

Index

- 1936 US presidential election, 18
- 2008 US presidential election, 52
- 2010 Brazilian presidential election, 48
- 2015 Greek referendum, 9, 96–104, 106
 - context of, 96–98
 - coverage bias, 102–103
 - estimation error, 103–104
 - measurement error, 100–102
 - nonresponse bias, 102
 - polls versus actual results, 98
 - sampling error, 100
 - spread calculations, 98–100
- 2016 Brexit, 106
- 2016 US presidential election, 2, 9, 83–93, 106
 - aggregate polls, 94–95, 136–138
 - approval ratings, 129
 - author's story, 53–54
 - availability bias, 121
 - change election model, 128
 - confirmation bias, 119–120
 - coverage bias, 61, 85–87
 - economy and, 130, 132
 - effective public opinion in, 18–19
 - estimation error, 88–89
 - expert predictions and, 114
 - fundamental prediction models, 139–140
 - likely voter models, 71
 - measurement error, 89–93
 - nonresponse bias, 87–88
 - as polling miss example, 136
 - probabilistic thinking, 123
 - salad bowl model, 141–142
 - sampling error, 83–85
 - as single input failure, 116–118
 - triangulation, 142–145
- 2018 Brazilian presidential election, 63
- 2018 Columbian referendum, 106
- 2018 US midterm elections, 219–220
- 2019 Argentine presidential election, 22–23, 106, 120–121
- 2020 US presidential election, 23, 106
- 2022 Brazilian presidential election, 11, 77
 - antiestablishment sentiment, 194–195
 - background, 190–191
 - behavioral intent polls, 206–208
 - benchmarks, creating, 190
 - as change election, 193–194
 - context (for messaging), 192–197
 - main problem heuristic, 195–197
 - message stickiness, 200–202
 - message testing, 202
 - messenger credibility, 197–200
 - packaging perspective of public opinion, 200–204, 208
 - second round messaging, 204–206
 - segmentation of electorate, 191–192
 - structural perspective of public opinion, 191–200, 208
 - summary table (for messaging), 202–204
- a posteriori cut point approaches, 77–78
- a priori cut point approaches, 76–77
- Abramovitz, Alan, 117, 119
- Adams, Eric, 174–175, 180
- aggregate enlightenment of public opinion, 42–43
- aggregate polls, 9, 94–96, 136
 - 2015 Greek referendum poll assessment, 96–104
- herding bias, 96, 105
- “one person, one vote,” 17–18, 24
- probabilities and, 136–138

- aggregate polls (cont.)
 - total survey error, 96
 - weighted aggregation, 18–19, 24, 99–100
- aggregate stability of public opinion, 8, 39–42
- alternative data sources, 218–222
- American Soldier, The* (Stouffer), 18
- analytical methods of pollsters, 188
- antiestablishment sentiment
 - 2022 Brazilian presidential election, 194–195
 - rise of, 163–166
- antiquity, public opinion in, 15, 24
- approval ratings, 10, 110, 147, 148–160
 - Biden example, 27–30, 154–160
 - convergent validity of social media data, 219
 - external events and, 46–48
 - as heuristic model, 128–129
 - policy factors, 149–150, 153–154
 - “rally around the flag” effect, 41, 152
 - salad bowl model, 141–142
 - structural factors, 149–153
- Athens, public opinion in, 15, 24
- attention (information processing), 36, 181–182
- attitude formation, 13, 25, 37
 - dynamic model, 8, 13, 25, 30–37, 168
 - misinformation, 185
 - static model, 8, 13, 25, 26–30, 37, 168
- attitudes
 - defined, 20, 24
 - measuring, 19–21, 24
 - non-attitudes, 44–45
 - public, 214
 - public opinion, relationship with, 8
 - rankings and ratings, 26–30, 179–181
 - in single polls (behavioral intent), 134
- attributes (attitude formation), 26–30
 - Biden approval ratings example, 27–30
 - defined, 27
- Auxilio Brasil, 194
- availability bias, 121
- average absolute difference (AAD), 98
- ballot question. *See* behavioral intent polls
- barriers (in behavioral outcomes), 134
- behavioral intent polls, 133–136, 206–208
- belief confirmation, 181–182
- benchmarks, 190
- between-person change, 45–46
- bias
 - availability bias, 121
 - cognitive biases, 9–10, 105, 109
 - confirmation bias, 118–121, 125
 - coverage bias, 9, 60–64, 82, 85–87, 102–103
 - explained, 55–56
 - herding bias, 96, 105, 121–122
 - mathematical depictions of, 56–57
 - measurement error, 67–69, 82, 89–93, 100–102
 - nonresponse bias, 64–67, 82, 87–88, 102
 - in single polls (behavioral intent), 135–136
- Biden, Joe. *See also* 2020 US presidential election
