

# WAPOR NEWSLETTER

WORLD ASSOCIATION FOR PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH

Third 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. Thomas Roessing, Germany

### **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

## Public Opinion Researchers Trace the Field's Historical Roots in Vienna

Contributed by Hannes Haas (Head of Department, Department of Communication, Vienna) & Katharina Lobinger (Scientific Assistant, Department of Communication, Local organizer)

The WAPOR Thematical Seminar "The Early Days of Survey Research and Their Importance Today" took place in Vienna on July 1-3. The seminar was the result of an international cooperation between WAPOR, the Faculty of Social Sciences at the University of Vienna and the Faculty of Social Sciences at



Charles University in Prague. The Department of Communication of the University of Vienna hosted the event. Vienna was chosen as the ideal place to retrace the roots of survey and public opinion research and to, as WAPOR president Thomas Petersen demands, "shake our field out of its tendency towards historical amnesia", because it was in Vienna where Paul Lazarsfeld (at left), Marie Jahoda and Hans Zeisel did their innovative and trailblazing studies and founded the "Wirtschaftspsychologische Forschungsstelle."

In their empirical study about the consequences of unemployment in Marienthal (a small town not far from Vienna) and later in their work in the USA they, and so many other scholars, had inspiring and innovative ideas which are worth being discussed again, particularly because many disciplines are so concerned with the present that the historical development of the field is hardly ever mentioned. The seminar in Vienna thus had the purpose to retrace some of the field's historical roots and to talk about their importance and implications for current research. The seminar's program included 20 papers and presentations and 30 participants from Australia, Sweden, USA, Czech Republic, Belgium, Germany, Mexico, United Kingdom and Austria attended the conference and exchanged their views in a very international and productive setting.

The seminar started with a relaxed get-together in the most inspiring ambiance of "Heuriger" Mayer am Pfarrplatz, a typical Viennese wine

(Seminar continued on page 4)

### *Table of Contents*

Vienna Seminar Highlights.....	1
President's Letter.....	2
ISO Standards Update.....	3
"Why do polls go wrong...sometimes?".....	5
IV Latin American Congress CFP.....	8
"Born to be a Respondent".....	9
Spain Regional Seminar Call for Abstracts.....	10

**64th Annual Conference  
Amsterdam, Netherlands  
21-23 September 2011**

---

## Letter from the President

Dear WAPOR members,

Is there also a word in your language like “Novemberfieber”—or November fever—which is now an accepted term in German? The word refers to the odd end-of-the-year scramble, primarily by government institutions, to quickly spend all of the money allocated to them for the current year, lest the responsible financial authorities get the impression that they had applied for too much money and could make do with a smaller budget in the coming year.



**Thomas Petersen**  
President

Hence all of the hectic activity at year’s end. New chairs and computers are hastily purchased, even though they aren’t really needed. Here at the Allensbach institute, we also profit from this at times: suddenly, there is money available for studies—sometimes even quite a lot of money—but they have to be completed quickly, before the year is over.

Of course, it is not November yet, but when it comes to my WAPOR presidency, I sometimes get the feeling that a kind of “November fever” has also broken out, although that was hardly my intention. I also have no need to go on a spending spree right before the end, even if you might think so when I inform you that we have just decided to buy a new computer for Renae Reis, our Executive Coordinator. In our defense, however, I should emphasize that the computer is badly needed—and at least she is not getting a new chair.

---

“..I do believe there are already signs that the idea [of Regional Chapters] is catching on in other regions of the world as well..”

---

It just worked out this way by chance, with a spate of new decisions being made shortly before the end of my term. Above all, I am pleased and proud to announce that as of January 1, 2011—one year after WAPOR’s constitution was changed accordingly—WAPOR will have its first official “Regional Chapter.” The Council unanimously approved Maria Braun’s application for the chapter, “WAPOR Latinoamerica,” which will have its headquarters in Buenos Aires and which will initially be recognized for two years as our official partner organization. Then, presumably at our annual conference in Hong Kong in the summer of

2012, we will take stock of the situation and decide whether to extend our cooperation beyond that point. For the moment, however, I would like to take this opportunity to thank Maria Braun and our other committed colleagues at WAPOR Latinoamerica. It was wonderful to see her great enthusiasm in bringing the project to fruition—and I do believe there are already signs that the idea is catching on in other regions of the world as well. In the long run this initiative, which was also made possible thanks to Mike Traugott’s persistent support in the Council, could very well turn out to be a defining moment for WAPOR’s future development.

