



NEWSLETTER

Third Quarter

2004

Executive Council

President

Dr. Kathleen A. Frankovic, USA

Past President

Dr. Brian Gosschalk, UK

Vice President & President-Elect

Prof. Esteban López-Escobar, Spain

Secretary-Treasurer/General

Secretary

Prof. Dr. Allan L. McCutcheon, USA

Liaison Committee Chair

Mr. Nick Moon, UK

Publications Chair

Dr. Thomas Petersen, Germany

ESOMAR Liaison

Dr. Frits Spangenberg, Netherlands

Professional Standards Committee

Prof. Dr. Tom Smith, USA

Membership Committee Chair

Prof. Dr. Connie de Boer, Netherlands

IJPOR Managing Editor

Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Donsbach,
Germany

Executive Coordinator

Ms. Renae Reis, USA

2005 Conference Chair

Dr. Thomas Petersen, Germany

National Representatives

Australia, Mr. Ian W. McNair

Canada, Mr. Raffaele Fasiolo

Chile, Ms. Marta Lagos

China, Dr. Robert Ting-Yiu Chung

Costa Rica, Dr. Carlos F. Denton

Czech Republic, Dr. Hynek Jerabek

Germany, Dr. Thomas Petersen

India, Mr. Prakash Nijhara

Japan, Mr. Kazuo Kobayashi

Mexico, Mr. Alejandro Moreno

Netherlands, Dr. Claes de Vreese

Norway, Prof. Ottar Hellevik

Philippines, Dr. Mahar K. Mangahas

Poland, Dr. Krzysztof Zagórski

South Africa, Ms. Mari Harris

Sweden, Mr. Arne Modig

Switzerland, Prof. Dr. Sibylle

Hardmeier

UK, Mr. Nick Moon

USA, Dr. Mark Schulman

**UPCOMING ANNUAL CONFERENCE:
SEPTEMBER 15-17, 2005
CANNES, FRANCE**

Canada 2004: The Cliff-Hanger that Wasn't

By Nat Stone

2006 WAPOR Conference Chair

Canada's political system represents a number of anomalies. While its system of government is modeled on that of the United Kingdom, its political culture has embedded features of both the United States and Continental Europe. And then there are the regions—Canada's political culture is regional. From polarized British Columbia to prosperous, free enterprise Alberta to centrist, centralist Ontario to collectivist, decentralist Quebec to the predominantly Anglo-Celtic Atlantic Region, Canada is a nation of regions.

Yet despite the uniqueness of Canada's political culture, the system of choosing governments is derived from that of Westminster. The federal Parliament consists of an upper house (the Senate as opposed to the House of Lords) and a lower house (the House of Commons), upon whose support the Government rests and whose members are chosen in a general election.

On May 23, Prime Minister Martin called an election for Monday, June 28 for the 308 seats in the House of Commons. In order to form a majority government, a party would have to win 155 of those 308 seats. Otherwise, the party with the most seats would normally form a minority government. The outgoing centrist Liberal Party, led by Prime Minister Paul Martin, was widely considered the leading contender at the beginning of the campaign. The Liberals' base of support is populous Ontario, with 106 seats and Atlantic Canada, with 32 seats. The most important challenger was the free enterprise Conservatives, led by Stephen Harper. The Conservatives' base of support was Western Canada, with 92 seats. A third contender on the national level was the left-of-centre New Democratic, led by Jack Layton. The New Democrats' base of strength has traditionally been urban and English-speaking. The fourth major party was the Bloc Quebecois, led by Gilles Duceppe. The Bloc Quebecois, as the name suggests, focused exclusively on winning Quebec's 75 seats. The Green Party (environmentalist) was making a concerted effort to become one of the major parties.

The Campaign

Canada's most important English newsmagazine, MacLean's, called it "Canada's nastiest campaign" in a post-mortem (July 12, 2004).