 - approval ratings example, 27–30, 154–160
 - infrastructure example, 33–35, 181–182, 184–185
 - targets (of messaging), 173
- binary thinking, 122
- Bishop, George, 44
- Blanco, Jimena, 120
- Bolduc, Don, 22
- Bolsonaro, Jair, 63, 164. *See also* 2018 Brazilian presidential election; 2022 Brazilian presidential election
- bottom-up attention, 36
- bounded rationality, 45
- Brazilian presidential election (2022). *See* 2022 Brazilian presidential election
- Brazilian quality-of-life agenda, 160–163
- “broken system” index, 163–165, 194–195
- Bush, George H.W., 152
- Bush, George W., 41, 46, 152, 154
- California Proposition 8, 23
- change elections, 127–128, 143, 193–194
- change in public opinion, mechanisms of, 45–46
- cherry-picking, 118–121
- Clinton, Hillary, 2. *See also* 2016 US presidential election
- cognitive biases, 9–10, 105, 109
 - availability bias, 121
 - binary thinking, 122
 - confirmation bias, 118–121
 - experts and prediction, 113–114
 - herding bias, 121–122
 - probabilistic thinking, 122–124
 - single input learning styles, 114–118
- cognitive processing. *See* information processing
- cognitive science, 30–37
- combinatorial models, 73
- communications
 - analytical methods of pollsters, 188

- attention, grabbing, 181–182
- behavioral intent polls (2022 Brazilian election), 206–208
- benchmarks, creating, 190
- context (for messaging), 192–197
- evaluation (information processing stage), 187–188
- literature on, 171
- main problems questions, 195–197
- message ecosystem, 171
- message stickiness, 182–185, 200–202
- message testing, 186–187, 202
- messages, 174–177
- messenger credibility, 177–178, 197–200
- messenger familiarity, 178–179, 197–198
- misinformation, 185
- packaging perspective of public opinion, 181–188
- priority linkages, 185–186
- rankings and ratings, 179–181
- second round messaging (2022 Brazilian election), 204–206
- structural perspective of public opinion, 171–181
- summary table example, 189, 202–204
- targets (of messaging), 172–174, 191–192
- conceptual frameworks for public opinion, 10–11
- confirmation bias, 118–121, 125
- Congress (US), founding of, 16–17
- context
 - 2015 Greek referendum, 96–98
 - 2016 US presidential election poll assessment, 89
 - 2022 Brazilian presidential election messaging, 192–197
 - antiestablishment sentiment, rise of, 163–166
 - for approval ratings, 153
 - Brazilian quality-of-life agenda, 160–163
 - in fundamental prediction models, 138–141
 - importance of, 3–4
 - measurement error and, 67–68
- context-based analysis, 10, 110, 147–148, 160–166, 212
- context-independent fundamental models, 141–142
- continuity elections, 127–128, 193
- convergence, 8, 21–23, 24
- convergent validity, 80, 219
- Converse, Philip, 44
- country image, diplomacy and, 175–176
- coverage bias, 9, 60–64, 82, 135
 - 2015 Greek referendum poll assessment, 102–103
 - 2016 US presidential election poll assessment, 85–87
- COVID vaccine uptake, 80
- credibility
 - of information, 31, 36, 37, 185, 187
 - linkage with familiarity, 178–179
 - of messengers, 177–178, 182–185, 197–200
 - of pollsters, 214–216
- cues and clues, 183–185, 200–202
- cut points in likely voter models, 76–78
- data quality. *See* quality of data
- data scientists, pollsters as, 7, 9, 51–52, 110, 168, 211
 - 2015 Greek referendum poll assessment, 96–104
 - 2016 US presidential election poll assessment, 83–93
- analyst assessment of likely voter models, 78
- author's story, 52–54
- bias, explained, 55–56
- coverage bias, 9, 60–64
- cut points in likely voter models, 76–78
- derived intention model, 75–76
- election miss examples, 106
- error, explained, 55–56
- estimation error, 9, 69–70
- likely voter models, necessity of, 70–72
- mathematical depictions of bias/error, 56–57
- measurement error, 67–69
- nonresponse bias, 64–67
- non-sampling error, 9, 60
- reliability, explained, 80–81
- sampling error, 9, 58–60
- sensitivity analysis of 2022 Brazilian presidential election, 78–79
- total survey error, 9, 57–58
- traditional Gallup model, 74–76
- validity, explained, 80–81
- Davis, James, 40
- decision inputs
 - approval ratings, 147, 148–160
 - context-based analysis, 147–148, 160–166
 - public opinion as, 8, 16, 23–24, 167–169, 214.