The second decision made in this “November fever” climate concerns a change in the WAPOR Council. Quite some time ago, Connie de Boer indicated that she would like to step down from her position as Membership Chair. The Council has now selected Thomas Roessing, a communication researcher at the University of Mainz, as her successor. I am very pleased to welcome Thomas to the WAPOR Council: for years now, he has been an active advocate for WAPOR among his academic colleagues and, given his knowledgeability and numerous contacts with other international organizations in our field, I am sure he will be an asset for

*(President continued on page 3)*

---

(President from page 3)

WAPOR. At the same time, I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to Connie for her many years of patient service in what is often such a thankless position. I believe I am speaking for all Council members when I say that I truly regret her decision, although I can also understand it.

In the coming weeks, our "November fever" will wind down with a third fundamental decision. Here, however, our deliberations have not yet come to a close (which is not so bad, since I need to have something to write about in my last "Letter from the President"). The decision concerns filling the position of Editor-in-Chief at the *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*. I am confident that I will be able to give you good news in this regard by the end of the year.

Best regards,



Thomas Petersen

## In the next issue...

More information will soon be available regarding the upcoming 64th Annual Conference being held September 21-23, 2011 in Amsterdam, Netherlands. Our conference is being co-chaired by Claes de Vreese and Peter Neijens, both of the University of Amsterdam. The call for papers and other information will be available in the next version of the newsletter to be published at the end of the year.



University of Amsterdam courtesy of eapae.org

---

## ISO Standards to be Revised

Tom W. Smith  
NORC/University of Chicago



In 2006 the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) issued international standards for market, opinion, and social research (ISO 20252). Currently ISO Technical Committee 225 is reviewing those standards. It is expected that revised standards will be finalized by early 2011. Organizations wishing to be certified as ISO compliant need to apply to a certifying body and undergo an audit. A number of countries have established certification bodies. These include 1) the Council for American Survey Research Organizations ([www.casro.org/iso](http://www.casro.org/iso)) for the United States and Canada, 2) SAI Global ([www.sai-global.com](http://www.sai-global.com)) and NCSI ([www.ncsi.com.au](http://www.ncsi.com.au)) in Australia, 3) Stichting Toetsingsbureau KCC ([kcc@vaneunen.nl](mailto:kcc@vaneunen.nl)) in the Netherlands, and 4) British Standards Institution ([www.bsigroup.co.uk](http://www.bsigroup.co.uk)), Marketing Quality Assurance ([www.mqa-ltd.co.uk](http://www.mqa-ltd.co.uk)), and SGS ([www.uk.sgs.com](http://www.uk.sgs.com)) in Great Britain. National trade and professional associations are involved in setting similar certification bodies in France, Japan, Spain, Sweden, and other countries.

WAPOR is a liaison member of TC 225 and has been active involved in the formulation of the ISO 20252 standards.



(Seminar continued from page 1)

tavern where Beethoven lived during the summer of 1817 and where he composed parts of his 9th symphony. With perfect summer weather the participants met in the lovely garden to dine and taste Viennese Wine under chestnut trees as perhaps Beethoven did at one time. On the next day WAPOR



president Thomas Petersen and Hannes Haas, head of the local host organization, opened the conference, which was held in the main building of the University of Vienna, inaugurated by emperor Franz Joseph I in 1884. The University of Vienna, which is located in the center of the city, is one of the oldest Universities in Europe; it was founded in 1365. Today it has 15 faculties, almost 180 study programs and departments, 8,900 employees and more than 85,000 students. The panels on the first day were concerned with the pioneers of modern survey research. A whole session was dedicated to Paul Lazarsfeld and his contributions to the development of survey research. Moreover, the seminar



discussed the methodological contributions of the pioneers work to modern research and the presentations revealed that some approaches that seem to be very new and innovative had already been used in similar ways long before. In the panel on the history of survey research in different countries a comparative perspective allowed to contrast the developments of opinion research in Austria, the Czech Republic, Latin America and Australia.

One of the seminar's highlights was the panel discussion led by Robert Manchin, managing director of The Gallup Organization Europe. Special guest Barbara Gallup showed a fascinating photo presentation that gave insight in 75 years of opinion research by Gallup and the people involved. In the presentation she also showed the first Gallup Poll release in 1935. Hans Zetterberg and his wife Karin Busch Zetterberg impressed the audience with their good memories and managed to identify most of the depicted persons, in some



cases with the help of the audience. The participants also got the chance to visit the Paul F. Lazarsfeld Archive at the University of Vienna. The archive comprises original documents from the Paul Lazarsfeld estate, including articles, more than 2,000 books, letters and manuscripts.