Table of Contents

Canadian Elections.....	1
President's Letter... 2	
Dues Tier Structure Information.....	3
Pamplona.....	6
National Rep Report Germany.....	8
Cannes.....	9
Insert.....Pamplona	
Insert.....Tier Info	

(continued on page 4)

Letter from the President

I write this in the midst of an American election campaign — and the time when charges and questions about public opinion polling are at their peak. While it is always distressing to have to defend your work in public forums, I think it's important to note how important opinion polls have become in political life. In an odd way, the myriad of political attacks indicates how integral measures of public opinion are to democracies, and how believable they have become. Polls have managed to achieve the success that George Gallup and others in the 1930s could only hope for.

But this success obviously comes at a price: once people believe you get things right, and think you have credibility, your results become a greater threat to partisans and can be attacked just as easily as a candidate attacks an opponent.

The recognition that polling could become a source of perceived truth was recognized more than 50 years ago. Stuart Dodd, then the director of the Washington State Public Opinion Laboratory, wrote that polling ranked among the most common rationalizations of beliefs. He invoked the use of the phrase “They say.” As he put it: “‘They say’ proves things. ...if it’s ‘in the numbers’ it proves things. ‘I saw it in a book, I saw it in print’ proves things. ‘It’s psychology’ — that proves things. And unfortunately polling falls into all those four categories: ‘They say — it’s gossip — it’s what the man in the street says’; ‘It’s in numbers’; ‘It’s in print’; and ‘It sounds psychological.’”¹



*WAPOR President
Kathleen Frankovic*

“The ability to conduct and report public opinion polls has empowered news organizations--it has given them the ability to disseminate information about public opinion to the entire public, essentially democratizing information.”

Attacks on opinion polls are also not new. In 1948, Harry Truman labeled the polls “sleeping polls,” produced to lull the electorate in to not voting. In 1992, Ross Perot decided that he couldn’t trust the polls, so he took his own “mail-in” survey via TV Guide. Also in 1992, the first George Bush accused pollsters of being “nutty” or “crazy,” and perhaps even “inhaling.” Four years later, another Republican, Bob Dole, also trailing in the polls, attacked them in one out of every

three speeches he gave in the fall campaign. And Dole’s pollster’s may have been the first operative to sent out memos claiming public polls were interviewing “too many Democrats.”

But the attack level in this election is extraordinary, as the attacks come from both sides. So far this year, the Los Angeles Times poll was accused of oversampling Democrats (with one of the President’s pollsters calling the results a “mess”), the Minnesota State Republican Party held a press conference to denounce the Minneapolis Star-Tribune’s poll and call for the firing of its director, and moveon.org, a liberal political group, took out a full page advertisement in The New York Times to criticize Gallup’s polling methods. Moveon.org included an unbelievably personal attack, claiming that Gallup’s results (which showed Bush comfortably ahead) were due to the religious beliefs of George Gallup, Jr., a son of the poll’s founder and Chairman of the Gallup International Institute (NOT the polling organization).

The ability to conduct and report public opinion polls has empowered news organizations – it has given them the ability to disseminate information about public opinion to the entire public, essentially democratizing information. But this empowerment comes at an ever-increasing price. Many people no longer want to publicly admit that an opinion poll result is based on objective measurement – perhaps as much because they believe the results and fear the reaction as because they don’t believe them. Instead many are very willing to attribute partisan motives to the pollster and the poll – and by extension, the news organization that sponsors it.

(continued on page 3)

Several current WAPOR activities aim at addressing this question. First, the thematic seminar to be held in Pamplona in November – “Elections, News Media and Public Opinion.” Coming so soon after the U.S. elections, this will be an opportunity to review the relationship between public opinion and journalists.

Second, two WAPOR Council members, Nick Moon and myself, are part of a new ESOMAR/WAPOR year-long project on public opinion polls. We aim to rewrite the WAPOR/ESOMAR Guide to Opinion Polls (last revised in 1998), and search out ways to improve the relationship between public opinion researchers and the media. The first meeting of this group was held in Lisbon September 20. It included a press conference where Portuguese journalists raised questions about the relationship between polls and policy, and asked the inevitable question about why U.S. election polls had different results.

Finally, Esteban Lopez-Escobar, WAPOR's president-elect, is chairing a WAPOR committee to examine the situation in Venezuela, to see if we can learn more about why exit poll and vote count differed.

