



NEWSLETTER

Second Quarter

2007

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. Robert Chung, Hong Kong

Liaison Committee Chair

Lic. Marita Carballo, UK

Publications Chair

Dr. Thomas Petersen, Germany

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

Dr. Wolfgang Donsbach, Germany

Historian

Prof. Philip Meyer, USA

Executive Coordinator

Ms. Renae Reis, USA

National Representatives

Australia, Mr. Ian W. McNair

Canada, Mr. Nathaniel Stone

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. Alejandro Moreno

Netherlands, Prof. Claes H. de Vreese

Norway, Prof. Ottar Hellevik

Philippines, Dr. Mahar K. Mangahas

Poland, Dr. Krzysztof Zagórski

Russia, Ms. Marina Krasilnikova

Sweden, Mr. Arne Modig

UK, Mr. Nick Moon

USA, Dr. Mark Schulman

Latin American Congress of Public Opinion: "Public Opinion, Social Conflict and Political Order"

Contributed by **María Braun**

Organizing Committee/WAPOR Colonia

From April 12 to 14, WAPOR's regional conference, "Public Opinion, Social Conflict and Political Order", was held in the city of Colonia del Sacramento, Uruguay.

Michael Traugott, WAPOR's president, opened the conference to a gathering of 120 public opinion researchers. For two days, and with the added pleasure of being in such a charming and historical city, these professionals discussed issues related to political parties and campaigns, the media, political cultures, identity, gender, social mobility, and democracy in our continent. Twelve countries were represented – ten from Latin America – as well as 40 research firms and more than 30 academic centers and universities.

Prior to the meeting, and coinciding with the 2nd Congress of SAIMO (Argentine Market and Opinion Researchers' Association), a joint WAPOR – SAIMO session was held in Buenos Aires, Argentina to discuss the relationship between market and public opinion research.

About the congress:

During the congress, ten round tables and two panels presented over 50 papers, all of which were based on public opinion data. These can be grouped into four core themes:

- 1. Democracy and political change in Latin America:** The papers covered issues on political crises and governance in Latin America. Conferences also discussed changes arising from the recent elections in Bolivia and Uruguay. Additionally, participants analyzed matters referring to political culture, the nationalist component in democracies, and the perception of corruption in the region.

(Colonia continued on page 4)

Table of Contents

Colonia: WAPOR's Latin American Seminar.....	1
President's Letter.....	2
Upcoming Conferences.....	3
France's Presidential Elections.....	5
AAPOR in Anaheim.....	6
Annual Conference Information: Berlin, Germany.....	10
Berlin Hotel Information and Registration Form.....	Insert

Letter from the President

Fellow WAPOR Members,

Greetings at the start of the summer. We have been working on a full schedule of conference and seminar activities for the membership, trying to expand the outreach of WAPOR with an eye toward increasing membership as well. In this newsletter, you will receive another report about the recent event organized for Latin American researchers in Colonia, Uruguay by Maria Braun and her associates. If you visit their web site at <http://www.waporcolonia.com/> you will now find all of the presentations that were made, as well as some media coverage related to the event. There is another WAPOR regional conference scheduled for Israel this month (June), and in the next several months, we hope to be announcing similar events in Asia. You will always be able to find this information on the WAPOR web site.

Our annual conference is scheduled in Berlin from September 19 to 21. Just as we sometimes do for ourselves, we will be emphasizing a special birthday that ends in “0” – our 60th! We will have some special events associated with the conference, and I hope you will be able to join us.

One issue that has been raised by this increased level of activity is how we follow through in support of these activities and the people who organize and participate in them. I am going to ask the Council at its next meeting, to be held in conjunction with the annual conference, to consider the concept of regional associations as a way to sustain interest in public opinion research, both substantively and methodologically, for groups of researchers who may not be able to attend our annual conferences on a regular basis. We will have to think about what kinds of support WAPOR can provide centrally and what the meaning of a membership in a regional association linked to WAPOR might be, among other issues. If you have any thoughts about this, I hope you will feel free to convey them to me.

The training of journalists in how to report on polls and public opinion, including guidance about when to ignore suspect claims about public opinion, remains one of our top priorities. In this regard, a committee empanelled by Past President Esteban Lopez-Escobar to propose guidelines for the ethical conduct of exit polls and for disclosure of the details of any specific exit poll has completed its work, and you can find a copy of its report on the WAPOR web site (see below for the link). I recently received a letter from Rob Daves, president of AAPOR, endorsing the report and its proposals.