Other topics of the seminar were the pollster's role in early survey research and the initial methodological approaches used in public opinion research. The audience for example learned about straw polls 100 years ago and the almost forgotten hidden surveys.



The atmosphere during the whole seminar was particularly warm and friendly and the local organizers were delighted to get very positive feedback from the participants. Of course this can in large part be ascribed to the exciting program put together by WAPOR president Thomas Petersen. Furthermore, the Arbeiterkammer (the Chamber of Labor in Vienna) financially supported the seminar, which enabled the local organizers to offer a social program with, for example, the get-together at the Viennese tavern and the wine reception at the University. Here we also want to highlight historical parallels regarding the sponsorship, as it was Otto Bauer, the former head of the Arbeiterkammer who had the idea for the Marienthal study. He brought Paul Lazarsfeld and his colleagues to Marienthal and financed their research. So we particularly want to thank the Arbeiterkammer for the awareness of the historic significance of the pioneer study and for the topically well-fitting, generous sponsoring of the seminar.

*Photos clockwise from top right:* Kathy Frankovic; Hans Zetterberg; Barbara Gallup, Robert Manchin, Hans Zetterberg; Robert Eisinger.

---

## Why do polls go wrong ... sometimes?

Claire Durand,  
Professor, Dept. of Sociology, University of Montreal  
Secretary-Treasurer, WAPOR

At the 61<sup>st</sup> Annual WAPOR conference in New Orleans, Louisiana, Tomas Bodor presented a paper on the failure of the polls in the Hungarian 2002 election. It struck me then that, in 2002 alone, there had been failures of the polls in three major elections, i.e., France, Italy and Hungary. The question was raised as to whether there were methodologies or/and socio-political circumstances associated with poll failures. It is with this idea in mind that I started a research project in 2008 together with John Goyder from University of Waterloo and Martial Foucault from University of Montreal. And it is in this context that we organized a session with a view to bringing together researchers interested in this question at the World Congress of the International Sociological Association, held in Goteborg in July 2010. This note synthesizes the papers presented during this session, which pertained to the French and Italian elections, the Swiss elections and referenda, as well as the U.S. primaries. The session ended with a review of 39 cases where polls have gone wrong since 1948.

Dormagen and Lehingue's focussed on why the extreme-right wing vote is often underestimated in polls published in France. They conducted exit polls after each of nine elections in France since the 2002 Presidential election in three districts contrasted by social class. Since election results were available for these districts, they could estimate whether response rates in the exit polls – on average 47 percent – differed according to political preferences in all three districts. They showed first that response rates to the polls are highly correlated with participation rates in elections, but only in the upper and middle class districts. For instance, response rates of voters for the left-wing candidates in the 2007 presidential election varied between 50% in the working class district and 75% in the upper class district while, for voters favourable to the extreme-right, they varied between 10% (Working class district) and 40% (upper class). Dormagen and Le Hingue concluded that response to surveys seems to obey similar rules and have similar social, political and contextual determinants associated with participation in elections. In addition, bias seems stronger in districts where the

extreme-right vote is in minority and stigmatized: It is harder to reach right-wing voters in the working class districts than in middle or upper class districts. Dormagen's presentation adds empirical-factual information on why the extreme-right is underestimated by most polls in France.

Fumagalli and Sala, in a paper presented by Sala, also used an innovative method (statistical matching) to estimate why polls may go wrong. Examining why the polls had overestimated the center-left by 3-4 points in the 2006 Italian General election, they focussed on the possible bias due to coverage error, most specifically, the absence from the samples of about 30 percent of the households that are either cell-only or directory non-listed. In order to examine this question, they used two data file, Istat's Multiscopo survey of 20,000 households which comprises information on telephone ownership and listing in directories and on political behaviours but not on political preferences and ITANES's survey of 2000 respondents, conducted face-to face (CAPI) which comprises information on political preferences but not on telephone use. The idea here is to match likes with likes in order to impute a value for being either included or excluded from the sampling frame to the ITANES respondents and see whether there is a potential difference in voting intentions between those who are estimated as included in the sampling frame and those estimated as excluded. Since it is an estimation process, it was replicated ten times in order to see whether all imputations give similar results. The presentation shows that in most replications, there is a significant difference between those included and those excluded, the latter being more inclined to vote for the right (either Forza Italia or Lega Norde) and less likely to vote for the left (ULIVO).