WAPOR welcomes your suggestions on all of these projects.

(Endnotes)

I. “Causes of the Disparity Between Poll Findings and Election Returns,” in Norman Meier and Harold Saunders,

The Polls and Public Opinion

(New York: Henry Holt, 1949), 174

WAPOR Council Adopts a 3-Tier Membership Fees Structure

By Allan McCutcheon

WAPOR Secretary-Treasurer and General Secretary

In its recent meeting on 20 October 2004, WAPOR Council adopted a new 3-tier membership fee structure based on nation of residence. Concern had been growing among several members of Council that WAPOR membership fees—while modest in comparison to the membership fees of many international organizations—were pricing many potential members out of WAPOR membership. This concern was particularly acute for members who live in nations with developing economies. All of the members of WAPOR Council expressed the desire that WAPOR be an inclusive organization, extending our membership to the widest possible audience of public opinion researchers worldwide.

To address this situation, Council voted unanimously to adopt a 3-tier structure in which members residing in Tier A nations will be assessed 100 percent of the membership fees, members residing in Tier B nations will be assessed 75 percent of the membership fees, and members residing in Tier C nations will be assessed 50 percent of the membership fees. Other than the differences in membership fees, members in each of the tiers will maintain identical rights and obligations as do the members in all of the other tiers. A complete listing of the nations in each of the three tiers, as well as a detailed listing of the specific membership fees structure, can be found on the WAPOR webpage. The new tier structure will become effective in 2005. Those members who reside in Tier B and C nations, and have already paid multi-year memberships, will receive extended years of membership based on the new membership fee structure—the Secretariat will notify those members directly.

Council asks that all WAPOR members encourage their colleagues in other nations to become a WAPOR member. Our ability to meet the worldwide challenges of polling and reporting on public opinion in all nations, and our ability to extend WAPOR membership privileges to colleagues in all nations, will be insured only if our international colleagues know of our efforts at inclusiveness. WAPOR will also conduct an advertising campaign to encourage public opinion researchers of all nations to become WAPOR members.

(Canada continued from page 1)

While the Conservatives spent much of their ammunition focusing on recent scandals of the Liberal Government, the Liberals based their campaign on the theme that the Conservatives could not be trusted.

For researchers, however, the big story of the 2004 federal election was the constantly shifting battleground during the 36-day campaign. Starting with a comfortable lead, Liberal hopes for a majority government quickly faded as the election became a horse race with the Conservatives. This highly competitive contest, however, suddenly gave way to a Liberal lead in the closing hours of the campaign—which led to a Liberal victory of sorts—a minority government of 135 seats as opposed to 99 for the Conservatives.

Table I shows the final survey results by each of Canada's major polling firms.

Table I Final Poll Results of Major Firms and the Actual Election Result, by % of Votes by Party

Party	Ipsos-Reid %	Ekos %	Environics %	COMPAS %	SES %	Actual Result %
Liberal	32	33	33	34	34	36.7
Cons	31	32	33	33	30	29.6
NDP	17	19	19	15	20	15.7
Bloc	12	11	11	13	14	12.4
Green	6	5	5	5	4	4.3

Ipsos-Reid: June 21-23, N= 2000

Ekos: June 21-24, N= 4159

Environics: June 17-22, N= 1444

COMPAS : June 22-23, N=800

SES (three-day average) June 24th, N=1200

At first, Table I may suggest to some that Canada's pollsters were "wrong." However, a more detailed analysis does not support the proposition that pollsters were "wrong" but rather that a number of factors were at play.

Factors that Contributed to the "Surprise Result"

SES Research

According to SES Research, several factors contributed to the "surprise result." SES Research and its media partner CPAC, Canada's political channel, gave Canadians an inside, day-to-day view of the political trends. SES-CPAC conducted nightly tracking polls that were made available to the public each day on CPAC's evening broadcast and on the SES Research website.