Please stay in touch and let me know about any issues or suggestions that you have for new areas of emphasis that the WAPOR Council should be considering. I hope I will see you in Berlin.

Sincerely,



Michael W. Traugott
President



WAPOR President
Prof. Mike
Traugott



*Mike Traugott, Cecilia Hughes and
Jimena Rodriguez at a reception in
Colonia*

**WAPOR Guidelines for Exit Polls
and Election Forecasts web link**
http://www.unl.edu/wapor/social_science.html

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 from now on.

2007

July 23-25, 2007:

”Media, Communication, Information: Celebrating 50 Years of Theories and Practices.”

Annual Conference of the International Association of Media and Communication Research (IAMCR)

Paris, France

Consult: www.iamcr.net

August 9-12, 2007:

Convention of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (AEJMC)

Washington, DC, USA

Consult: www.aejmc.org

September 16-19, 2007:

”Excellence.”

Annual Congress of ESOMAR.

Berlin, Germany

Consult: www.esomar.org

2008

May 22-26, 2008:

58th Annual Conference of the International Communication Association (ICA)

Montreal, Quebec, Canada

Consult: www.icaheadq.org

August 6-9, 2008:

Convention of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (AEJMC)

Chicago, IL, USA

Consult: www.aejmc.org

2009

May 21-25, 2009:

59th Annual Conference of the International Communication Association (ICA)

Chicago, IL, USA

Consult: www.icaheadq.org

July 2009:

21st World Congress of the International Political Science Association (IPSA)

Santiago, Chile

Consult: www.ipsa.ca

2010

July 11-17, 2010:

17th World Congress of Sociology, International Sociological Association (ISA)

Goteborg, Sweden

Consult: www.isa-sociology.org

As always, if you have a conference or seminar from an organization you are involved with, please let us know. Send an email to renae@wapor.org to add this information.



WAPOR Office Information Update

The WAPOR office will be closed for the month of June as Renae Reis (Executive Coordinator) will be on maternity leave. Please feel free to continue to send emails to the office (renae@wapor.org), as she will be checking email and trying to answer any questions or respond to comments.

Also, please continue to register for the Berlin Annual Conference, registrations will be accepted all summer long. Remember, the deadline for registration is August 10.

Thank you!

2. Electoral campaigns and the media: The overall presentations analyzed the complex relationship between the media and politics, as well as public opinion research and its role in electoral campaigns. In particular, some explored the relationship between political campaigns and the media, debating principles of electoral marketing and image building in campaign strategies. Finally, one discussion examined the evolution of public opinion of the electorate during Lula da Silva's administration and the volatility of Ecuador's electorate in the electoral process of 2006.

3. Methodological questions and challenges: Diverse papers covered themes on the efficacy of surveys in building quality-of-life indices, the advantages and disadvantages of panel studies, the use of comparative research methods, the reliability of exit polls, and the application of techniques to predict election results. A panel also presented some comparative projects in public opinion.

"We are witness
to more
democracies
than ever..."

4. Public opinion and social analysis: Three in ten round tables presented studies based on public opinion data coming from different countries. Topics dealt with problematic issues like sexual and reproductive rights, persons living with HIV, views on the female condom, gender and poverty, sexuality, politics and violence, the youth and politics, patriotism and consumption, volunteerism, social protest, and social capital.

About the future

Latin America is in a particularly relevant position in terms of our profession. Important and distinct countries like Chile, Brazil, Mexico, Venezuela, Peru, Colombia, and Bolivia – among others – have experienced key election processes. Most of the countries in the Southern Cone – Argentina, Paraguay, and Uruguay – are fast approaching decisive elections.

In the past 25 years democratically elected governments have taken office across continental Latin America. Today, we are witness to more democracies than ever before in our history. Our profession represents a relatively new actor in this process. For this participation to grow, we must capture the experience of the region as a whole, examining the purely political side, among others (from social and cultural changes to the technical and methodological problems that characterize the region).



Cecilia Straw, Barbara Corrales and Noelia Carioli



Fabian Echgary and Leonardo Athias

If we truly feel that this matters, we must build Latin American congresses. And this appears to be the result of WAPOR's First Latin American Congress of Public Opinion: the decision to hold a second congress, this time in Lima, Peru.

Please see the entire set of papers/presentations at <http://www.waporcolonia.com>.