- See also* communications

- decision makers, 214
 - convergence with public opinion, 21–23, 24
 - public opinion usage, 5, 8
- DEFF (sample design effect), 59–60
- democracy, public opinion in formation of, 16–17
- demographics, stability of public opinion, 40
- derived intention model, 73, 75–76
- descriptive aspect of pollsters, 212
- design decisions
 - mode of survey administration, 61–63, 66, 85–86
 - post-survey weighting, 63–64, 66, 86–87
- detractors, 172–173, 191–192
- differential name recognition, 48, 178, 197–198
- differential nonresponse, 66
- diplomacy, country image and, 175–176
- direction (attitudes), 20
- discrete outcome polling, 145–146
- divergent validity, 80
- “don’t know” (DK) options
 - 2016 US presidential election poll assessment, 89–93
 - measurement error and, 68–69
- Doxiadis, Aristos, 97
- dynamic model (attitude formation), 8, 13, 25, 30–37, 168
 - credibility of information, 31, 36
 - emotions and, 32–33
 - infrastructure example, 33–35
 - memory as networks, 33–35
 - online processing model, 35–37
 - short-term and long-term memory, 32
- economy
 - in 2016 US presidential election, 132
 - approval ratings and, 47, 150–151, 155–158
 - in heuristic models, 129–131
- effective public opinion, 18–19, 24, 172
- elaboration (information processing), 182–185
- election prediction, 10, 106, 109–110, 211–212
 - 2016 US presidential election triangulation, 142–145
 - approval ratings, 147, 148–160
 - author’s story, 111–112
 - discrete outcome polling, 145–146
 - fundamental models, 138–142
 - heuristic models, 126–133
 - poll-based models, 133–138
 - social media data sources, 219–220
 - triangulation, 126
- election turnout rates, 71
- emotions, information processing and, 32–33, 182–185
- enhancement (with non-survey data), 221
- Enlightenment, public opinion during, 15–16, 24
- enlightenment of public opinion, 42–43
- error, 9
 - estimation error, 9, 69–70, 82, 88–89, 103–104
 - explained, 55–56
 - mathematical depictions of, 56–57
 - measurement error, 67–69, 82, 89–93, 100–102
 - non-sampling error, 9, 60, 82
 - sampling error, 9, 58–60, 81, 83–85, 100
 - in single polls (behavioral intent), 135–136
 - total survey error, 9, 57–58, 83, 96, 98–100, 211
- estimation error, 9, 69–70, 82, 135
 - 2015 Greek referendum poll assessment, 103–104
 - 2016 US presidential election poll assessment, 88–89
- evaluation (information processing), 36, 187–188
- Expert Political Judgment: How Good Is It? How Can We Know?* (Tetlock), 113
- experts
 - prediction and, 113–114
 - single input learning styles, 114–118
- expressions of public opinion, 214
- extension (with non-survey data), 221
- external events, impact on public opinion, 46–48
- familiarity of messengers, 178–179, 197–198
- favorability. *See* credibility
- Federalist Papers, The: No. 63*, 17
- Fernández, Alberto, 22–23, 120–121
- five-variable segmentation scheme, 173
- forecasts. *See* election prediction; prediction
- fortune tellers, pollsters as, 7, 9–10, 52, 109–111, 168, 211–212
 - 2016 US presidential election triangulation, 142–145
 - approval ratings, 147, 148–160
 - author’s story, 111–112
 - availability bias, 121
 - binary thinking, 122
 - confirmation bias, 118–121

- context-based analysis, 147–148, 160–166
- discrete outcome polling, 145–146
- experts and prediction, 113–114
- fundamental prediction models, 138–142
- herding bias, 121–122
- heuristic prediction models, 126–133
- poll-based prediction models, 133–138
- probabilistic thinking, 122–124
- single input learning styles, 114–118