According to SES Research, the election campaign itself was characterized by a high level of voter volatility, with the Conservatives and Liberals battling for top spot throughout most of the four week campaign. When the writ was dropped in late May, SES's surveys indicated that the Liberals were ahead but vulnerable. Two factors shifted momentum from the Liberals to the Conservatives. First, the sponsorship scandal fed voter disenchantment. Second, the release of a bad news fiscal budget by the provincial Liberal party in Ontario, Canada's most populous province and a key battleground, added fuel to the "time for a change" mentality. Faced with a Conservative charge, the Liberals changed strategies and countered with ads attacking the Conservatives, and messaging which targeted the social democratic NDP voters to strategically vote Liberal to block a potential Conservative victory. The tide turned once again, and Paul Martin and Liberal party were re-elected, albeit with a minority government. SES trends showed the Liberals with a four point margin five days before voting day. By election day, this margin increased to eight points.

Ipsos Reid

Ipsos-Reid, a major Canadian public opinion firm, wrote in [For the Record: 2004 Federal Election Polling Post Mortem](#), "...the results of the 2004 election campaign were greatly influenced by a shift in voter support in seat-rich Ontario, and to a lesser extent in Quebec, in the final 24 hours of the campaign."

Ipsos-Reid found that there appeared to be a switch of 6.7% from the final Ipsos-Reid survey conducted on the night of Wednesday, June 23 to voting day, Monday, June 28. In Quebec, the Liberals rebounded and garnered approximate 5 points

(Canada continued from page 4)

during the same period. This shift added a considerable number of seats to the final Liberal tally of 135—and away from the Conservatives in Ontario and the Bloc Quebecois in Quebec.

According to the Ipsos-Reid analysis, there were two significant factors at play. First, the campaign had yet to have its full impact on voters when the polls were undertaken and released. Secondly, because Canada's election laws prohibit the release of polls on election day, the final shift would not have been reported in time to correct the record until after the votes were counted.

GPC Research

GPC Research attempts to explain the possible “surprise result” from a qualitative perspective. In order to understand how the undecideds were thinking and the factors that would ultimately guide their decision, GPC Research conducted a focus group mid-campaign with undecided voters of all ages in Ottawa, located in urban Ontario. Urban Ontario is traditional Liberal turf, but had become the key battleground between the Liberals and Conservatives. The focus group was intended to provide a more qualitative understanding of the views of some undecided voters and the issues that would ultimately affect their vote.

In the focus group, the undecided voters expressed skepticism about all the party leaders, specifically expressing anger toward Paul Martin, uncertainty about what Stephen Harper stands for and disbelief that Jack Layton would keep his promises or be given the opportunity to govern.

Integrity and sincerity were central issues for these undecided voters – with most indicating they would support the leader they believed was making reasonable commitments and was most likely to keep them. Social issues such as abortion, same-sex marriage and hate crimes legislation did not resonate as important election issues. Health care and taxes were very important. More specifically, voters were interested in learning how parties would use their tax dollars - and not necessarily interested in voting for parties who promised just to cut taxes.

At the end of the focus group, participants were asked to identify who they felt they would support in the election. While almost all wanted to support anybody but the Liberals, half the room ended up painfully and reluctantly indicating that – if forced to make a choice – they would have to vote for the Liberals.

Conclusion

In the end, Ontario did give 45% of its votes and 75 of its 106 seats to the Liberals. And from Ontario's two biggest cities (Toronto and Ottawa), the result was even more lopsided: 27 out of 30 seats went to the Liberals.

A closer analysis of the results of the polls and the election results themselves suggest that a number of factors contributed to the “surprise result” of the election.

Elections

WAPOR annual elections are currently under way. Candidates for Vice-President/President-Elect are Allan McCutcheon and Mike Traugott. The candidates for Standards Committee Chair are Mari Harris and Tom Smith. Ballots have been mailed to all current WAPOR members and are due in Brian Gosschalk's office by November 15. Brian Gosschalk and Nick Moon will be tallying the votes and will be “calling the election.” Please watch your email for the announcement of the results next month!

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. The WAPOR listserv is the easiest and fastest way to do just that! Send your email to wapor@unl.edu and your email will be received by all current WAPOR members. Please let us know if you have any questions.