French Polls and the Aftermath of 2002

By Claire Durand, Professor,
Department of Sociology, Université de Montréal

In the recent presidential campaign of 2007, French pollsters were under close scrutiny. Their spectacular failure to predict the leading candidates in the first round of the presidential election of 2002 had been considered instrumental in the qualification of far-right nationalist Jean-Marie Le Pen for the second round of the two-round election.

According to results presented in Blais (2004), reverse strategic voting—based on the certainty that Lionel Jospin and Jacques Chirac would make it to the second round—cost Jospin about 18 percent of his support and Chirac about 15 percent, and was instrumental in allowing Le Pen make it to the second round.

How could such a situation occur? A number of reasons were brought forward in panels, conferences and articles (Durand, Blais and Larochelle, 2005). Estimating extremes, particularly the far right, has been difficult in many countries, especially in France. The samples showed a substantial underestimation of people who admitted having voted for the far right in previous elections. However, French pollsters were criticized for their practice of adjusting their estimates based on the “professional experience of the pollster.” In short, they produced a number of estimates based on respondents’ recall of vote in previous elections, likelihood of voting and certainty of choice. They then chose the most likely estimate for each candidate and would even modify the chosen estimates in order to smooth out the

evolution of estimates when they felt there was too much movement. With such methods, it is likely that if estimates put LePen ahead of Jospin, they were deemed improbable and discarded or “smoothed out” accordingly.

What about 2007?

In the months preceding the first round of the election on April 22, the French press and pollsters’ Web sites were full of articles explaining the survey method, the margin of error and warning people that polls were not predictions but mere portraits of the opinion at a single point in time. Articles also pointed to the impact on voters of the 2002 “catastrophe.” But what about the impact of 2002 on pollsters? This article asks three questions. Did the pollsters fare better in 2007 than in 2002? Are there indications that at least some pollsters modified their methods following 2002? And what was the role of the Survey Commission (Commission des sondages), which has the legal mandate to scrutinize electoral polls in France?

Did the pollsters fare better in 2007 than in 2002?

A number of criteria can help determine how well pollsters fared. Table 1 shows different estimates of poll accuracy for the leading candidates (three in 2002 and four in 2007). If one first compares the mean estimates of the last poll conducted by the six different pollsters, it may be concluded that

2007 was no better than 2002; on the contrary, in fact. While in 2002, only Le Pen’s share was poorly estimated (minus 4 points), in 2007, two of the main candidates, Sarkozy and Le Pen, were poorly estimated, with Le Pen’s share this time grossly overestimated (plus 3.8) and Sarkozy’s underestimated by 3.3 points.

If one looks at the best and worst estimates among these last polls, a similar conclusion is reached. The best poll was 2.6 points away from the result for Le Pen in 2007 while it was 2.9 points away (in the opposite direction) in 2002. The worst poll was 6.1 points away from the results for Le Pen in 2007 and 6.9 points in 2002. Unlike 2002, however, the worst poll estimate for each of the other main candidates were also quite inaccurate (4.7 points for Sarkozy, 3.4 points for Royal and 2.6 points for Bayrou). Based on these figures, one must conclude that the main improvement in 2007 was the fact that five out of six pollsters correctly predicted the order of finish, contrary to 2002 where no pollster did so. However, this is closely linked to the fact that the differences in share of the vote between the leading candidate and the rest were larger. Le Pen was as badly estimated in 2007 as in 2002, but in the opposite direction—as if, shaken by their underestimation of 2002, the pollsters had this time used their highest figures for Le Pen.

As for the second round of the election, comparing it with 2002 is impossible, since at that time pollsters had only asked respondents their preference between Chirac and Jospin before the first round. Very few polls were pub-

(France continued on page 8)

“Of Polls and Policy”

AAPOR Meets in Anaheim, California

By Allan L. McCutcheon
Gallup Research Center
Survey Research and Methodology Graduate Program
University of Nebraska

AAPOR held its 62nd annual conference in Anaheim, California May 17-20, with the theme “Of Polls and Policy.” Dave Sackett of the Tarrance Group, Mark Mellman of the Mellman Group, and Ronald Bernstein of the Los Angeles Times served as panelists of the plenary session “Polls and the Practice of Politics.” The panelists discussed the use of polls for agenda setting in American elections, from the perspectives of a Republican pollster, Democratic pollster, and journalist, respectively. Patricia Moy, 2007 AAPOR Conference Chair and WAPOR member, chaired the plenary session.

