second Latin American Congress has been completed, and it is scheduled for April 22 to 24 in Lima, Peru. The topic of the Congress will be "Public Opinion, Democracy, and Conflicts in Latin America," and you can find out more about the event and ways to submit proposals and plan for attendance at their web site, <http://www.pucp.edu.pe/iop/waporlima/> as well as in this newsletter on pages 10 and 11. This group of WAPOR members is about to publish a book containing selected papers from their first Congress in Colonia, Uruguay, and they are working on the organization of the first WAPOR regional organization as well.

Finally, WAPOR will hold its next annual conference from September 11 to 13 in Lausanne, Switzerland. The meeting has been scheduled so it precedes the next ESOMAR Congress in Montreux, Switzerland from September 15 to 18, but our program committee worked very hard to find a location in which the expenses would be lower in order to allow students and young professionals to attend our meeting. A call for papers will appear very soon, so keep an eye out for that.

I have enjoyed my service as WAPOR president, especially the opportunities to meet so many of you at so many different venues. My travel to so many meetings and conferences has

*(President continued on page 3)*

---

(President continued from page 2)

been supported in large part by funds made available to me by the University of Michigan, including the Department of Communication Studies and the Dean of the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts. I want to take this opportunity to express my gratitude for that. I look forward to seeing you at the annual conference in Lausanne, if not before.



---

## **Conferences of Other Associations**

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

### 2009

February 5-6, 2009:  
12th Annual Meeting, American Association  
of Behavioral and Social Sciences  
Las Vegas, NV, USA  
Consult: <http://aabss.org/>

March 13-15, 2009:  
4th Global Conference: Cybercultures -  
Exploring Critical Issues  
Salzburg, Austria  
Consult: [http://www.inter-disciplinary.net/  
ci/Cyber/cybercultures/c4/cfp.htm](http://www.inter-disciplinary.net/ci/Cyber/cybercultures/c4/cfp.htm)

May 21-25, 2009:  
59th Annual Conference of the International  
Communication Association (ICA)  
Chicago, IL, USA  
Consult: [www.icahdq.org](http://www.icahdq.org)

May 26-29- 2009:  
38th Conference of the European Marketing  
Academy  
Nantes, France  
Consult: [www.emac2009.oprg/r/home](http://www.emac2009.oprg/r/home)

July 16-17, 2009:  
Regional Conference, International  
Communication Association (ICA)  
Melbourne, Australia

Consult: [http://www.icahdq.org/  
conferences/index.asp](http://www.icahdq.org/conferences/index.asp)

July 21-24 2009:  
Human Rights and Communication, 2009  
IAMCR Conference  
Mexico City, Mexico  
Consult: <http://www.iamcr.org>

July 2009:  
21<sup>st</sup> World Congress of the International  
Political Science Association (IPSA)  
Santiago, Chile  
Consult: [www.ipsa.ca](http://www.ipsa.ca)

September 15-18, 2009:  
ESOMAR Congress  
Leading the Way: Ethically, Responsibly,  
Creatively  
Montreux, Switzerland  
Consult: [www.esomar.org/index.php/  
Congress-09-overview.html](http://www.esomar.org/index.php/Congress-09-overview.html)

### 2010

June 22-26, 2010:  
60th Annual Conference, International  
Communication Association (ICA)  
Singapore  
Consult: [http://www.icahdq.org/confer-  
ences/index.asp](http://www.icahdq.org/conferences/index.asp)

July 11-17, 2010:  
17th World Congress of Sociology,  
International Sociological Association (ISA)  
Goteborg, Sweden  
Consult: [www.isa-sociology.org](http://www.isa-sociology.org)

### 2011

May 26-30, 2011:  
61st Annual Conference, International  
Communication Association (ICA)  
Boston, MA, USA  
Consult: [http://www.icahdq.org/confer-  
ences/index.asp](http://www.icahdq.org/conferences/index.asp)

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!

predominant in the public sphere over the past years. Roessing's examples of inadvertently funny question wordings used in newspaper surveys or online polls were among some of the seminar's most humorous, albeit somewhat bittersweet moments.

By way of example, Hynek Jerabek of Charles University, Prague outlined the self-understanding of survey research in its fledgling years, demonstrating how many survey research organizations have in the meantime fallen into the trap of becoming nothing more than data producers. Such organizations, Jerabek lamented, have lost sight of the original understanding of survey research as an intellectual, advisory service. In other papers presented at the conference and in the closing discussion, participants took a renewed look at the question of how survey researchers can successfully reclaim sovereignty over the interpretation of their own data in public.