- triangulation, 124–125
- foxes, 115–116, 117–118
- framing, 176, 180, 200
- fundamental prediction models, 138–142, 143
- future of pollsters, 222
- Gallup, George, 18
- Gallup model, 73, 74–76
- General Social Survey (GSS), 40
- general will, 16, 24
- government popularity. *See* approval ratings
- Greek referendum. *See* 2015 Greek referendum
- Haddad, Fernando, 63, 191
- Hamilton, Alexander, 17
- hedgehogs, 115, 116–117
- herding bias, 96, 105, 121–122
- heuristic prediction models, 126–133, 143
 - approval ratings, 128–129
 - change election, 127–128
 - economy in, 129–131
 - main problem heuristic, 131–133
- heuristic-based reasoning, 45
- hot cognition, 33, 183
- house effects, 136
- House of Representatives (US), founding of, 16–17
- Hurricane Katrina, 46
- ill-informed citizenry
 - instability of public opinion and, 43–45
 - low information rationality, 45
- incomplete sample frame, 60
- incumbency, 141–142
- inflation (Biden approval ratings example), 155–158
- information processing, 30–37
 - attention, grabbing, 181–182
 - credibility of information, 31, 36, 187
 - emotions and, 32–33, 182–185
 - evaluation stage, 187–188
 - infrastructure example, 33–35
 - memory as networks, 33–35
 - misinformation, 185
 - online processing model, 35–37
 - priority linkages, 185–186
 - short-term and long-term memory, 32
- information sources, 25
- infrastructure example
 - attention, grabbing, 181–182
 - dynamic model (attitude formation), 33–35
 - message stickiness, 184–185
 - priority linkages, 186
- instability of public opinion, 38, 43–45, 46–49
- intensity (attitudes), 20
- intent–behavior link, 134–135
- intention (in behavioral outcomes), 134
- interpretation (information processing), 36
- issue salience, impact on public opinion, 48–49
- Jay, John, 43
- law of large numbers, 42
- likely voter models
 - analyst assessment of, 78
 - constructing, 72–73
 - cut points in, 76–78
 - derived intention model, 75–76
 - estimation error, 88–89, 103–104
 - necessity of, 70–72
 - sensitivity analysis, 78–79, 88
 - traditional Gallup model, 74–76
- Lippman, Walter, 43
- long-term memory, 32
- low information rationality, 45
- Lula da Silva, Luiz Inácio, 111–112, 161, 163, 169–170. *See also* 2022 Brazilian presidential election
- Macri, Mauricio, 22–23, 120–121
- Madison, James, 17
- main problem heuristic, 131–133
 - 2016 US presidential election
 - triangulation, 143
 - 2022 Brazilian presidential election, 195–197
 - Biden approval ratings example, 156–158
 - Brazilian quality-of-life agenda, 160–163
 - policy factors in approval ratings, 153–154
- majoritarian aggregation, 17–18
- margin of error (MOE), 9, 58–60, 81, 83–85
- Markov Chain Monte Carlo Simulation (MCMC), 136

- McCain, John, 52
 measurement error, 67–69, 82, 135
 2015 Greek referendum poll assessment, 100–102
 2016 US presidential election poll assessment, 89–93
 median voter model, 21
 memory
 emotions and, 32–33
 as networks, 33–35
 short-term and long-term, 32
 Menoume Europi (Stay in Europe)
 movement, 97
 message stickiness, 181, 182–185, 200–202
 message testing, 186–187, 202
 message-messenger fit, 179, 198–200
 messages (in political communications), 174–177
 messaging. *See* communications
 messengers
 credibility, 177–178, 182–185, 197–200
 familiarity, 178–179, 197–198
 methodological statements, 87
 microtargeting, 173
 middling elections, 127–128
 Milbank, Dana, 116
 misinformation, 44, 185
 mobocracy, 16–17
 Moore, Michael, 117
 multi-attribute model (attitude formation).