During the first two days of the conference, several sessions and panels were dedicated to the discussion of cell phone surveys. As a number of presenters noted, the widespread availability of landline telephones in the U.S. resulted in an early lag for the adoption of cell phones relative to other nations, though this lag is now disappearing. Consequently, the survey industry must find new methods to adapt to the emergence of this spreading technology.

A couple of additional innovations to this year’s meeting also contributed to a particularly impressive program this year. The poster sessions included a discussant to help compare and contrast the researchers’ findings. Also, a new set of sessions—entitled “Methodological Briefs”—provided a forum for papers that were more tightly focused on one or two research findings.

As is usual for the meeting, research papers covered a wide range of substantive and methodological topics. In addition to this year’s focus on cell phone technology, methodological topics included several sessions on increasing response and completion rates in web surveys, the measurement of race and ethnicity, response propensity, question order effects, mode effects, and cross-cultural/cross-national survey research. Several sessions also focused on topics related to pre-election and electoral polling.

On Friday evening, AAPOR members attended a memorial service for recently deceased members. Prominent among those remembered was WAPOR member Warren J. Mitofsky. Several AAPOR and WAPOR members shared their recollections of favorite moments with Warren—there were many, and all agreed that he will be missed in our profession and at our meetings.

Following AAPOR tradition, president Rob Daves served as the master of ceremonies at the Saturday evening Awards Banquet. To begin on the usual light note, Rob announced that he had just accepted a new position as “Director of T-tests for the Lipton Company,” one of America’s leading retailers of tea. On a more serious note, he introduced Warren Mitofsky’s widow, Mia Mather, to present the newly named Warren J. Mitofsky Innovators Award to two groups of recipients. First, Arthur Lupia and



**AAPOR President Rob Daves—
Lipton’s new “Director of T-tests”**

(AAPOR continued on page 7)

Diana Mutz, received the award for the Time-sharing Experiments in the Social Sciences project (TESS)—this project enables survey researcher experiments to share time on a representative national survey. The second pair of Mitofsky Innovators Award recipients were Mark Blumenthal and Charles Franklin for Pollster.com.

Pollster.com was cited as an “extraordinarily well-informed and accessible forum on public opinion research and poll results. Its reach extends well beyond the survey research community, broadening the level of knowledge among a larger public on survey methodology and the interpretation and reporting of survey findings.”



Mia Mather (center) presenting 2007 Warren J. Mitofsky Innovators Award to Charles Franklin (left) and Mark Blumenthal (right) for Pollster.com.

The 2007 Book Award was given to the book “What Americans Know About Politics and Why It Matters,” by Michael Delli Carpini and Scott Keeter, 1996. “This book epitomizes the rich and powerful results that can emerge from the extensive mining of survey archives in combination with innovative, original data collection,” said the Book Award committee chair and WAPOR member Tom W. Smith.

Finally, the 2007 Seymour Sudman Student Paper Award was awarded to Mathieu Turgeon, now an assistant professor at the University of North Texas, for his winning submission, “Just Thinking: Attitude Authenticity and Citizen Competence.” Turgeon’s paper argues that citizen’s develop attitudes that are more authentic and consistent with their personal values and interests through a process of ‘just thinking’ about politics and issues.

Photo credits: Steve Everett

Helen Dinerman Award Nominations Being Sought

The Helen Dinerman WAPOR Award is presented annually in memory of Helen Dinerman’s scientific achievements over three decades of public opinion research. The award, given since 1981, honors particularly significant contributions to survey research methodology. This is a career award recognizing a lifetime of service to the profession and the discipline.

Recent winners include: Roger Jowell, Sidney Verba, Phillip Converse, Roger Tourangeau, Mahar Mangahas, Seymour Martin Lipset, Hans Zetterberg, Robert Merton and Bob Worcester. Last year in Montreal, the award was presented to Don Dillman of Washington State University (United States) for his lifetime achievements.

Please send suggestions and a few lines of justification by email to WAPOR at renae@wapor.org by **August 1**. The winner will be announced at the WAPOR Annual Conference this September in Berlin, following the decision by three past Presidents of WAPOR.

lished between the two rounds, and Chirac's lead was clear (around 80 percent). In 2007, learning from their mistake of 2002, and encouraged to do so by the Survey Commission, pollsters made sure to ask voter intention not only for the two leading candidates but also between Bayrou, the third candidate, and Sarkozy or Royal, when Bayrou was rather high in the polls.