WAPOR REGIONAL CONFERENCE

“Elections, News Media and Public Opinion”

Pamplona, Spain

November 24-26, 2004

The first WAPOR regional conference in Pamplona was held in May 16-18, 1997. It was a successful meeting entitled “Communication and Democracy”, attracted 30 participants from nine countries: Argentina, Hong-Kong, Israel, Japan, Mexico, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, the United States and Spain.

The second WAPOR regional conference took place in November 21-23, 2000. More than 60 participants came from Argentina, Armenia, Brazil, Chile, Denmark, Egypt, Mexico, the Netherlands, Peru, South Africa, Sweden, the United Kingdom, the United States, Uruguay, Venezuela and Spain.

There are many good reasons to attend the 2004 Pamplona regional conference: (i) despite being a regional conference it has traditionally attracted people from several countries, giving it a truly international perspective (this year we expect to have participants from Greece, Turkey and other new countries, such as Latin America); (ii) 2004 it is a very interesting year in which several elections have taken, or will take place (Spain, the United States, United Kingdom, Canada, all the countries of the European Union, etc.); (iii) taking part in the conference is an excellent occasion to join WAPOR (membership offers a number of benefits for those working in the field of public opinion); (iv) for the potential American participants the timing is good: it is a holiday period (a Thanksgiving dinner is planned in Pamplona).

Pamplona, Spain is the capital of the former kingdom of Navarra, and is easily accessible by plane or train. Participants can reach Pamplona via Madrid, taking one of several daily flights or a comfortable train ride, or Barcelona. Its proximity to San Sebastian, Bilbao (home of the Guggenheim Museum), the Basque Coast, and Biarritz in France, as well as its internationally renowned cuisine, make Pamplona an ideal setting for this conference. Ernest Hemingway was a frequent visitor to Pamplona, because he loved the popular feast in which the bulls run on the streets. In addition, the conference will be subsidized by the regional government, which means lower costs for seminar participants. Please see the following page for the preliminary program and page 11 for your registration form. You can also visit www.wapor.org for more information on everything from the seminar to the accommodations available during your stay in Spain. See the websites below for even more information on Pamplona and Spain!

<http://www.pamplona.net>

<http://spainforvisitors.com/sections/events2.htm>

<http://www.red2000.com/spain/pamplona/>

<http://www.idealspain.com/Pages/Places/Pamplona.htm>

Program Information

Please see our website at
www.wapor.org for program
developments



Seminar Preliminary Program

(depending on the number of attendants and of accepted papers some changes can take place)

The conference venue is the University of Navarra's central building. The comfortable and handsome Aula Magna has been booked for the opening of the event. The sessions will take place in smaller meeting rooms. There will be some sessions for Spanish speaking delegates, but in the opening session there will be simultaneous translation.

Wednesday, November 24th

19,45: Reception offered by the President of the regional government of Navarra (Palacio de Navarra)

20,30: Dinner in the Napardi's 13th century dining room (Napardi is the best known male gastronomic association in Pamplona; members of the association will cook for the conference attendants)

Thursday, November 25th (University of Navarra's central building)

8,30: Accreditation

9,15: Opening of the conference (central building, Aula Magna)

9,30-11,00: Plenary Session

11,00-11,30: Coffee break

11,30-13,00: Session/s

13,30: Lunch ("Faustino"; cafeteria-restaurant in the central building)

15,30-17,00: Session/s

17,00-17,15: Coffee break

17,15-18,45: Session/s

21,00: Thanksgiving dinner

Friday, November 26th (University of Navarra's central building)

9,00-10,30: Session/s

10,30-10,45: Coffee break

10,45-12,15: Session/s

12,45: (potentially: reception in the City Hall offered by the Lady Major)

13,45: Lunch

16,00-17,30: Session/s

17,30-18,00: Coffee break

18,00-18,30: Closing of the conference (central building, Aula Magna)

We are providing room for 24 papers at least. The number could be increased depending on the proposed papers and the judgement of the selection committee. The length of the presentations will be 15 to 20 minutes, depending on the final arrangements.