*Organizations have lost sight of the original understanding of survey research as an intellectual advisory service.*

In response to the fiery presentation by Willem Saris (ESADE, Barcelona), "Something Has to be Done to Protect the Public against Bad Survey Research," Anne Niedermann of the Allensbach Institute offered a surprising answer, i.e. a council designed to ensure self-regulation among German survey researchers. Similar to the established press councils in many countries, this council could issue warnings and impose sanctions on polling organizations that fail to adhere to the accepted ethical practices in the field. Still, although participants from other countries certainly viewed this model as worth emulating, there was also a broad consensus that a council of this kind can ultimately have very little impact on its own.

A law that was passed in Greece last year gave participants the opportunity to ponder the self-critical question of whether, or to what extent, scientifically oriented social researchers, in calling for compliance with disclosure and publication of quality standards, have actually helped to damage the standing of survey research in the public. The Greek law imposes substantial limitations on the freedom of research—limitations that in part even infringe on fundamental constitutional rights—for the stated reason that this is the only way to ensure that survey researchers adhere to quality standards. In this case at least, the attempt to communicate quality criteria to laypersons ultimately achieved the exact opposite of what was intended. Prompted by a new-found awareness of the need for quality standards and equipped with a smattering of knowledge about survey research, Greek lawmakers proceeded to do more damage than they ever could have had they remained in the dark.

(Cadenabbia continued on page 5)



First row from left to right:  
Fiona Chew, Luana Russo, Michela Natili, Joy Casuga, Willem Saris, Maria Karaklioumi, Kathy Frankovic, Hynek Jerabek, Anne Niedermann, Miguel Basanez

Second row from left to right:  
Jiri Remr, Gary de Ocampo, Tuomo Turja, Ottar Hellevik, Thomas Roessing, Jon D. Miller

Third row, from left to right:  
Michael Traugott, Colin Irwin, Michael Stanton, Giancarlo Gasperoni, Thomas Petersen

Our thanks for the photo, provided courtesy of Colin Irwin



In view of this situation, conference participants concluded that instead of the numerous attempts to provide media consumers with technical information about published surveys—information that is ultimately of little use to them—it would probably make more sense to concentrate on training journalists. As is also the case when it comes to other kinds of information, a journalist's job is to thoroughly research and competently assess the survey data he or she receives. Yet this is only feasible if journalists have a deeper understanding of the fundamental principles of survey research, along with the possibilities it offers and the limits to what it can prove. After all, a good newspaper, so people say, one that employs well-trained and responsible journalists, will also contain good, reliable and scientifically sound information. Although, as Jon D. Miller of Michigan State University dryly remarked, even the best newspapers also print horoscopes.

---

## Call for Proposals

The Call for Proposals for Question Design Teams for Round 5 of the ESS has now been published with a deadline for applications of **6th February 2009 (17.00 GMT)**.



Applications are welcomed for both 'new' rotating modules and for 'repeats' of rotating modules that have been fielded previously.

The ESS is a biennial social survey that measures changes in public attitudes and behavior patterns over time and across nations. There have been four rounds so far, covering over 30 nations and using rigorous methodology. The current call is for Round 5, which will take place between 2009 and 2011.

Each round of the ESS has a core module of around 120 substantive and social-demographic questions, and then two rotating modules of up to 50 questions. Each rotating module covers a single academic and/or policy concern within Europe, and is drafted by a team selected competitively. Teams applying need to be multinational with three to five subject specialists based in at least three different ESS countries.

The deadline for the call is **6 February 2009 (17.00 GMT)** and further details can be found on [www.europeansocialsurvey.org](http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org).

If you have queries about the call, please contact: [ess@city.ac.uk](mailto:ess@city.ac.uk)

---

## Letter from Britain

12 November 2008

To the American pollsters and the media which (mis)report them:

Never have so many trees been sacrificed to produce acres of newsprint and hours of broadcast media time wasted on anything before as the sum total of skeptical reporting of opinion polls in the American presidential election. It seems that every pundit and commentator has taken a swipe at the polls during the recent election. Yet on the night, triumph!