 See static model (attitude formation)
 naïve model, 73, 76
 name recognition. *See* differential name recognition; familiarity of messengers
 “Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics, The” (Converse), 44
 “neither” options. *See* “don’t know” (DK) options
 Nelson, Jim, 119
 networks, memory as, 33–35
 neutrality (attitudes), 20
 no cut point approaches, 76
 non-attitudes, 44–45
 noneconomic factors in approval ratings, 151–153
 nonresponse bias, 64–67, 82, 135
 2015 Greek referendum poll assessment, 102
 2016 US presidential election poll assessment, 87–88
 non-sampling error, 9, 60, 82, 135
 coverage bias, 9, 60–64, 85–87, 102–103
 estimation error, 9, 69–70, 88–89, 103–104
 measurement error, 67–69, 89–93, 100–102
 nonresponse bias, 64–67, 87–88, 102
 non-survey data, 218–222
 Norporth, Helmut, 117
 Obama, Barack, 52
Obergefell v. Hodges (2015), 23
 “one person, one vote,” 17–18, 24
 online processing model, 35–37
 “other” options. *See* “don’t know” (DK) options
 overlapping spreads, 83–85
 packaging perspective of public opinion, 10, 168, 181–188, 212
 2022 Brazilian presidential election, 200–204, 208
 attention, grabbing, 181–182
 elaboration, 182–185
 evaluation (information processing), 187–188
 message testing, 186–187
 misinformation, 185
 priority linkages, 185–186
 Page, Benjamin, 39
 partisanship (infrastructure example), 33–35
 party identification nonresponse problem, 66
 personal relevance, 181–182
 persuadables, 172–173, 191–192
Phantom Public, The (Lippman), 43
 philosophical concept, public opinion as, 15–16, 24
 polarization, 3
 policy factors in approval ratings, 149–150, 153–154, 158
 policy makers. *See* decision makers
 political communications. *See* communications
 political pollsters, 216–217
 politico-graphic model, 73, 76
 poll-based prediction models, 133–138, 143
 aggregate polls and probabilities, 136–138
 single polls (behavioral intent), 133–136
 polling industry
 organizations and associations, 213–214
 origin of, 17–18
 polling results
 context, importance of, 3–4
 public opinion, relationship with, 3

- polls (surveys), 2
 2015 Greek referendum, versus actual results, 98
 aggregation. *See* aggregate polls
 attitude measurement, 19–21, 24
 election miss examples, 106
 error in. *See* error
 history of, 6
 mode of administration, 61–63, 66, 85–86
 non-attitudes and question wording, 44–45
 non-survey data as proxy, 220–222
 post-survey weighting, 63–64, 66, 86–87
 public opinion, as synonymous, 17–18, 24
 question wording, impact of, 49
 as single input failure, 114–118
- pollsters. *See also* data scientists, pollsters as;
 fortune tellers, pollsters as; spin doctors,
 pollsters as
 author's story, 3–4, 52–54, 111–112, 169–170
 challenges for, 2–3, 4
 credibility of, 214–216
 defined, 6, 212–213
 descriptive aspect, 212
 future of, 222
 polling organizations and associations,
 213–214
 purpose of, 212–213, 217–218
 three-hatted, 7, 8, 52, 110, 168, 211–212
 types of, 216–217
- popularity of government. *See* approval ratings
- populist politics, rise of, 163–166
- post-survey weighting, 63–64, 66, 86–87
- prediction, 109–111, 211–212. *See also* election
 prediction
 availability bias, 121
 binary thinking, 122
 cognitive biases, 9–10, 109
 confirmation bias, 118–121
 context-based analysis, 147–148, 160–166
 experts and, 113–114
 herding bias, 121–122
 probabilistic thinking, 122–124
 single input learning styles, 114–118
 triangulation, 124–125
- predictive validity, 80, 219–220
- presidential approval ratings. *See* approval ratings
- presidential elections. *See also* 2016 US