Analysis of the polls carried from January 1 shows that there was no change in voter intention for the duo Sarkozy-Royal from the beginning of February. The time-series analysis projected Sarkozy at 53.4 percent, and he received 53.1 percent. In circumstances where there is no change, it seems rather easy to predict the results from a high number of polls. However, the two last polls published on the Internet on May 4, minutes before the midnight ban, put Sarkozy at 55 percent, leading voters to think that an upward trend for Sarkozy had occurred after the debate of May 2. These last polls proved to be inaccurate and were the worst of all the polls published between the two rounds.

Did the methods change?

After the catastrophe of 2002, it would be reasonable to think that, as was the case for the 1992 British election (Curtice, 1997), pollsters would adjust their methods, perhaps with the help of statisticians and academics. Many meetings and discussions were held, but did methods really change?

One way of looking at pollsters' methods is indirect. Since it is statistically impossible that estimates produced by surveys all be the same, variance in estimates can be considered a good indication that published figures are derived exclusively from the sampling process and have not been tempered with. Table 1 shows that in 2002, five out of six estimates for Jospin were the same at 18 percent; for Chirac, three were at 20 percent and two were at 19.5 percent; and for Le Pen, three were at 14 percent. In 2007, there was less unanimity, and yet three estimates were the same for Sarkozy and Le Pen, and two were the same for Royal.

The last column of Table 1 gives the value and significance of F tests of the difference between the pollsters' estimates from March 1 to the day before election. In 2002, there was no significant difference between the pollsters' estimates for the three main candidates (Anovas of 1.44, .92 and 1.2). On the other hand, in 2007, there was a significant difference between pollsters' estimates for three leading candidates: Sarkozy (F=18.5), Royal (F=4.4) and Le Pen (F=6.8). What does this mean? While one may think normal not to have significant differences between pollsters, in this case the difference is good news in a way because it could mean that pollsters were publishing their own figures without "aligning" with each other. It could also mean that their methods differ, since they produced different figures. For the second round, no significant differences appeared between pollsters except for one pollster, who tended to put Sarkozy systematically almost one point higher than the others.

Finally, since the French law makes it compulsory for pollsters to provide the Survey Commission with detailed information on how their polls are conducted and their estimates produced, it is also possible to examine what pollsters reveal about their methods. A comparison of the information provided by pollsters from 2002 and 2007 indicates that methods did not change much. The same pollsters used the same sentences to describe their methods and appeared to adjust the data in the same way. The main difference was that pollsters no longer said they made adjustments based on their "professional experience."

The methods used by pollsters seem to vary mostly in the number and type of previous elections they used to adjust and produce estimates. For the first round of the 2007 presidential election, while all the pollsters used the first round of the 2002 election, some also used the first round of the 2002 legislative election, the first or second round of the 2004 regional election, and the 2005 referendum. For the second round, obviously, first-round "recall" (i.e., voters' recollection of how they voted in the first round) allowed for a good adjustment. Only one pollster also used other elections, and two used likelihood of vote and certainty of choice.

An idea of the difficulty faced by French pollsters can be gained by looking at how close recollection of vote for

(France continued from page 8)

previous elections was to the actual vote. The best recall should be the one taken on election day; people should recall well how they voted a few hours before. However, the recollection of LePen's vote—his actual election result was 10.5 percent—varied from 4.5 percent to 7.1 percent for three pollsters for which data is available, and the weights applied to these respondents varied between 1.37 and 2.31. One week later, recollections varied from 3.3 percent to 5.6 percent. This indicates that the problem is not so much with reliable recollection but most likely either with sampling (probability sampling with quotas, polls carried over only one to two days), with non-response (samples appear to substantially under-represent the less educated), or with concealment of far-right vote.

What about the Survey Commission?

The Survey Commission is an interesting feature of French law governing political polls. The Commission can intervene whenever it deems it is relevant to do so. It may issue warnings concerning specific published polls, it must quickly examine and respond to complaints about polls, and its external experts examine all information filed by pollsters to see if their methods and published estimates are correct.

The Commission issued a number of press releases regarding its role, and warning about margin of error and using necessary caution to when interpreting results. It also required pollsters to keep their published figures within the range of the different estimates produced by the adjustments they were using.

For the first time since its establishment, the Commission issued a public warning regarding the figures published by one pollster on March 8 and March 15, stating that it had reservations about the way the adjustments were made and about the stated significance of the one-point differences in voter intention obtained by the leading candidates. However, the Commission did not provide specifics about what was problematic in the adjustments used by the pollster and about the figures for which it had reservations. This warning likely had an impact, however, sending a clear message to pollsters that “messing with data” would not be accepted.