The results of the referendum on the Minarets Initiative, aimed at banning the construction of new Minarets in Switzerland, held in November 2009 constituted another instance of a surprising failure of the polls since the polls predicted a No victory and the Yes side won with 57% of the vote. Lutz presented a paper devised with Pekari, focusing on whether the failure of the polls in this particular referendum was an exception. They analysed 50 polls from the same polling institute (gfs.bern) pertaining to referenda held in Switzerland between

*(Polls continued on page 6)*

1998 and 2009. They show that the polls predicted the wrong winner in 10 out of 50 polls (20%), i.e., two of the 27 polls who ended with a victory of the Yes side and eight out of the 23 polls who ended with a No. They also showed that the discrepancy between the polls and the vote on the Minaret initiative is an outlier in the series of 50 polls. In all other referenda but one, the No side was underestimated by the last published poll. Statistically speaking, they showed that the proportion of declared undecided in the last poll, the turnout, the vote share between Yes and No and the fact that the referendum is an initiative (compared to a mandatory process) together account for nearly 30% of the variance in the difference between the percent of No in the last poll and the vote. Lutz also concluded that while polls fail rather frequently, there remains a substantial lack of transparency pertaining to methods, data collection, etc., which impairs the possibility to examine the reasons for failures more thoroughly. He concluded with a rather provocative question: What are the polls good for?

What about the polls for the elections in Switzerland? Joye presented a paper written together with Sapin, Pollien and Ernst-Stahli where they explored two main reasons that may account for discrepancies between the polls and the vote, namely the absence of cell-only households and the hard-to-reach and reluctant respondents. Using a face-to-face survey with a response rate of 45 percent, they divided the respondents into three groups: those who have a landline telephone and are listed in the directory, those who have a landline but are not listed and finally those who do not have a landline. They show that the main difference appears between those who have a landline and those who don't, the former being more interested in politics, more inclined to vote and stating political preferences that are more to the right. They then turned to the political profile of the compliant respondents (75%) compared with the reluctant (10%) and hard-to-reach (15%) respondents. Using the same survey, they show that there is a slight difference in political orientation between the three groups. However, using a short questionnaire to non-respondents, they find no difference whatsoever between respondents and non-respondents. Finally, using the same procedure but with the European Social Survey, they indeed found a difference between respondents and non-respondents, the latter being less interested in politics, more right-wing and less positive towards surveys. They concluded that the impact of non response is not stable and may vary with methods, mode of administration, etc.

As for Traugott and Wlezien, they took advantage of a never occurred situation, i.e., the fact that, for the first time since the actual system of primaries was established in the United States in 1976, there was an open contest until the end in a series of primaries before a presidential election. In previous elections, the nominee was generally known by March. In addition, the failure of the polls in the New Hampshire primaries where all 13 pre-election polls foresaw an Obama victory and Clinton won with 3 percent more, triggered an inquiry by AAPOR. Traugott and Wlezien examined the reasons for the gaps between the polls and the vote in U.S. 2008 Primaries. They analysed 258 polls conducted for 36 Democratic Primaries and 219 polls conducted for 26 Republican Primaries. Regressing the difference between poll share and vote share on a number of predictors shows that this difference was mainly explained (41% of the variance) for the Democrats by a) the percent of Blacks in a given state and b) the winner's poll share. As for the Republicans, the winner's poll share is also a predictor together with the number of McCain delegates. The analysis did not include the impact of the time of the survey because only "final estimates" produced in the last week before each primary were used.