Congratulations to the pollsters of America. The American pollsters' final tallies have now been examined closely in the light of the outcome. In all we have been able to source 19 different eve-of-poll data sets, reported on or just before November 3<sup>rd</sup>. **All 19 sets of share figures from the American eve-of-election polls fell within a margin of plus or minus three percent. In fact, 18 of the 19 polls were within plus or minus two percent, the best record ever.**

After days of working to collect, confirm and standardize the 'final' polling figures to make sense of the disparate ways American polling organizations conduct their political polls and report them, once again we have arrived at what we consider the definitive list of final polls (but would be glad to have evidence of any others we've missed).

We've scoured all the wonderful websites which served us so well during this election, including the pollsters' own sites, the media's and other clients' sites, and the now famous compilation sites including [www.realclearpolitics.com](http://www.realclearpolitics.com), [www.538.com](http://www.538.com), [www.270togo.com](http://www.270togo.com), etc.

The hyperlinks to the pollsters' final reports are below, in the order that after standardizing them we rank them in terms of error on share for [Barack] Obama and [John] McCain, averaging the two. Where two or more share errors tied, we used error on lead as the tie break.

We were not able to use, as we do in Great Britain, a three or even four (for Scotland and Wales where they have separate 'national' parties in addition to Labour, Conservative and Liberal Democrats) party accuracy measure. WE do not rank them to present a 'league table' so much as to evaluate the performance of the polls generally in as objective a manner as some 40 years of political polling experience provides.

Nor do the American pollsters report like for like in other ways. Several did not ask so could not report the share figures for other candidates, and in some cases where they asked the question they failed to report the results in their press releases. Further, several of the press releases/final poll reports did not report

*(Britain continued on page 7)*

### Hyperlinks (click below for all active links)

<http://www.unl.edu/wapor/hyperlinks.html>

RasmussenReports  
Ipsos/McClatchy  
Diageo/Hotline  
Pew Research  
Daily Kos/Research 2000  
Fox News, Opinion Dynamics  
YouGov/Polimetrix  
NBC/Wall Street Journal  
American Research Group Inc  
Democracy Cops/Greenberg QR  
Marist  
Harris Interactive  
IBD/TIPP  
CNN/Opinion Research  
ABC/Wash Post  
CBS News  
Reuters/CSPAN/Zogby  
Gallup  
GWU/Battleground

---

(Britain continued on page 6)

the technical details, sample size, fieldwork dates, etc. As a result, it took us nearly as many days to finalize our data analysis as it did for the American election results to be counted.

Nearly 40 years ago the legendary founder of Opinion Research Centre in London, later the protégé of Lou Harris as President of the Harris Poll, Humphrey Taylor, called together the major British pollsters to establish ground rules they would agree to use to improve the reporting of their political opinion polls in the British media, and to clarify the role of voting intention results as not predictions of election outcomes days, months or even years hence but as commentators at the racetrack.

At a stroke, the better journalists and more responsible media improved their reporting and interpretation of poll findings to the benefit of their readers and viewers/listeners and each other. Some journalism departments even began the teaching of "Understanding and Reporting British Public Opinion", and seminars have been held before every British General Election, most in the House of Commons, for the so-called "press lobby" of journalists who frequently report and inevitably comment on poll findings as the election progresses. These have proved popular, and have been well attended.

American pollsters have no such common basis of reporting their findings, certainly leading to me, and probably to many of them, being asked throughout the campaign, "How can I believe the polls if two companies' final polls had Obama at 50% and yet he got 53% on the day; it can't just be sampling error, can it?" My answer, "No, it isn't."

In fact, if the two polls had reallocated to take account of the fact that they both reported 5% of their samples were 'don't knows', they both were spot on, showing Obama with 54%, the outcome on the day. All British pollsters now follow this conven-

tion, year in and year out, so that no one is any longer confused by different polling companies reporting on a different basis, and their findings can be used to compare with the election result four years before and demographic comparisons.

In addition, having comparable ways of reporting their figures enables them and others to calculate 'swing', the statistic universally used in reporting British elections and polls which allows constitutencies' (states in the USA) results to be directly compared to each other and to the national results as well as to the previous party performance at previous elections.

This is the subject of my **Letter from Britain #2**, which can be found at [www.ipsos-mori.com](http://www.ipsos-mori.com)

Sir Robert Worcester  
Founder, MORI  
rmworcester@yahoo.com

Please note:

You can find graphical versions of the 2004 and 2008 American presidential elections, pollsters' results and their accuracy from MORI on the following pages.