Conclusion

The shock of 2002 may have caused French pollsters to question their methods, but apparently not seriously enough for them to make substantial changes. As a result, they did not fare better in 2007 than in 2002; however, since the consequences were much less catastrophic, the media did not raise the issue. Varying the basis used to produce estimates from poll to poll is not an acceptable scientific method and prevents anybody, including the pollsters themselves, from improving and systematizing their methods.

However, it is somewhat easier to determine how French pollsters work because French law requires them to file methodological information that is, in part, publicly available and scrutinized by experts. In a context of increasing globalization, where at least some French pollsters are members of international groups, it is unlikely that similar methods are not being used elsewhere.

Finally, pollsters are under great pressure by the public and the media to produce reliable and accurate figures within hours. Furthermore, they compete with each other on who will have “the” best figures, even though this notion is nonsense given existing margins of error and the conditions under which such polls are conducted. At the same time, conducting reliable surveys appears to be increasingly difficult, with technological change—mobile and IP phones—and the rise of non response.

It is tempting to suggest that specific sessions in WAPOR, AAPOR and other organizations interested in methodology address the problem of estimating voter intention in different situations. Researchers tend to criticize the methods used by pollsters but abandon them in the search for solutions.¹ Advances in this field requires good cooperation between pollsters and academics.

(France continued on page 10)

References:

Bachelet, D. (2006). “Propositions de nouvelles méthodes pour estimer les intentions de vote : Application au duel Le Pen – Jospin dans le premier tour de l’élection présidentielle de 2002.” *Revue française du marketing*. February 2007, pp 11–30.

Blais, A. (2004). “Strategic Voting in the 2002 French Presidential Election.” *The French Voter: Before and After the 2002 Elections*. Michael Lewis-Beck, ed. pp 93–109, Hampshire, UK: Palgrave.

Curtice, J. (1997). “So How Well Did They Do? The Polls in the 1997 Election.” *Journal of the Market Research Society*, 39: 449–461.

Durand, C., A. Blais and M. Larochelle (2005). “The Polls of the French Presidential Election: An Autopsy.” *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 68 (4), 602–622.

(Footnotes)

¹ One interesting exception is a recent article by Bachelet (2007), who devised a new method to estimate the vote for far-right candidates in France using the recall of preceding vote and estimates of the behavior of non-responders and concealment of respondents. This method gives almost perfect estimates of the vote for LePen in 2002 and 2007. An attempt to use it for the Quebec election of 2007, however, did not bring satisfactory results. This points to the need for further refinement.

Table 1
Estimates of Poll Accuracy in the First Round of French Presidential Elections of 2002 and 2007

2007						
	Election Result	Last published poll - 6 pollsters				All polls from March 1
		Mean estimate (diff. with result)	Best poll estimate (diff. with result)	Worst poll estimate (diff. with result)	Number of similar estimates n (est.)	Difference between pollsters F(p)
Sarkozy	31.2	27.9 (-3.3)	30.0 (-1.2)	26.5 (-4.7)	3 (28)	18.5 (.00)
Royal	25.9	23.8 (-2.1)	25.5 (-0.4)	22.5 (-3.4)	2 (24)	4.4 (.00)
Bayrou	18.6	18.2 (-0.4)	19.0 (+0.4)	16.0 (-2.6)	0	0.8 (.54)
Le Pen	10.4	14.2 (+3.8)	13.0 (+2.6)	16.5 (+6.1)	3 (14)	9.4 (.00)
2002						
Chirac	19.9	19.7 (-0.2)	20.0 (+0.1)	19 (-0.9)	3 (20), 2 (19.5)	1.44 (.23)
Jospin	16.2	17.8 (+1.6)	16.5 (+0.3)	18 (+1.8)	5 (18)	0.92 (.48)
Le Pen	16.9	12.9 (-4.0)	14.0 (-2.9)	10 (-6.9)	3 (14)	1.2 (.33)

Announcement:
60th ANNUAL CONFERENCE
Public Opinion and the Challenges of the 21st Century
Berlin, Germany

Wednesday, September 19 to Friday, September 21, 2007

Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin (WZB)
Social Science Research Center Berlin

The World Association for Public Opinion Research (WAPOR) will hold its annual conference in September 2007 in Berlin, Germany. We will start with an ESOMAR/WAPOR Joint Session on the afternoon of September 19th. During the following 1.5 days we will be discussing “**Public Opinion and the Challenges of the 21st Century.**” Along with other topics of interest we would like to focus on:

- Learning from History: What Historians tell us about the Relevance of Polling
- New Problems – New Methods
- The Understanding and Relevance of Public Opinion in Theoretical Perspective
- Public Opinion and Civil Society
- Survey Research, Peace Building and Conflict Resolution
- Public Opinion and Democracy
- Survey Research and Gender Gap
- Survey Impact among Voters and Politicians
- Media, Polling and Public Opinion

WAPOR seeks to bring together scholars with a historical, sociological, political science or communications science background who would present original research papers at this conference.