Finally, I presented a paper prepared with Deslauriers, Goyder and Foucault that aimed to review the literature on instances where polls have gone wrong, defined as instances where most polls either did not predict the winner or showed a systematic bias in their estimation of the final vote share. We found 51 articles pertaining to 39 such instances in 15 countries. These articles deal with over 150 polls from at least 80 different pollsters and show that there is a concentration of cases from 1980 to 2009 (26 cases out of 39), which corresponds to the spread of political polls, including in emerging democracies. We looked for similarities between cases at the socio-political and methodological levels. Most electoral systems (35 out of 39) were proportional in different ways. The number of candidates in each election varied: 22 elections had only two candidates, nine elections had three, and eight more than three. Besides, only 15 cases ended with a gap of five percent

---

(Polls continued from page 6)

or less between the two leading candidates. Voter turnout does not seem to explain cases either since only two elections had a turnout of 60% or less and 11 had a turnout of 90% or more. However, in 17 out of 21 cases where the information is provided, a candidate or party considered populist or from the extreme-right was present. At the methodological level, problems related to coverage and sampling are the most often mentioned. They comprise non-response bias (26 articles, 10 countries), quota-related problems (17 articles, 4 countries) and coverage and selection (16 mentions, 9 countries). Problems of estimation are also mentioned: weighting and adjustment (9 mentions, 5 countries) and imputation of preferences to non-disclosers (8 mentions, 5 countries). Articles tend to attribute failures even more to psycho-socio-political factors like late decision (32 mentions, 10 countries) and the spiral of silence (20 mentions, 10 countries). We conclude that polls' failure should be seen as an occasion that brings new insight in polls methodology and their role in the political arena.

**In conclusion**, this session allowed sharing new directions in the analysis of why polls go wrong. First, Dormagen et al. as well as Joye et al. focussed on the possible relationship between cooperation to surveys and political preference. Though this is a well researched topic, they bring new input in using multiple sources of data or examining multiple elections in specific settings. While Dormagen et al. find that response rates vary greatly by political opinion as well as by social class, Joye *et al.* find that respondents and non respondents do not always differ. It depends on the context. Both Fumagalli and Sala and Joye *et al.* examined coverage, more specifically the absence of non-listed telephone numbers and of cell-only households in the sampling frame, as a possible factor in explaining failures of the polls. They indeed conclude that coverage may play a role. Lutz and Pekari as well as Traugott and Wlezien examine series of polls in order to try to explain the difference between the polls and the vote. Also, Durand *et al.* tried to look at a series of elections where polls fail to predict the election accurately. Whatever the means used to answer the question, recourse to multiple polls, to multiple elections or to multiple datasets seems the way to go if we are to find regularities that may bring us to preview contexts or methods — or specific

methods in specific contexts — that may lead to failure of the polls. Also, combining data coming from the media coverage of different elections could also give us insight into the reasons for the failure of the polls.

References:

Dormagen, Jean-Yves and Patrick Le Hingue  
Why do exit polls necessarily go wrong? And why it matters for sociological knowledge of electoral behavior

Durand, Claire, Deslauriers, Mélanie, Goyder, John and Martial Foucault  
Mispredictions of electoral polls : A metaanalysis of methodological and socio-political determinants over 50 years

Fumagalli, Laura and Emanuela Sala  
Telephone coverage error and Italian polls. The case of 2006 and 2008 general elections

Joye, Dominique, Sapin, Marlène, Pollien, Alexandre and Michèle Ernst Stahl  
Does methodology matter? An exploration based on the Swiss side of international surveys

Lutz, Georg and Nikolas Pekari  
Why polls can go wrong: On the difficulty of predicting referenda outcomes with polls in Switzerland

Traugott, Michael and Christopher Wlezien  
Contextual Effects on Poll Performance during the 2008 Presidential Nomination Contest



If you have an interesting idea for an article we could use in the newsletter, please send an email to Renae Reis (Editor) at [renae@wapor.org](mailto:renae@wapor.org) or to Alejandro Moreno (Publications Chair) at [Alejandro.Moreno@reforma.com](mailto:Alejandro.Moreno@reforma.com). We are always looking for articles about things such as new research, historical perspectives of research or any other information that would be of interest to our members/readers. Thank you!



## "Journey of Students and Young Researchers in Public Opinion"

3 November 2010 - Paper Submission Deadline

### Belo Horizonte, Brazil

*The next Latin American Congress...*

Applications for participation in the IV Latin American Congress of Public Opinion of WAPOR are currently being accepted. The current congress is being organized based on eight Thematic Areas (AT) and is open to the participation of young researchers in public opinion. The subject areas for submission of work are as follows:



*"WAPOR Congress, Belo Horizonte Brazil will manage the importance and challenges of public opinion and democracy, in its interface with communication policy and new technology and it will involve Latin American, European and American researchers."*



Co-sponsored by POP and UFMG.