Saturday, November 27th Excursion (optional)

National Representative Report--Germany

Thomas Petersen

WAPOR National Representative--Germany

“A poll is a poll is a poll”—this, as Daniel Yankelovich lamented on accepting the Helen Dinerman Prize eight years ago, is the media’s guiding principle. The quality of a survey, Yankelovich maintained, plays no role in media reporting: good surveys and bad surveys are all lumped together as if they were of the same quality. Today, it would seem as if we have gone a significant step further in Germany: now, bad surveys are clearly preferred to good ones. As a rule, the more abstruse and absurd a survey finding is, the more astonishing it appears and the greater the likelihood that it will attract journalists’ interest and thus find its way into the media spotlight.

One recent example is a survey called “Perspektive Deutschland,” which was conducted not long ago for a second time by the management consulting firm McKinsey & Company, together with the German TV broadcaster ZDF, the newsmagazine Stern and the telecommunications company T-Online. The survey’s sponsors proudly proclaimed that 356,000 people had participated in the study, thus making “Perspektive Deutschland” the “largest sociopolitical online survey worldwide.” The study was representative, its initiators claimed, since weighting was used to compensate for the effects of self-selection and the fact that the master sample was limited to Internet users.

The findings of the study ought to appear absurd to anyone with even the most rudimentary knowledge of representative surveys. For example, according to the findings of this survey, 52 percent of all Germans would be willing to accept pension cuts if this would help to stabilize the social welfare system. Serious representative surveys show, however, that the share of persons who would actually be in agreement with such a measure is less than 10 percent. It is hard to imagine any clearer demonstration of the inability of weighting procedures to compensate for the effects of self-selection. Yet this did not prevent journalists and politicians from trumpeting the findings of “Perspektive Deutschland” like those of practically no other survey. The large number of respondents was so attractive—just like in the days of the Literary Digest surveys—that all doubts were dispelled as to the veracity of the findings, which were obviously grotesquely distorted. The study was just too big, too beautiful, too amazing to be ignored. Who cared that it was wrong?

Somewhat more calm has returned—for the moment, at least—to the debate on preserving respondents’ anonymity, which had roiled German market research over the past three years. So far, German survey researchers have adhered to the principle that personal data that could help to identify respondents is not to be passed on to third parties—including the clients commissioning the surveys. In recent years, however, some members of the “Arbeitskreis deutscher Markt- und Sozialforschungsinstitute” (ADM), a German market research association, urged that this rule be dropped so as to facilitate certain types of research on customer satisfaction—and perhaps also to enable them to get into the business of trading address databases which, when combined with market research findings, would be extremely attractive for the advertising sector. Such a decision would have had catastrophic consequences for survey research in Germany. Along with the legal ramifications for the research process (there was the risk that respondents would have had to be asked to give written consent before participating in a survey), a decision of this kind could have severely damaged the image of survey research in the eyes of the population. The majority of ADM institutes, along with other associations such as the “Berufsverband deutscher Markt- und Sozialforscher” (BVM) and the primarily academic “Arbeitsgemeinschaft sozialwissenschaftlicher Institute” (ASI), recognized the danger and were able to prevent the ADM from making such a decision.

(continued on page 10)

WAPOR

58th Annual Conference

"Search for a New World Order—
the Role of Public Opinion"

Cannes, France

September 15-17, 2005

FIRST CALL FOR PAPERS

There are great events on the horizon. In the late summer of next year, researchers will be gathering in Cannes, the famous seaside resort on the French Cote d'Azur, for the 58th annual WAPOR conference. The site is ideal for the conference and participants will find the hotel we have chosen, the

Novotel Cannes Montfleury
25, avenue Beauséjour
06400 Cannes
France

www.novotel.com

is the perfect setting, offering a cool Nordic air in sweltering southern France.

Quiet and yet centrally located, it is not hard to tell that the modern four-star hotel once belonged to the Radisson/SAS group and it has remained true to its Scandinavian heritage: the conference rooms, which are furnished in pale wood, bear names such as "Oslo," "Stockholm," or—the southern most outpost—"Berlin." If that is not refreshing enough, conference participants can cool down in the spacious hotel pool, situated right next to the conference rooms—unless, of course, they would prefer to take a brief 10-minute stroll to downtown Cannes and the famous seaside promenade. Registration forms for the conference and hotel accommodations will be published in the WAPOR Newsletter well ahead of the conference.