 presidential election; 2022 Brazilian
 presidential election
 1936 (US), 18
 2008 (US), 52
 2010 (Brazil), 48
 2018 (Brazil), 63
 2019 (Argentina), 22–23, 106, 120–121
 2020 (US), 23, 106
- priming, 183
- priority linkages, 176–177, 185–186, 196
- private pollsters, 216–217
- probabilistic thinking, 122–124
- probabilities from aggregate polls, 136–138
- proof points, 176
- Proposition 8 (California), 23
- public attitudes, 214
- public opinion, 1–2
 alternative assessment methods, 6
 in ancient Rome and Athens, 15, 24
 approval ratings, 10, 110
 attitude measurement, 19–21, 24
 attitudes, relationship with, 8
 benchmarks, creating, 190
 conceptual frameworks, 10–11
 context-based analysis, 10
 convergence with decision makers,
 21–23, 24
 as decision input, 8, 16, 23–24,
 167–169, 214. *See also*
 communications
 decision-maker usage of, 5, 8
 effective public opinion, 18–19, 24, 172
 enlightenment of, 42–43
 expressions of, 214
 external events and, 46–48
 in founding of United States, 16–17
 instability of, 38, 43–45, 46–49
 issue salience and, 48–49
 mechanisms of change, 45–46
 non-survey data, 218–222
 packaging perspective, 181–188
 as philosophical concept, 15–16, 24
 polarization in, 3
 polling results, relationship with, 3
 polls, as synonymous, 17–18, 24
 as predictor. *See* election prediction
 quality of data. *See* quality of data
 question wording and, 49
 sociopolitical outcomes, assessing, 5, 8
 stability of, 8, 38, 39–43
 structural perspective, 10, 168, 171–181
 public pollsters, 216–217
 public will, 214

- qualitative likelihood, 123
- quality of data, 51–52
 - 2015 Greek referendum poll assessment, 96–104
 - 2016 US presidential election poll assessment, 83–93
- analyst assessment of likely voter models, 78
- bias, explained, 55–56
- coverage bias, 9, 60–64
- cut points in likely voter models, 76–78
- derived intention model, 75–76
- election miss examples, 106
- error, explained, 55–56
- estimation error, 9, 69–70
- likely voter models, necessity of, 70–72
- mathematical depictions of bias/error, 56–57
- measurement error, 67–69
- nonresponse bias, 64–67
- non-sampling error, 9, 60
- reliability, explained, 80–81
- sampling error, 9, 58–60
- sensitivity analysis of 2022 Brazilian presidential election, 78–79
- total survey error, 9, 57–58
- traditional Gallup model, 74–76
- validity, explained, 80–81
- quality-of-life agenda (Brazil), 160–163
- question order
 - 2016 US presidential election poll assessment, 89
- measurement error and, 67–68
- question wording
 - 2015 Greek referendum poll assessment, 100–102, 105
 - 2016 US presidential election poll assessment, 89–93
- impact on public opinion, 49
- measurement error and, 68
- non-attitudes and, 44–45
- “rally around the flag” effect, 41, 152
- rankings (attitude formation), 26–30
 - Biden approval ratings example, 27–30
 - defined, 27
 - in political communications, 179–181
 - stability of, 28
- ratings (attitude formation), 26–30
 - Biden approval ratings example, 27–30
 - defined, 27
 - in political communications, 179–181
- Rational Public, The: Fifty Years of Treands in Americans’ Policy Preferences* (Page and Shapiro), 39
- referendum. *See* 2015 Greek referendum
- relative optimism, 193
- reliability, 80–81, 82
- response order
 - 2016 US presidential election poll assessment, 90
 - measurement error and, 68
- Rome, public opinion in, 15, 24
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, 16, 24
- Rousseff, Dilma, 48, 161
- rules of thumb, 4
- Sabato, Larry, 116
- salad bowl model, 117, 141–142