- AT1-Methodology and investigation in public opinion
- AT2-Public opinion and new technologies
- AT3-Public opinion and media
- AT4-Public opinion, campaign and vote
- AT5-Parties, political representation and public opinion
- AT6-Social capital, citizenship and World Values survey
- AT7-Public opinion and political participation
- AT8-Public opinion, political culture and democracy

Registration to participate at the congress-as a listener or with the submission of a paper-will close on November 3 and should be made directly from the congress website at <http://www.waporbh.ufmg.br>.

**Contact:**

**Helcimara de Souza Telles, Congress Chair**

Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais - UFMG

Faculdade de Filosofia e Ciências Humanas - FAFICH / Departamento de Ciência Política - DCP

Av. Antônio Carlos, 6.627 - CEP:30850-021 - Belo Horizonte/MG - Brasil

Telephone: +(55) (31) 3409-5007 | Fax: +(55) (31) 3409-5030

**Twitter:** @oppublica

**E-mail:** waporcongressbh@gmail.com



---

## Born to be a Respondent?

Tom W. Smith

NORC/University of Chicago

Lori Foster Thompson (North Carolina State University), Zhen Zhang (Arizona State University), and Richard D. Arvey (National University of Singapore) have authored the first study “to test whether a genetic component underlies survey response behavior.” Their research, “Genetic Underpinnings of Survey Response,” appears in the *Journal of Organizational Behavior* (2010), so far only available online at [www.interscience.wiley.com](http://www.interscience.wiley.com). They conducted a survey of 1,116 identical or fraternal twins from the Minnesota Twin Registry. Using standard behavioral genetic methodology, they estimated the genetic component of survey response by comparing the differences between identical twins, who have a 100% overlap in their genes, with fraternal twins who on average share 50% of their genetic make up. Their models estimated that between 45-49% of the variance in responding to their survey was related to inherited traits. They are unable to identify the specific genetic attributes that predict survey response, but mention a predisposition towards or against engaging in helping behavior as one likely factor.

This study is limited by having used only Caucasian twins from one states, by studying only twins who had participated in an earlier survey, by covering only responses to a postal survey, and by focusing in their literature review and analysis only on research in organizational behaviors (especially surveys of employees),

Better understanding the genetic traits that influence survey response should both help understand types of people underrepresented in surveys and to suggest approaches that might be utilized to boost response rates.

---

## *Conferences of Other Associations*

### 2010

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

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

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

March 24-27, 2011  
International Workshop on Comparative Survey Design and Implementation (CSDI)  
2011 CSDI Workshop  
London, England  
<http://csdiworkshop.org>

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

July 18-22, 2011  
Fourth Conference of the European Survey Research Association (ESRA)  
Lausanne, Switzerland  
<http://surveymethodology.eu/conferences/>

---

**Call for Abstracts**  
**WAPOR Regional Seminar**

***“Transnational Connections – Challenges and Opportunities  
in Communication for Public Opinion Research”***

Segovia, Spain  
March 17-18, 2011

The World Association for Public Opinion Research will hold a spring regional seminar, “Challenges and Opportunities for Public Opinion Research” as part of the international *Transnational Connections* symposium series in Segovia, Spain.

*About the Regional Seminar*

As the media landscape evolves, citizens have unprecedented control over increasingly diverse content and as the boundaries between news and entertainment are officially blurred, it is central to ask what motivates media exposure and how various media formats affect attitudes, behaviors, and also public opinion, polarization and conflict. As scholars pay renewed attention to every-day talk, the interplay between media, political discussion and public opinion deserves closer scrutiny. Also, with increasing campaign professionalization and with political consultants applying their skills internationally, it is essential to ask whether campaigning techniques are applicable across sociopolitical contexts and generate similar effects. Further, the proliferation of new media, such as social networking, Twitter and mobile telephones in developing countries, necessitates assessing their political consequences. Lastly, as new methods of studying public opinion emerge, it is worthwhile to ponder whether the methodological advances go hand in hand with theory building and with greater understanding of the antecedents and consequences of public opinion, citizen participation and political governance. This confluence of developments provides the perfect backdrop for examining the state of the field of public opinion.