## Election Results

The ballots have been counted and we are happy to announce that Tom W. Smith has been elected Vice President/President-Elect (a six year term) and that Patricia Moy has been re-elected as Professional Standards Chair (a two year term).

Thank you to everyone who participated in the election process as well as to the nominees for allowing their names to be on the ballot. Voter turnout this year was 30%.

FINAL POLLS 4.11.08				OBAMA	MCCAIN	Others	Don't	LEAD	Vote	OBAMA	MCCAIN	Others	LEAD	LEAD	O-M	Obama	McCain	ALL		
Polling Organisation							Know	Obama	w/o DK					ERROR	SHARE	SHARE	SHARE	POLL		
#	Foot-note	Sample Size	Fieldwork End Dates	%	%	%	%	%		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	ACCURACY		
1	<a href="#">RasmussenReports</a>	2,4	c. 1,000	3-Nov-08	52	46	1	1	6	99	53%	46%	1%	7%	0	0.0%	0%	0%	19/19	
2	<a href="#">Ipsos/McClatchy</a>	2	760	2-Nov-08	53	46	1		7	100	53%	46%	1%	7%	0	0.0%	0%	0%	53%/46%	
3	<a href="#">Diageo/Hotline</a>	2,4	887	2-Nov-08	50	45		5	5	95	53%	47%	0%	9%	2	0.5%	0%	1%	100% within	
4	<a href="#">Pew Research</a>	2	2,995	1-Nov-08	52	46	2		6	100	52%	46%	2%	9%	2	0.5%	1%	0%	+/-3%	
5	<a href="#">Daily Kos/Research 2000</a>	2	1,100	3-Nov-08	51	46	2	1	5	99	52%	46%	2%	6%	-1	0.5%	1%	0%	18/19	
6	<a href="#">Fox News Opinion Dynamics</a>	2	971	2-Nov-08	50	43	2	5	7	95	53%	45%	2%	8%	1	0.5%	0%	1%	53%/46%	
7	<a href="#">YouGov/Polimetrix</a>	1,3	31,148	2-Nov-08	51	45	2	2	6	98	52%	46%	2%	6%	-1	0.5%	1%	0%	95% within	
8	<a href="#">NBC/Wall Street Journal</a>	2,5	1,011	2-Nov-08	51	43	1	5	8	95	54%	45%	1%	6%	-1	1.0%	1%	1%	+/-2%	
9	<a href="#">American Research Group Inc</a>	2	1,200	3-Nov-08	53	45	1	1	8	99	54%	45%	1%	9%	2	1.0%	1%	1%	11/19	
10	<a href="#">Democracy Cops/Greenberg QR</a>	2,6	1,000	2-Nov-08	53	44	3		9	100	53%	44%	3%	9%	2	1.0%	0%	2%	53%/46%	
11	<a href="#">Marist</a>	2	1,011	3-Nov-08	52	43	3	2	9	98	53%	44%	3%	9%	2	1.0%	0%	2%	58% within	
12	<a href="#">Harris Interactive</a>	2,3	5,210	3-Nov-08	52	44	4		8	100	52%	44%	4%	8%	1	1.5%	1%	2%	+/-1%	
13	<a href="#">IBD/TIPP</a>	2,4	981	3-Nov-08	52	44	4		8	100	52%	44%	4%	8%	1	1.5%	1%	2%		
14	<a href="#">CNN/Opinion Research</a>	2	1,011	1-Nov-08	51	43	4	2	8	98	52%	44%	4%	8%	1	1.5%	1%	2%		
15	<a href="#">ABC/Wash Post</a>	2	2,762	2-Nov-08	53	44	2	1	9	99	54%	44%	2%	10%	3	1.5%	1%	2%		
16	<a href="#">CBS News</a>	2	1,051	2-Nov-08	51	42	2	5	9	95	54%	44%	2%	10%	3	1.5%	1%	2%		
17	<a href="#">Reuters/CSPAN/Zogby</a>	2	1,226	3-Nov-08	54	43	3		11	100	54%	43%	3%	11%	4	2.0%	1%	3%		
18	<a href="#">Gallup</a>	2	3,050	2-Nov-08	55	44	1		11	100	55%	44%	1%	11%	4	2.0%	2%	2%		
19	<a href="#">GWU/Battleground</a>	4	n/a	3-Nov-08	50	48	2		2	100	50%	48%	2%	2%	-5	2.5%	3%	2%		
AVERAGE					52	44	2		7	98.4	53%	45%	2%	8%	1	1.1%	0.8%	1.3%		
<b>ELECTION RESULT</b>					<b>53%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>1%</b>		<b>7%</b>											
ELECTION RESULT					52.6%	46.1%	1.3%		6.6%											
99.7% counted					66,316,572	58,013,719	1,631,950		8,302,853											
Turnout					125,962,241															
Analysis by Robert Worcester and Tomasz Mludzinski, Ipsos MORI <a href="mailto:rmworcester@yahoo.com">rmworcester@yahoo.com</a>																				