Proposals should include a general description of the research paper (research topic, specific research questions or hypotheses, methods and results), as well as full contact information (mailing address, e-mail address and telephone number) for each co-author or participant on a separate sheet. The abstract should not exceed three double-spaced pages or 750 words.

Deadlines:

Deadline for Papers: 1 July 2007

Closing Registration: 1 September 2007

Contact:

Richard Hilmer
Managing Director
Infratest dimap
Gesellschaft für Trend- und
Wahlforschung mbH
Moosdorfstr. 7-9
D-12435 Berlin
Tel +49 (0)30 533 22-113
Fax +49 (0)30 533 22-122
wapor@infratest-dimap.de

60th Annual Conference

“Public Opinion and the Challenges of the 21st Century” Berlin, Germany September 19-21, 2007

More information on the upcoming 60th Annual Conference being held in Berlin, Germany in 2007, is posted on page 11 of this newsletter. You can also find a registration form and hotel information as an insert.

Contact Information:
Richard Hilmer
(wapor@infratest-dimap.de) or
Renaë Reis
(renae@wapor.org)

WAPORnet

As a member of WAPOR, you have access to the listserv, which you can use to keep in touch with other WAPOR members. This is a feature of your membership that we urge you to take advantage of. You may have information on upcoming events or on current happenings in public opinion research that you would like to share with the other members. Send your message to wapor@unl.edu to reach current members of WAPOR. Tip: Replying to a message from wapor.net results in everyone receiving your reply.

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

Please contact:

WAPOR Secretariat

UNL Gallup Research Center

200 North 11th Street

University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Lincoln, Nebraska 68588-0242, USA

phone: 1 402 458 2030

fax: 1 402 458 2038

email: renae@wapor.org

Editor: Renaë Reis

Calendar

June 26-29, 2007

WAPOR Regional Seminar
*Public Opinion, Communication and
Elections*
Jerusalem and Haifa, Israel

August 10, 2007

Hotel and Conference Registration Deadline
WAPOR Annual Conference
*Public Opinion and the Challenges of the 21st
Century*
Berlin, Germany

(Hotel rooms will be released after August 10;
Conference registrations received after
August 10 will be an additional \$50 per
registration)

September 19-21, 2007

WAPOR Annual Conference
*Public Opinion and the Challenges of the 21st
Century*
Berlin, Germany
Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin (WZB)
Social Science Research Center Berlin

-
-
- 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 Thomas Petersen (Publications Chair) at tpetersen@ifd-allensbach.de

Let us know your upcoming events.

*Please note, the deadline date for the
3rd quarter newsletter is
September 28, 2007.*

WAPOR
Annual Conference Registration
Berlin, Germany
September 19--21, 2007

Please return to:
 WAPOR Secretariat
 UNL Gallup Research Center
 200 N Eleventh Street
 Lincoln, NE 68588-0242
 USA

Fax: 001 (402) 458-2038

I hereby register for the WAPOR Annual Conference

Name:

Organization/Institute:

Street Address: City..... Zip Code.....

Country:

Telephone: Fax: E-mail:

Date of birth*:

(*For the Welcome Cocktail at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs there are strict safety regulations. We are required to deliver a list with names and date of birth of all participants three days before the event. You will be asked to produce identification on-site.)

Please fill out ALL sections below and the total at the bottom of the page.

Conference Registration Options

Please circle the appropriate registration fee for the conference. Conference fee includes all materials for the conference, the welcome cocktail, all lunches, all coffee breaks between sessions, and the award dinner. Registration for non-members includes a one-year membership to WAPOR beginning 1/1/2008. To avoid a late registration fee (see below), attendees should submit their registration forms *by August 16*.

	by August 16	after August 16
Member	\$340	\$390
Non-Member	\$465	\$515
Student Member	\$250	\$250
Student Non-Member	\$300	\$300

WAPOR's annual award dinner on 9/20 is being held at Weinhus Huth, a nearby restaurant, and includes one of the following two menus as well as wine, coffee and tea. Please select your menu below.