*"Search for a New
World Order--the
Role of Public
Opinion."*

Of course, WAPOR annual conferences are not just about tourism, but are primarily meant to be an important intellectual experience and the 2005 conference in Cannes is no exception. We would be pleased to receive as many proposals for papers, panels or round table sessions as possible. The 2005 conference will have a central theme: "Search for a New World Order—the Role of Public Opinion." Although this topic may remind some people, particularly Americans, of political catchphrases that were commonly used in the last few decades, it is intended to be neutral in terms of both political and philosophical outlooks. In view of the turmoil at the start of the 21st century, we feel it is time to take a closer look at the fundamental question of what role survey research has to play in a rapidly changing world. For example, how can survey research scientifically track the growing tensions between the Western and Islamic worlds and, in so doing, contribute to a better understanding of the underlying reasons for the divisions between these two parts of the world and also, to a certain extent, within the Western world as well? How is the international community of survey researchers effected by the emergence of new economic and political powerhouses, particularly in Asia? In view of the ever greater complexity of international relations, how can survey researchers today continue to fulfil their obligations as chroniclers for future

(continued on page 10)

historians, as so forcefully described by Paul F. Lazarsfeld in 1950? In other words, how can we best shoulder the responsibility entailed in being the only scholarly discipline capable of reliably documenting and relaying the popular mood directly—i.e. without interpretation by the media or other analysts—to future historians? These are just some of the questions we would like to consider in Cannes.

Of course, these are not the *only* questions we would like to discuss! The theme is intended as a focus point and not a defining criterion! It goes without saying that the WAPOR annual conference in Cannes will, as always, provide a broad forum for all survey research issues. We are looking forward to receiving a wide variety of interesting papers pertaining to the entire spectrum of methodological research and applied survey research from around the world. Please send your proposals for papers and panel sessions, along with a brief abstract of about one or two pages, **by April 1, 2005 at the latest** to:

Thomas Petersen
Institut für Demoskopie Allensbach
Radolfzellerstrasse 8
78476 Allensbach
Germany

Tel.: +49 (7533) 805 191
Fax: +49 (7533) 3048

Email: tpetersen@ifd-allensbach.de

Calendar

November 24-26, 2004
Pamplona, Spain
Regional Conference

September 15-17, 2005
Cannes, France
58th Annual Conference

When the Dutch researcher Joop van Holsteyn presented findings at the WAPOR conference in Cadenabbia demonstrating how a postal survey had resulted in a better election forecast than a telephone survey, Hans Zetterberg exclaimed: “Have our telephone surveys become so damn bad that they can’t even hold their own with written surveys?” In Germany, there are some indications that the quality of telephone samples is in fact declining rapidly. Along with the known difficulties—low response rates, distortions due to the overrepresentation of respondents with high strength of personality, and a rapidly growing number of households with unlisted numbers or with no fixed-line telephone connection—a lesser known problem has also arisen in recent times: i.e. the fact that more and more households have broadband telephone connections, for which they automatically receive three telephone numbers from the phone company—something of which the householders themselves are often not aware. As a result, these households are overrepresented in RDD surveys.

The preceding article is a new feature in the WAPOR Newsletter. Each edition, we will be featuring information and happenings regarding public opinion research in each country by asking the National Representative of that country to write a piece for the newsletter. Thomas Petersen will be contacting each National Representative for their article.

***Please let us know your upcoming events.
Deadline for 3rd quarter newsletter events or
article submission is December 15, 2004.***

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_reis@gallup.com
Editor: Renae Reis

WAPOR Regional Conference
"Elections, News Media and Public Opinion"
Pamplona, Spain
November 24-26, 2004

Registration Form

Name: _____

Organization/Institute: _____

Address: _____

Country: _____

Telephone: _____

Fax: _____

Email: _____

Registration Fees include welcome reception and dinner, and meals on November 25 & 26

	Price per Person	Number of Persons	Total
WAPOR Member:	225 euros	_____	_____
Non-WAPOR Member*:	315 euros	_____	_____
Student: (undergraduate and graduate enrolled)	165 euros	_____	_____
Non-WAPOR Student*:	215 euros	_____	_____
Total amount**			_____

*Non-member rate includes 2005 membership in WAPOR

**Please note, the fee charge is shown here in Euros but will be charged in US Dollars in accordance with the exchange rate at www.oanda.com for the date we receive your registration form.