1 Registered Voters, 2 Likely Voters, 3 Internet Panel, 4 Technical details missing from html announcement, 5 Conducted by Hart/Newhouse, 6 (sic)



FINAL POLLS 12.11.04 RMW N.B. Likely voters	Survey End Date	BUSH	KERRY	Other	Margin		BUSH	KERRY	LEAD		Rounded	Rounded	Rounded	ALL POLL ACCURACY	TELEPHONE POLL ACCURACY	
		(inc DK)	%	%	%	Bush	Kerry	(Two-Horse Race)			LEAD ERROR	B-K SHARE ERROR	BUSH SHARE ERROR			KERRY SHARE ERROR
1 Pew	29-Oct-04	51	48	1	3		52%	48%	4%	0.6%	0.00	0.00	0.00	17/17	15/15	
2 TIPP	FINAL	50.1	48	1.9	2.1		51%	49%	2%	0.4%	0.45	1.00	0.00	51%/48%	51%/48%	
3 ABC News*	Tracker	49	48	3	1		51%	49%	2%	0.4%	1.00	2.00	0.00	100% within	100% within	
3 Harris (phone)	1-Nov-04	49	48	3	1		51%	49%	2%	0.4%	1.00	2.00	0.00	+/-3%	+/-3%	
5 Gallup/CNN/USA Today	FINAL	49	49	2	0	0	50%	50%	0%	1.4%	1.50	2.00	1.00	11/17	11/15	
5 GWU Battleground	Tracker	50	46	4	4		52%	48%	4%	0.6%	1.50	1.00	2.00	51%/48%	51%/48%	
7 ARG	30-Oct-04	48	48	4	0	0	50%	50%	0%	1.4%	1.50	3.00	0.00	65% within	73% within	
7 CBS News/NY Times	30-Oct-04	49	46	5	3		52%	48%	4%	0.6%	2.00	2.00	2.00	+/-2%	+/-2%	
7 Reuters/Zogby	Tracker	48	47	5	1		51%	49%	2%	0.4%	2.00	3.00	1.00	4/17	4/17	
7 NBC News/WSJ	31-Oct-04	48	47	5	1		51%	49%	2%	0.4%	2.00	3.00	1.00	51%/48%	51%/48%	
7 Marist College	1-Nov-04	49	50	1		1	49%	51%	-2%	2.4%	2.00	2.00	2.00	24% within	27% within	
12 GQRR (D)	FINAL	48.7	49.5	1.8		0.8	50%	50%	0%	1.4%	2.10	2.00	1.50	+/-1%	+/-1%	
13 Newsweek/Princeton	29-Oct-04	50	44	6	6		53%	47%	6%	1.6%	2.50	1.00	4.00			
13 FOX/Opinion Dynamics	31-Oct-04	46	48	6		2	49%	51%	-2%	2.4%	2.50	5.00	0.00			
15 ICR	26-Oct-04	48	45	7	3		52%	48%	4%	0.6%	3.00	3.00	3.00			
15 YouGov/Economist (internet)	FINAL	47	50	3		3	48%	52%	-4%	3.4%	3.00	4.00	2.00			
15 Harris (internet)	1-Nov-04	47	50	3		3	48%	52%	-4%	3.4%	3.00	4.00	2.00			
ELECTION RESULT		51%	48%	1%	3		51%	48%	3%	1.3%	1.8%	2.35	1.26			
RESULT							60,480,193	57,122,374	3,357,819	118m						
B-K SHARE %							51.4%	48.6%	2.8%							
											<a href="http://www.mori.com">www.mori.com</a>					

Analysis by  
Robert Worcester  
and  
Roger Mortimore

# Call for Papers



II Congreso Latinoamericano de Opinión Pública  
"Opinión Pública, democracia y conflictos en América Latina"  
Lima, Perú, 22-24 de abril del 2009



## 2nd WAPOR Latin American Congress "Public Opinion, Democracy and Conflicts in Latin America" Lima, Perú April 22-24, 2009

### The Congress

Public opinion research has had a long history in Latin America, and the current economic and political climate makes such research even more valuable. Studying the current climate in Latin America allows a broad range of researchers to observe and analyze public opinion processes and conflicts, both at the national level as well as comparatively within the region.