- same-sex marriage legalization, 23
- sample design effect (DEFF), 59–60
- sample frames, 60
- sample mean, 55–56
- sample survey, 19
- sampling error, 9, 58–60, 81, 135
 - 2015 Greek referendum poll assessment, 100
 - 2016 US presidential election poll assessment, 83–85
- second round messaging (2022 Brazilian presidential election), 204–206
- segmentation, 172–174, 191–192
- Senate (US), founding of, 16–17
- sensitivity analysis
 - 2016 US presidential election, 88, 144
 - 2022 Brazilian presidential election, 78–79
- triangulation, 125
- Serra, José, 48, 111–112, 169–170
- Shapiro, Robert, 39
- short-term memory, 32
- Silver, Nate, 116, 118
- simple aggregation, 17–18
- simple random sampling (SRS), 59
- single input learning styles, 114–118
- single polls (behavioral intent), 133–136
- Social Contract, The* (Rousseau), 16
- social media data sources, 219–220
- sociopolitical outcomes
 - defined, 5
 - public opinion and, 8
- sovereign debt crisis. *See* 2015 Greek referendum
- spin doctors, pollsters as, 7, 10–11, 52, 110, 167–169, 212

- analytical methods used by, 188
- author's story, 169–170
- behavioral intent polls (2022 Brazilian election), 206–208
- packaging perspective of public opinion, 181–188, 200–204, 208
- second round messaging (2022 Brazilian election), 204–206
- structural perspective of public opinion, 171–181, 191–200, 208
- summary table example, 189, 202–204
- spreads
 - 2015 Greek referendum calculations, 98–100
 - overlapping, 83–85
- stability
 - of issue rankings, 28
 - of public opinion, 8, 38, 39–43
- static model (attitude formation), 8, 13, 25, 26–30, 37, 168
- Stouffer, George, 18
- structural factors in approval ratings, 149–153, 155–158
- structural perspective of public opinion, 10, 168, 171–181, 212
- 2022 Brazilian presidential election, 191–200, 208
- messages (in political communications), 174–177
- messenger credibility, 177–178
- messenger familiarity, 178–179
- rankings and ratings, 179–181
- targets (of messaging), 172–174
- substitution (with non-survey data), 221
- supporters, 172–173, 191–192
- surveys. *See* polls (surveys)
- targets (of messaging), 172–174, 191–192
- testing messages, 186–187, 202
- Tetlock, Philip, 113
- three-hatted pollsters, 7, 8, 52, 110, 168, 211–212.
 - See also* data scientists, pollsters as; fortune tellers, pollsters as; spin doctors, pollsters as
- three-variable political segmentation, 172–173, 191–192
- time-for-change model, 117
- timing effects
 - Biden approval ratings example, 155–156
 - in single polls (behavioral intent), 134–135
- total survey error, 9, 57–58, 83, 96, 98–100, 211
- traditional Gallup model, 73, 74–76
- triangulation, 212
 - 2016 US presidential election, 142–145
 - Biden approval ratings example, 158–160
 - cognitive biases, 109
 - election prediction, 124–125
 - fundamental prediction models, 139
 - single input learning styles, 115
 - as validation, 80
- true population value, 55–56
- Trump, Donald, 2, 49, 163, 180, 219. *See also* 2016 US presidential election; 2020 US presidential election
- trust. *See* credibility
- Tsipras, Alexis, 97
- turnout rates for elections, 71
- uncertainty, 123
- United States, public opinion in founding, 16–17
- vaccine uptake, 80
- validity, 80–81, 82, 219–220
- voting-age population, percentage by country, 70. *See also* likely voter models
- Wang, Sam, 116
- weighted aggregation, 18–19, 24, 99–100
- weighted data
 - post-survey design, 63–64, 66, 86–87
 - sensitivity analysis of 2022 Brazilian presidential election, 78–79
 - triangulation, 125
- will of all, 16
- within-person change, 45–46