Method of payments accepted: Credit card (see below) or check in US Dollars

MasterCard or Visa number: _____

Expiration date: _____ Cardholder signature: _____

Please return to:

WAPOR
UNL Gallup Research Center
200 North 11th Street
Lincoln, NE 68588-0242, USA
Fax: 1 402-458-2038
Renae_Reis@gallup.com

Tier-A	Tier-B	Tier-C
Andorra	American Samoa	Afghanistan
Aruba	Anguila	Albania
Australia	Antigua and Barbuda	Algeria
Austria	Argentina	Angola
Bahamas	Bahrain	Armenia
Belgium	Barbados	Azerbaijan
Bermuda	Botswana	Bangladesh
Brunei	Brazil	Belarus
Canada	British Virgin Islands	Belize
Cayman Islands	Chile	Benin
Channel Islands	Cook Islands	Bhutan
Cyprus	Croatia	Bolivia
Denmark	Czech Rep.	Bosnia/Herzegovina
Faeroe Islands	Dominica	Bulgaria
Finland	Estonia	Burkina Faso
France	Gabon	Burundi
French Polynesia	Grenada	Cambodia
Germany	Guadeloupe	Cameroon
Greece	Hungary	Cape Verde
Greenland	Isle of Man	Central African Rep.
Guam	Korea, Rep.	Chad
Hong Kong	Lebanon	China
Iceland	Libya	Colombia
Ireland	Malaysia	Comoros
Israel	Malta	Congo Dem. Rep.
Italy	Martinique	Congo, Rep.
Japan	Mauritius	Costa Rica
Kuwait	Mayotte	Cote d'Ivoire
Liechtenstein	Mexico	Cuba
Luxembourg	Montserrat	Djibouti
Macao	Netherlands Antilles	Dominican Rep.
Monaco	Oman	Ecuador
Netherlands	Palau	Egypt
New Caledonia	Panama	El Salvador
New Zealand	Poland	Equatorial Guinea
Northern Mariana Islands	Puerto Rico	Eritrea
Norway	Saudi Arabia	Ethiopia
Portugal	Seychelles	Fiji
Qatar	Slovak Rep.	Gambia
San Marino	Slovenia	Georgia
Singapore	South Africa	Ghana
Spain	St. Kitts and Nevis	Guatemala
Sweden	St. Lucia	Guinea
Switzerland	Trinidad and Tobago	Guinea-Bisseau
Taiwan	Turkey	Guyana

United Arab Emirates	Uruguay	Haiti
United Kingdom	Venezuela	Honduras
United States		India
US Virgin Islands		Indonesia
		Iran
		Iraq
		Jamaica
		Jordan
		Kazakhstan
		Kenya
		Kiribati
		Korea, Dem. Rep.
		Kyrgyz Rep.
		Laos
		Latvia
		Lesotho
		Liberia
		Lithuania
		Macedonia
		Madagascar
		Malawi
		Maldives
		Mali
		Marshall Islands
		Mauritania
		Micronesia Fed.
		Moldova
		Mongolia
		Morocco
		Mozambique
		Myanmar
		Namibia
		Nepal
		Nicaragua
		Niger
		Nigeria
		Pakistan
		Papua New Guinea
		Paraguay
		Peru
		Philippines
		Romania
		Russian Fed.
		Rwanda
		Samoa
		Sao Tome and Principe

		Senegal Sierra Leone Solomon Islands Somalia Sri Lanka St. Vincent and Grenadines Sudan Suriname Swaziland Syria Tajikistan Tanzania Thailand Togo Tonga Tunisia Turkmenistan Tuvalu Uganda Ukraine Uzbekistan Vanuatu Vietnam West Bank and Gaza Yemen Yugoslavia, Fed. Rep. Zambia Zimbabwe
--	--	--