The second WAPOR Congress in Latin America, to be held in Lima, Peru, April 22 to 24, 2009, is an opportunity for scholars and practitioners to engage in various intellectual conversations about public opinion and current affairs in Latin America. Problems regarding government legitimacy, the current economic crisis, political parties and accountability, and media and public agendas will be of special interest in this regional seminar.

Abstracts from interested parties are due by **February 15, 2009** (please use the abstract form provided on the following page) to:  
[waporlima@pucp.edu.pe](mailto:waporlima@pucp.edu.pe)

### Cost of the Congress:

Professionals: S/. 370 nuevos soles (US\$ 120 dollars\*)

Students: S/. 150 nuevos soles (US\$ 50 dollars\*)

\* Approximate cost depending on the exchange rate, it may vary slightly.

**Webpage:** (In Spanish, English coming soon)

[www.waporlima.com](http://www.waporlima.com)

### More Information:

[waporlima@pucp.edu.pe](mailto:waporlima@pucp.edu.pe)



**II Congreso Latinoamericano de Opinión Pública**  
"Opinión Pública, democracia y conflictos en América Latina"  
Lima, Perú, 22-24 de abril del 2009



**Call for Papers**  
**2nd WAPOR Latin American Congress**  
**"Public Opinion, Democracy and Conflicts in Latin America"**  
**Lima, Perú, April 22-24, 2009**

Please send this document to:  
[waporlima@puce.edu.pe](mailto:waporlima@puce.edu.pe)  
by **February 15, 2009**.

<u>TITLE:</u>
<u>AUTHOR(S):</u>
<u>INSTITUTION YOU BELONG TO:</u>
<u>E-MAIL:</u>
<u>OBJETIVE(S):</u>
<u>METHODOLOGY:</u>
<u>RESULTS OBTAINED:</u>
<u>CONCLUSIONS:</u>

---

## Calendar

### **February 5, 2009**

Call for Papers for the 62nd Annual Conference Announced  
Lausanne, Switzerland  
September 11-13, 2009

### **February 15, 2009**

Deadline Call for Papers:  
II WAPOR Latin American Congress  
"Public Opinion, Democracy and Conflicts in Latin America" (see page 10 for details)

## Notes

- Renewal notices for 2009 dues were mailed in November. Additionally, emails were sent to members whose dues for 2009 had already been paid. If you did not receive a membership dues statement or an email, please let the WAPOR office know.
- If you have moved or changed jobs recently, please check our online membership directory ([http://www.unl.edu/wapor/membership\\_directory.html](http://www.unl.edu/wapor/membership_directory.html)) to be sure we have your up-to-date information. If not, please send a message to [renae@wapor.org](mailto:renae@wapor.org) to update the directory.

Thank you!

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: 1 402 472 7720

fax: 1 402 472 7727

email: [renae@wapor.org](mailto:renae@wapor.org)

Editor: Renae Reis

## WAPOR has a new address

Beginning on August 18, 2008, the WAPOR Secretariat is in a new location. The office is still housed within the UNL Gallup Research Center at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, just in a different building. The new mailing and phone information is below:

### **WAPOR**

**c/o UNL Gallup Research Center**

**University of Nebraska-Lincoln**

**201 North 13th Street**

**Lincoln, NE 68588-0242**

**USA**

**Ph: 402-472-7720**

**Fx: 402-472-7727**

The website at

**<http://www.wapor.org>**

remains the same. As does the email address ([renae@wapor.org](mailto:renae@wapor.org)) Please let us know if you have any questions.

Thank you!

- 
- 
- 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](mailto:renae@wapor.org) or to Nick Moon (Publications Chair) at [nmoon@gfk.com](mailto:nmoon@gfk.com).

*Let us know your upcoming events.*

*Please note, the deadline date for the  
1st quarter newsletter is  
February 20, 2009*