- Fillet of pike perch on potato-leek ragout with Pommery-mustard sauce
- Stuffed breast of guinea fowl on herb risotto with melted tomatoes

Total cost for conference registration: (A) \$ _____

Additional Ticket(s) for Award Dinner

If you are interested in purchasing extra tickets for the award dinner, note the number of additional tickets being purchased and the menu of your choice.

_____ Award Dinner @ \$90; menu choice _____

Total cost for additional meals: (B) \$ _____

Total cost for registration plus additional meals: (A + B) \$ _____

Method of payment:

Mastercard: _____ EXP: _____ Signature _____

VISA: _____ EXP: _____ Signature _____

Check enclosed in USD (no Eurocheques please!)

Insert—WAPOR Newsletter, Second Quarter 2007

Hotels for WAPOR Congress, September 19th-21st, 2007:

We strongly advise all participants to reserve their hotel accommodation as soon as possible, since there will be two big events taking place in Berlin at the same time as the conference (the music fair "popkomm" and a congress for health professionals).

We have reserved a preliminary contingent of 165 rooms in four different hotels. Until the 16th of August, you can book these rooms using the key word WAPOR (except of the Etap Hotel, there you have to use a number, conditions below). Please note that we will not be able to guarantee rooms after August 16.

In detail we have:

80 rooms in the four-star hotel

Best Western Hotel President

An der Urania 16-18

D-10787 Berlin

Tel. +49 (0) 30-219 03 0

Fax. +49 (0) 30-214-1200

Email. reservat@president.bestwestern.de

<http://book.bestwestern.com/bestwestern/productInfo.do#null>

with following conditions:

Single room 99 Euro.

Double room 124 Euro.

Breakfast and tax included. (It is not possible to get a price without breakfast, because this a special rate.)

This hotel is in walking distance to the WZB. You'll need about 10-15 minutes.

40 rooms in the four-star hotel

NH Berlin Mitte

Leipziger Strasse 106-111

D-10117 Berlin

Tel. +49 (0) 30-20620790

Fax. +49 (0) 30-20620780

Email: reservations.berlin.de@nh-hotels.com

http://www.nh-hotels.com/listapaises/en/europe/germany/berlin/nh_berlin-mitte.html

With the following conditions:

Single room 149 Euro.

Double room 149 Euro.

Breakfast 18 Euro.

Tax included.

Transport to the conference location: By public bus, line M48. The bus stops directly in front of the hotel and starts every 10 minutes. It takes 10 minutes to the stop "Kulturforum", which is two minutes in walking distance to the WZB. In total you'll need about 15 minutes.

The NH Berlin Mitte has a slightly higher standard than the Best Western.

30 rooms in the four-star hotel

RAMADA PLAZA BERLIN

Prager Platz

D-10779 Berlin

Telefon: +49 (0) 30 236 250-640

Telefax: +49 (0) 30 236 250-590

Email: berlin.plaza@ramada.de

<http://www.ramada-plaza-berlin.de/index.htm>

with following conditions:

Single room 139 Euro.

Double room 139 Euro.

Breakfast 18 Euro per person.

Tax included.

Transport to the conference location: There is a metro starting every 7-10 minutes in front of the hotel (line U9) and then you'll have to change to a bus. In total you'll need about 30 minutes.

We will try to organize a shuttle service for participants staying at this hotel.

15 rooms in the two-star hotel

Etap Berlin

Potsdamer Platz

Anhalter Str. 6

D – 10963 Berlin

Tel: +49 (0) 30 / 257 67 70

Fax: +49 (0) 30/ 257 677125

Email: e5899-re@accor.com

http://www.accorhotels.com/accorhotels/fichehotel/de/etp/5058/fiche_hotel.shtml

with following conditions:

Single room 48 Euro.

Double room 58 Euro.

Breakfast 5,50 per person.

Tax included.

In this hotel the participants have to use the number: **116788** (they don't work with keywords).

Transport to the conference location: By public bus, line M29. The bus stops two minutes away from the hotel (stop "Anhalter Bahnhof") and starts every 10 minutes. It takes 5 minutes to the stop "Gedenkstätte Deutscher Widerstand", which is five minutes in walking distance to the WZB. In total you'll need about 15 minutes.

(Note: Current exchange rates from Euro to Dollar at 1€=\$1.35)

Hotel information can also be found
on the WAPOR website:
<http://www.wapor.org>