We encourage scholars and practitioners with sociological, psychological, political science and/or communications science background, using a variety of quantitative and qualitative research methodologies, to submit abstracts and panel proposals that revolve around the main conference topics:

- Media Coverage and public opinion-antecedents and consequences
- Polarization, fragmentation, and conflict
- New media, public opinion and political participation
- Deliberation, political discussion, social network heterogeneity
- Media exposure, selectivity
- Public opinion (mis)perception
- Non-political media and public opinion
- Social movements and grassroots organizing
- Studying public opinion in challenging environments
- Electoral campaigns and public opinion
- Novel approaches to studying public opinion

Abstracts should include a general description of the research paper or panel (research topic, questions or hypotheses, methods and results), up to 5 keywords as well as full contact information (mailing address, e-mail address and telephone number) and affiliation for each co-author on a separate sheet. The abstract should not exceed 500 words.

**Deadline for proposals: 15 November 2010**

*[About the Transnational Connections Symposium Series](#)*

The first symposium, Transnational Connections - Challenges and Opportunities for Political Communication (<http://www.transnationalconnections.ie.edu>), brought together scholars and practitioners from 15 countries around the world who debated the state of political communication research, the new theoretical and methodological frontiers facing the field and the possibilities for international collaboration.

This year, researchers and practitioners will again meet at the IE University, which houses 21<sup>st</sup>-century facilities in a 13<sup>th</sup>-century convent. The Symposium will include conference-style panels during which participants will present research papers as well as issue-specific workshops during which invited scholars will plan and/or advance collaborative research projects.

The Symposium will be co-sponsored by the IE School for Communication at IE University and the Center for Global Communication Studies at the Annenberg School for Communication, University of Pennsylvania in partnership with the Political Communication Divisions of the International Communication Association (ICA), the International Political Science Association (IPSA), and the European Communication Research and Education Association (ECREA) and the Mediated Communication, Public Opinion, and Society Section of the International Association for Media and Communication Research (IAMCR).

**Contact for inquiries:**

Magdalena Wojcieszak  
IE School of Communication  
IE University  
Cardena Zúñiga  
12 40003 Segovia  
Spain  
[communication@ie.edu](mailto:communication@ie.edu) or  
[magdalena.wojcieszak@ie.edu](mailto:magdalena.wojcieszak@ie.edu)

**Contact for submissions:**

WAPOR  
University of Nebraska-  
Lincoln  
Gallup Research Center  
201 North 13th Street  
Lincoln, NE 68508-0242  
USA  
[renae@wapor.org](mailto:renae@wapor.org)



---

## Calendar

## News...

### **2010**

#### **November 3, 2010**

Submission deadline for IV Latin American Congress "*Journey of Students and Young Researchers in Public Opinion*"  
See page 8 for more information

#### **November 15, 2010**

Submission deadline for WAPOR Regional Seminar  
"*Transnational Connections-Challenges and Opportunities in Communication for Public Opinion Research*"  
See page 10-11 for more information

#### **December 15, 2010**

Submission deadline for events or articles for the next WAPOR newsletter

### **2011**

#### **March 17-18, 2011**

WAPOR Region Seminar  
"*Transnational Connections-Challenges and Opportunities in Communication for Public Opinion Research*"  
Segovia, Spain

#### **May 4-6, 2011**

IV Latin American Congress of Public Opinion  
"*Journey of Students and Young Researchers in Public Opinion*"  
Belo Horizonte, Brazil  
[http://wapor.unl.edu/pdf/Preliminary\\_Schedule.pdf](http://wapor.unl.edu/pdf/Preliminary_Schedule.pdf)

In the coming weeks you will be receiving two notices in your inbox. One is will be your dues notice if you are a "pay as you go" member of WAPOR. This year our goal is to do online renewals. This is a result of our new website on which you will be able to sign in securely into your user account, edit any information, search the site for information about other members, and best of all, pay your dues online. We will let you know when this feature is live.

The second notice you will receive is your invitation to vote for council members in this year's election. You will receive an invitation to vote at the email address that we currently have on file for you. This email address will also be your user name, ensuring that each member is only able to vote once in the election.

The paperless dues notices and e-balloting will allow WAPOR to save money on printing and postage, while reducing in impact on the environment. Be sure to add the email [renae@wapor.org](mailto:renae@wapor.org) to your address book to ensure delivery of these important notices.

- 
- 
- Do you have an idea for an article in the newsletter?
  - Is there an event happening in your part of the world?
  - Are you intersted 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 Alejandro Moreno (Publications Chair) at [Alejandro.Moreno@reforma.com](mailto:Alejandro.Moreno@reforma.com).

*Let us know your upcoming events.*

*Please note, the deadline date for the  
4th quarter newsletter is  
December 15, 2010*

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](mailto:renae@wapor.org)

Editor: Renae Reis